

LEADS

of the Left-Hand Path



A History of Spiritual Dissent

Stephen E. Flowers, Ph.D.

**LORDS OF THE LEFT-HAND PATH:
A History of Spiritual Dissent**

Stephen E. Flowers, Ph.D.

Second Edition

© 1997

Copyright © 1997
by Stephen E. Flowers

All rights reserved. No part of this book, either in part or in whole, may be reproduced, transmitted or utilized in any form or by any means electronic, photographic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the permission in writing from the Publisher, except for brief quotations embodied in literary articles and reviews.

For permissions, or for the serialization, condensation, or for adaptation write the Publisher at the address below.

Published by
RÛNA-RAVEN PRESS
P.O. Box 557
Smithville, Texas 78957

Printed in the United States of America

PRO OMNIS DOMINIS VIAE SINISTRAE

contra stupidos

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my appreciation to many who helped in the shaping and re-shaping of the work:

Michael A. Aquino, Don Webb, Rosemary Webb, R. L. Barrett, Nikolas Schreck, Zeena, J. Chisholm, Seth Tyrsen, Dianne Ross, Sir Ormsond, and my beloved wife Crystal Dawn.

Abbreviations

Ar.	Arabic
BCE	Before Common Era (= B.C.)
CE	Common Era (= A.D.)
DMP	Demotic Magical Papyri
G.	German
Gen.	Genesis
Gk.	Greek
Heb.	Hebrew
Jn.	John
Lat.	Latin
Lk.	Luke
Mk.	Mark
Mt.	Mathew
PGM	<i>Papyri Graecae Magicae</i> (= Preisendanz' edition of the Greek magical papyri)
pl.	plural
Rus.	Russian
sg.	singular
Skt.	Sanskrit

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: The Left-Hand Path.....	1
Introduction.....	1
The Right-Hand Path and the Left-Hand Path.....	2
White Magic / Black Magic.....	3
Lords of the Left-Hand Path.....	3
Chapter 2: The Eastern Traditions.....	13
The Left-Hand Path in the East.....	13
Right-Hand Path / Left-Hand Path.....	15
The Left-Hand Path in Hinduism.....	16
Left-Hand Path Hinduism.....	18
Methods of the Hindu Left-Hand Path.....	20
The Left-Hand Path in Buddhism.....	25
Methods of Left-Hand Path Buddhism.....	27
Zoroastrianism and the Left-Hand Path.....	28
Chapter 3: The Roots of the Western Tradition.....	35
Roots of the Western Left-Hand Path.....	35
Pagan Roots in Europe.....	35
The Hellenic Left-Hand Path.....	36
Prometheus and Pandora: The Origins of Evil and its Transformative Effects on Humanity.....	37
The Myth of Prometheus and the Left-Hand Path.....	38
The Greek Mysteries and the Left-Hand Path.....	38
Pythagoras and the Left-Hand Path.....	40
Plato and the Left-Hand Path.....	40
The Epicurean and Stoic Schools.....	43
The Left-Hand Path in the North.....	43
The Slavic Left-Hand Path.....	46
The Left-Hand Path among the Semites.....	47
The Orthodox Hebrew Synthesis of the Right-Hand Path.....	49
The Hamitic Left-Hand Path.....	51
The Cult of Set.....	51
Chapter 4: The First Millennium.....	57
Gnosticism and the Left-Hand Path.....	59
Was Jesus a Lord of the Left-Hand Path?.....	63
Islam and the Left-Hand Path.....	66
The Assassins and the Old Man of the Mountain.....	68
The Yezidi Devil Worshipers.....	69
Chapter 5: The Path of Satan.....	73
The Left-Hand Path in the Western Middle Ages.....	73
The Christian Heretics.....	76
The Dualists.....	76
The Pantheistic Free Spirits.....	77
The Witch Craze.....	79
The Faustian Path.....	81
Chapter 6: Lucifer Unbound.....	87
The Modern Age and New Understandings.....	87
“Old Nick”.....	88
Lucifer and the Enlightenment.....	89
To Rule in Hell.....	89
The Hell-Fire Club.....	90
The Divine Marquis.....	93
The Dawn of the Faustian Age.....	95

Goethe and Faust.....	96
The Classical Devil.....	99
Satan in the 19th Century.....	100
The Devil and the Romantics.....	100
Le Diable au XIXe Siecle.....	104
Leo Taxil and the Anarchistic Art of Hoaxing.....	106
The Red Devil.....	106
The Devil and Karl Marx.....	109
The Anarchistic Devil.....	109
The Rites and Rituals of Bolshevism.....	111
The Bolsheviks and the "Empire of Evil".....	114
The Will to Power: Nietzsche the Antichrist.....	119
Chapter 7: An Interlude in the Absolute Elsewhere:	
Adolf Hitler and the Modern Mythologizing of Evil.....	120
Nazi Irrationalism and Paganism.....	120
The Facts behind the Mythos.....	120
Nazi Medievalism and Science.....	121
The Life of Adolf Hitler: The Wolf Unbound.....	121
The Life of Heinrich Himmler:	
Lord of the Black Knights.....	122
Sources for the Study of the Nazis and Magic.....	123
Nazi Cosmology.....	123
Nazi Methodology.....	124
The Rituals of Nazism.....	125
The Nazis and the Left-Hand Path.....	129
Chapter 8: The Occult Revival.....	133
Helena Petrovna Blavatsky	
and the Theosophical Society.....	133
Theosophy and the Left-Hand Path.....	135
HPB and the "Light Bearer".....	136
The Great Beast: Aleister Crowley.....	137
Sources for the Study of Thelemism.....	138
Crowley's Magical Orders.....	138
Crowley's Cosmology.....	139
Philosophy of Man.....	141
Crowley's Theology.....	142
The Technology of Magick.....	144
Vision.....	146
The Saturnians and Gregor A. Gregorius.....	147
History of the FS.....	147
Saturnian Cosmology.....	148
Humanity in the Dark Light of Saturn.....	149
Saturnian "Theology".....	150
The Initiatory Path of Saturn.....	150
The Saturnian Vision.....	151
Gregor A. Gregorius and the Left-Hand Path.....	151
Austin Osman Spare: The Lover of the Self.....	152
The Fourth Way and the Left-Hand Path.....	153
Remarkable Men.....	155
Sources of Study.....	157
The Organization of the Work.....	158
The Work.....	158

The Seven Men: The Concept of Initiation in the Fourth Way.....	159
Cosmology.....	161
The Enneagram.....	162
A Fourth Way Theology?.....	163
The Methodology.....	163
“Evil” and the Fourth Way.....	164
Is the Fourth Way Left-Hand Path?.....	164
Modern Witchcraft and the Left-Hand Path.....	165
Chapter 9: Anton Szandor LaVey and the Church of Satan.....	171
The Life of Anton LaVey.....	172
The Myth of Dr. LaVey.....	175
The Early Church of Satan.....	177
The Greater Church of Satan.....	178
The Withdrawal of Dr. LaVey: The Church of Satan after 1975.....	179
Sources for the Study of Anton LaVey.....	180
Organization of the Church of Satan.....	181
Pre-1975 Degree System of the Church.....	182
Post-1975 Degree System of the Church.....	183
Major Doctrines of the Church of Satan.....	184
The Nine Satanic Statements.....	185
The Nine Satanic Sins.....	187
The Eleven Rules of the Earth.....	188
The Satanic Cosmology: or the World According to the Abominable Dr. LaVey.....	189
Cycles of Fire and Ice.....	190
LaVeyan Dualism.....	191
The Power of Limited Resources.....	193
The Satanic View of Mankind.....	194
Man as a Carnal Ego.....	195
Satanic Society and the Invisible War.....	195
“Satanic Sex”.....	197
Gender Politics and Imagery.....	197
“The Marquis LaVey”.....	198
Satanic Ethics.....	200
Satanic Immortality.....	201
Satanic Theology.....	202
Satanic Magic in Theory and Practice.....	203
Satanic Technologies.....	203
The Practice of Greater and Lesser Magic.....	203
Lesser Magic.....	203
Greater Magic.....	204
Satanic Psychodramatic Magic.....	205
Erotic Crystallization Inertia.....	206
Trapezoidal Magic.....	207
The LaVeyan Vision.....	208
Anton LaVey and the Left-Hand Path.....	209
Chapter 10: Michael A. Aquino: The Temple of Set.....	215
The Saga of Ra-en-Set.....	215
Influences.....	215
The Life of the Second Beast.....	214

The Tree in the North.....	221
The Flourishing of the Temple.....	222
Sources for the Study of the Temple of Set.....	222
The Jeweled Tablets of Set.....	222
The Inspired Works of Michael Aquino.....	223
Secondary Sources on the Temple.....	224
The Organizational Principles of the Temple.....	226
The Degree System of the Temple of Set.....	226
Orders within the Temple of Set.....	229
The Black Magical Universe: Setian Cosmology.....	229
Behold the Majesty of Set: Setian Theology.....	231
The Children of Set: Setian Anthropology.....	233
The Black Flame.....	233
The Elect of the Temple of Set.....	233
The Grail of Life beyond Death.....	234
Setian Magical Technology:	
Black Magic in Theory and Practice.....	235
Setian White Magic.....	236
The Practice of Lesser Black Magic.....	237
The Practice of Greater Black Magic.....	237
Xeper: Initiatory Black Magic.....	238
Ultima Futura: The Vision of the Temple of Set.....	239
Michael Aquino and the Left-Hand Path.....	240
Appendix: The Urban Legend of Satanicism.....	243
Terminus Viae: Afterword.....	249
Glossary.....	251
Bibliography.....	253

Preface
To the 1997 Edition
An Untimely Meditation

I began writing this book at the beginning of 1989 and for all practical purposes it was complete in late 1992. It was written during a time of great dynamism in my own life, and although the contents of the book may appear to many outward observers to be staid and even static, this dynamism is present just below the surface. This book was composed in large measure as a response to the irrational “Satanic scare” of the late 1980s and early 1990s. It was written with the intention of reaching a wide readership of thinking individuals capable of understanding the historical and cultural scope of ideas underlying the images of the left-hand path.

The manuscript proved to be an untimely one in this regard. I attempted to interest literary agents and publishers of all kinds in the manuscript— it was universally rejected. Large publishers were evidently only interested in books which sent one of two messages: either “devil worshippers are dangerous and lurking in your schools and day-care centers and you should be very afraid,” or “there are no such things as Satanists and those who call themselves that are bafoons.” Of course, this book provided neither of these approved cultural messages. *Lords of the Left-Hand Path* is a sober, objectively sympathetic and scholarly look at individuals and schools of thought which have been referred to as being *left-hand path*. This serious approach was thought to be “too disturbing” — as one agent put it to me — to be published for a broad readership.

Smaller publishers too found reasons to reject the manuscript. In this instance it was usually because the interpretations of their own sacred cows were seen as too controversial, or that certain individuals or schools of thought simply could not ever be mentioned in a book published by that company— such are the forces at work in the media today.

This is a forbidden book.

The contents of this book come through my own lens of understanding. The lens is my own and I take full responsibility and credit for both its shortcomings and any glory attached to it. However, it must also be said that, because of my particular hermeneutic, each of the individuals and schools observed in this text also contributed to the shaping and refinement of that lens. Beyond these there are other such shapers— chief among them my experience in academia. The intellectual techniques learned in that environment, perhaps more than any other are responsible for the form and nature of this text.

The original draft of chapter 9 of this book contained more extensive quotes from Anton LaVey. Permissions were denied for the use of these quotes, so this chapter was rewritten avoiding any extensive or contiguous quotations of the works by LaVey. The resulting text is perhaps less positive toward the Church of Satan than it might have been if LaVey had allowed himself to speak directly. However, the analysis in the chapter is now actually immensely more accurate.

It should also be noted that the author of this book is in not a Satanist, but is a practitioner of the left-hand path based on purely indigenous European models.

This is the first and last book I shall write on the subject of the left-hand path. What I have to say about the major schools discussed here has been said in this text. I have now returned to my own garden, there to tend the saplings of seeds long planted.

Stephen E. Flowers
Woodharrow
Friday June 13, 1997

Preface To the 1992 Edition

Is there a sinister conspiracy of Satanic forces loose in the world causing mayhem, abducting, abusing, and even sacrificing children and others to His Satanic Majesty? The media have asked these and other equally sensational questions have been asked in the recent past, and offered the most dramatic and entertaining answers possible for the consumption of a bored and dull public.

If the question arises as to whether there is a coherent Satanic or left-hand path philosophy or theology, the answer has to be that there is, and that there has been for centuries. However, the philosophers of this path of the left-hand have rarely been directly heard from until this century. The present age offers us the unique opportunity to hear directly from the Lords of the Left-Hand Path in a way unknown since the days of ancient philosophers.

We live in an age which enables us to become better informed of a wide variety of viewpoints and approaches to the spiritual problems of being human beings, it at the same time is an age which encourages a monotonous sameness in the answers to fundamental questions acceptable in a mass culture. The philosophers of the left-hand have always challenged the all-pervasive common ways of doing things — whatever those ways might have been — and thus have always been agents for change. The left-hand path, as expressed in the world today, is an open challenge to certain individuals who are ready to take it up. It is also now for the first time in ages being expressed openly in the hope that by knowing what its true character is, those who choose not to follow it will at least be informed as to what it is all about, and in this knowledge lose at least some of their age-old fear of it.

The point of view championed in this book is decidedly that of the left-hand path itself. I have years of training as a scholar, and have put these and other skills I have acquired to use in shaping a sympathetic, yet objective analysis of the major historical and contemporary manifestations of this fascinating ultimate adventure of the human spirit in the cosmos. This will be a refreshing departure. There have been dozens of recent books, and hundreds of books throughout history, which have purported to study the Devil and all his works from a decidedly antagonistic viewpoint. There have also been a very few studies for public consumption written by modern philosophical Satanists from a highly polemic angle. I trust that the objective reader will be no more put off by my viewpoint than he or she would be if a Catholic priest would write a book on the history of Christian theology.

There is a clear and present need for this work as there has never been a work of its kind, and this vacuum is becoming dangerous to the philosophical fabric of the post-modern world. Again the cries of “Burn the witch!,” “Kill the heretic!,” and “Death to the Satanist!” are being heard. This time not so much from priests and evangelists — who have already largely been discredited in this day and age — but by therapists and law enforcement officers, bolstered by the medieval world-views of extremist theologians. In the past it was impossible for the lords of the left-hand path to speak out; now the time has come when it is necessary that they must do so. This book indirectly gives a voice to all those who have tread the leftward road throughout history and who continue to explore it in the present world. If it brings just one ray of enlightenment on these matters, it will have done its work.

Dr. Stephen E. Flowers
Austin, Texas
Friday, January 13, 1989

Chapter 1

The Left-Hand Path

Introduction

We will begin with definitions. Philosophical inquiry calls for clarity, and we need clarity for this publicly unexplored realm. Without these precise definitions anyone exploring this path on any level will be led into the sea of misunderstandings and confusion (evident in the section below on the historical portrayals of the left-hand path and “black magic”). Exact understanding of the nature of the left-hand path hinges on a precise theory of the universe in which it is perceived. This theory and the model it presents will prove useful in analyzing the left-hand path traditions throughout history.(1)

The universe is the totality of existence both known and unknown. This is a complex model, divided into at least two components: 1) the objective universe and 2) the subjective universe. The objective universe is the natural cosmos— or world order. This is essentially mechanical or organic, i.e. it is ruled by certain predictable laws manifested in a time/space continuum. The objective universe, including the laws governing it, can be equated with “nature” as well as with “God” in the Judeo-Christian tradition. All of natural science as well as orthodox theology is predicated on the concept that these laws of the objective universe can be discovered and quantified or described in a purely rational manner in the first instance or by “divine revelation” in the other. When considered closely it is evident that what is usually referred to as “God” in orthodox religions is actually identical to that which he is said to create— the natural/mechanical/organic order— or *cosmos*. It might also be pointed out that there has generally been a popular but sometimes misleading distinction between the concepts “mechanical” and “organic.” On one level they are the same in that both are governed by predictable laws. A clock-work or the human body are both ruled and maintained by certain mechanical structures which allow them to function in their environments. At another level there is a distinction between the mechanical and the organic in that the organic model has the ability to propagate and mutate its mechanical structures to ensure its survival. This is possible because there are coded mechanisms within the organism expressly for this purpose (DNA) and because the malleable molecular structure of the mechanism allows for these mutations.

The *subjective universe* is the “world” of any sentient entity within the universe. There are as many subjective universes as there are sentient beings. The subjective universe is the particularized manifestation of consciousness within the universe. Usually experience of the *objective universe* is only indirect as information concerning it must come through the subjective universe. Curiously enough the subjective universe does not seem governed by the same natural/mechanical/organic laws as the objective universe— in fact this is the main distinction between them. The subjective universe has the option of acting in a *non-natural* way, i.e. free from the limitations of the world of five senses and three dimensions.

At this point it might be worth pointing out that the terms objective/subjective have nothing in common with the distinction between accurate/inaccurate, or exact/inexact which

popular usage might have projected onto the terms. The subjective universe is capable of far more accurate and exact manifold operations than the objective universe— your reading and understanding of these words is based on the exercise of a faculty within your subjective universe. In simple grammatical terms the subject is the reader, i.e. that which reads, and the object is that which is read. The subjective universe is capable of a full spectrum of possibilities which range from virtually absolute precisions to almost total delusion because it is not bound by natural laws. The focus or epicenter of this non-natural subjective universe is equated with human consciousness, or soul, or self.

The *non-natural* aspect of this soul is clearly and basically indicated by humanity's drive to impose structures artificially created in that subjective universe upon the objective universe. All artificially created structures (i.e. those made by art/craft) are by definition something separate and apart from the natural cosmos— be those structures pyramids, poems, or political institutions. Animals, many of which may have complex social organizations, are bound by nature and by their organic programming. The wolf-pack, no matter if in one part of the world or another, now or a million years ago, has the same social order. But you will look in vain to find *any two* human social institutions that are absolutely identical. Anything which is the product of the subjective universe — individual or collective — will bear the mark of variation.

Each particular instance of this soul — this phenomenon of the subjective universe — implies the existence of a first form or general principle from which all the particular manifestations are derived. In the most philosophically refined of the schools of the left-hand path this first *principle of isolate intelligence* is identified as the "Prince of Darkness," or the ultimate deity of the left-hand path. This is the archetype of the Self from which all particular selves are derived. This is also an element of the non-natural universe which objectively belongs to the universe itself. In this way the Prince of Darkness can be seen as an independent sentient being in the objective universe because this is the very *principle* of that quality in the universe. Humanity is the only species we know of which shares that quality.

The Right-Hand Path and the Left-Hand Path

The central question now becomes what is the way in which this conscious, free soul is going to relate to, or seek to interact with, the objective universe or the universe as a whole. The right-hand path answers this question simply by saying that the subjective universe must harmonize itself with the laws of the objective universe— be that envisioned as God or nature. Humanity is to seek knowledge of the law, and then apply itself to submitting to that law in order to gain ultimate union with the objective universe, with God, or nature. The right-hand path is the path of union with universal reality (God or Nature). When this union is completed the individual self will be annihilated, the individual will become one with the divine or natural cosmic order. In this state the ego is destroyed as "heaven" is entered or a nirvanic existence/non-existence is "attained." This is clearly the goal of all orthodox Judaic/Christian/Islamic or Buddhistic sects.

The left-hand path considers the position of humanity as it is; it takes into account the manifest and deep-seated desire of each human being to be a free, empowered, independent actor within his or her world. The pleasure and pain made possible by independent existence are seen as something to be embraced and as the most reasonable signs of the highest, most noble destiny possible for humans to attain— a kind of independent existence on a level usually thought of as *divine*.

Just as most humans go through their natural, everyday lives seeking that which will give them maximal amounts of such things as knowledge, power, freedom, independence and distinction within their world, those who walk the left-hand path logically extend this to the non-natural realm. They eschew right-hand path admonitions that such "spiritual behavior" is "*evil*" and that they should basically "get with the program" (of God, of Nature, etc.) and become good "company men." The self awareness of independence is seen by many as the fundamental reality of the human condition— one can accept it and

live, or reject it and *die*. By accepting the internal, known reality of human consciousness an eternally dynamic — ever moving, ever changing — existence is embraced; by rejecting it and embracing an external, unknown reality of God/Nature, an eternally static— ever still and permanent — existence is accepted. From a certain enlightened perspective, both paths are perfectly good, it is just a matter of the conscious exercise of the will to follow one of these paths in an aware state without self-delusion.

Essentially, the left-hand path is then the path of non-union with the objective universe. It is the way of isolating consciousness within the subjective universe and, in a state of self-imposed psychic solitude, refining the soul or psyche to ever more perfect levels. The objective universe is then made to harmonize itself with the will of the individual psyche instead of the other way around. Where the right-hand path is **theocentric** (or certainly **alleocentric**— “other-centered”), the left-hand path is **psychecentric**, or **soul/self-centered**. Those within the left-hand path may argue over the nature of this self/ego/soul, but that the individual is the epicenter of the path itself seems undisputed. An eternal separation of the individual intelligence from the objective universe is sought in the left-hand path. This amounts to an immortality of the independent self consciousness moving within the objective universe and interacting with it at will.

White Magic/Black Magic

The terms “white magic” and “black magic” have been so bandied about in popular jargon that they might be said to have lost most of their meaningfulness. For my purposes I will restore them to a meaningful philosophical context. Magic can be defined as a methodology by which the configuration of the subjective or objective universe is altered through an act of will originating within the psyche, or the core of the individual subjective universe. Perhaps the most famous definition was offered by the English magician, Aleister Crowley who said: “Magic(k) is the Science and Art of causing Change to occur in conformity with Will.”(2)

Actually there is no one definition of magic universally accepted by academics and practicing magicians alike, nor is there common agreement on the distinctions between *religion* and *magic*. But taking most of the current theories into account a more comprehensive definition might be ventured: Magic is the willed application of symbolic methods to cause or prevent changes in the universe by means of symbolic acts of communication with paranormal factors. These factors could be inside or outside the subjective universe of the operator. Magic is a way to make things happen that ordinarily would not happen. Religion may be distinguished from magic only when the nature of the human will is taken into account. In magic the individual will is primary and is considered to have a real and independent existence. The magician makes the universe do his bidding, to harmonize itself with his will, whereas in religion the human community attempts to harmonize its behavior with a universal pattern, be it God or Nature.

In a precise sense the distinction between White and Black Magic is simply that White Magic is a psychological methodology for the promotion of *union* with the universe and pursuing aims in harmony with those of the universe, while Black Magic is such a methodology for the exercise of independence from the universe and pursuing self-oriented aims. Structurally, White Magic has much in common with religion as defined above, while Black Magic is more purely magical in and of itself. This is why magic as a category of behavior is often condemned by orthodox religious systems.

The historical conceptualizations of White Magic and Black Magic will be discussed below, but for the sake of precise understanding here, I will simply be using White Magic as a designation for the spiritual methodology or technology of the right-hand path and Black Magic as a designation for that of the left-hand path.

Lords of the Left-Hand Path

In this book I examine the ideas and careers of many magicians and philosophers of the past and present. Some are figures widely thought to be “Satanic” or evil, while others may have gone through history without such an image. But images rarely correspond to

reality— despite what Madison Avenue or Washington DC would have you believe. In the final analysis some of these figures will be rejected as being something other than practitioners of the left-hand path. The criteria I use in determining the true left-hand path character of those so deemed must be laid out clearly at this point. Some of those considered in the book will have a number of the criteria, but not enough to be considered a “lord” or master of the path.

There are two major criteria for being considered a true Lord of the Left-Hand Path— Deification of the Self and Antinomianism. The first of these is complex: The system of thought proposed by the magician or philosopher must be one that promotes individual self-deification, preferably based on an initiatory magical scheme. This first criterion will be seen to have four distinct elements:

- 1) Self-deification— attainment of an enlightened (or awakened), independently existing intellect and its relative immortality.
- 2) Individualism— the enlightened intellect is that of a given individual, not a collective body
- 3) Initiation— the enlightenment and strength of essence necessary for the desired state of evolution of self are attained by means of stages created by the will of the magician, not because he or she was “divine” to begin with.
- 4) Magic— practitioners of the left-hand path see themselves as using their own wills in a rationally intuited system or spiritual technology designed to cause the universe around them to conform to their self-willed patterns.

The second criterion, antinomianism, states that practitioners think of themselves as “going against the grain” of their culturally conditioned and conventional norms of “good” and “evil.” True Lords of the Left-Hand Path will have the spiritual courage to identify himself with the cultural norms of “evil.” There will be an embracing of the symbols of conventional “evil,” or “impurity,” or “rationality,” or whatever quality the conventional culture fears and loathes. The lord of the left-hand path will set himself apart from his fellow man, will actually or figuratively become an outsider, in order to gain the kind of inner independence necessary for the other initiatory work present in the first criterion. The practice of this second criterion often manifests itself in “antinomianism,” that is, the purposeful reversal of conventional normatives: “evil” becomes “good,” “impure” becomes “pure,” “darkness” becomes “light.”

Literally antinomianism implies something “against the law.” But the practitioner of the left-hand path is not a criminal in the usual sense. He or she is bound to break the cosmic laws of nature and to break the conventional social laws imposed by ignorance and intolerance. But in so doing the left-hand path practitioner seeks a “higher law” of reality founded on knowledge and power. Although beyond good and evil, this path requires the most rigorous of ethical standards. These standards are based on understanding and not on blind obedience to external authorities.

This latter characteristic of the true left-hand path is the chief cause of its misunderstanding, not only for those on the outside, but for some who would follow this path as well. It takes an enormous amount of spiritual courage to persevere in the face of rejection by not only the world around them but by elements within their own subjective universes as well. Many break under the strain and fall away from the aim and sink back into the morass of cultural norms.

To be considered a true lord of the left-hand path then, someone must have rejected the forms of conventional “good” and embraced those of conventional “evil,” and have practiced antinomianism, as part of the effort to gain a *permanent, independent, enlightened* and *empowered* level of being. This self-deification does not seem sufficient without the “Satanic” component which acts as a guide through the quagmire of popular sentiment and conventional beliefs.

In completing research for this book I discovered that in fact there are two distinct *branches* of the left-hand path. *Both* of these branches fulfill the criteria outlined above, but approach the process from distinct points of view. One of these, which I will call the “Immanent Branch of the Left-hand Path,” proceeds from an “objectivistic” and even *materialistic* outlook. Its magical methods are often steeped in *imagery* and its orientation is almost exclusively toward the objective or mundane universe. In this branch the antinomian aspect is especially pronounced. Among modern schools it is exemplified by LaVeyan Satanism. (See chapter 9.)

The second branch, which I will name the “Transcendental Branch of the Left-Hand Path,” is based upon a psychecentric (soul- or intellect-centered) model. It is highly idealistic and its magical methods are usually founded on *eternal forms* or *archetypes*. The ultimate separation of the human mind from the cosmic order around it is recognized and celebrated. In its highest forms the Transcendent Branch is focused on the subjective universe— on the separation of the Self from the cosmic order and the evolution of that Self into a permanent and empowered form. In this branch the self-divinizing aspect is especially pronounced. Among modern schools it is exemplified by the Setian magical philosophy of Michael Aquino. (See chapter 10.)

I will begin with the left-hand path as understood in “eastern” religious systems— that is systems which have their origins in the Indo-Iranian cultural sphere. I will discuss the concepts of the right-hand path *versus* the left-hand path in the context of Hinduism and Buddhism (in which the terms first originated), this section will place the whole discussion in a non-Judeo-Christian context, and in one in which the two paths co-exist within the same cosmology. Also included here is a treatment of the Zoroastrian doctrines of dualism and how they affected the development of the left-hand path in the west.

The philosophical systems of certain great world cultures, such as those of the Far East (China and Japan), or the Meso-American world, will be noted for their absence. This is partially due to limitations in my own knowledge, but it also seems that the systems of Taoism and Shinto, for example, lack the strict dichotomies necessary to understanding the role of the individual in the universe in terms of the “two paths.” The degree to which they are present in either system seems to have been the result of contact with Indo-Aryan thought in the form of Buddhism.

In the second part of the book, I will discuss the western branches of the left-hand path. First we must understand clearly the true nature of the “western” traditions. It is important to know the degree to which indigenous European systems share elements with the “eastern” traditions, and the degree to which the “west” is really a product of southern influence— chiefly coming from the Middle East and Egypt. What we often call “eastern” is in fact more truly western (or northern), while what we call “western” is really more truly “middle eastern” or southern.

In the discussion of the original European traditions we will first explore the Greco-Roman world. The Promethean myth is seen as a paradigm of the relationship of the “creator god” and the “giver of the gift of the divine spark.” In the north we will see the Odinic myth as an original paradigm of the Prince of Darkness which foreshadows the Faustian themes to come.

The west, of course, became greatly influenced by Middle Eastern traditions through the conversion to Christianity (a Judaic cult from the east), as well as Judaism itself and late Islam. Understanding of this tradition is essential to understanding the left-hand path in the west today. Interesting here are Sumerian as well as Semitic backgrounds on the role of “gods of evil” in non-Judaic Semitic religion.

The Egyptian tradition, especially as it regard the cult of the god Set, is important not only for the understanding of ancient left-hand path traditions, but also for its possible significance for the contemporary Temple of Set.

To grasp the deepest significance of the left-hand path in the west from the time of the conversions to the dawn of the post modern age (after World War II) Christian period. We

must discover the Judaic roots of Christianity in Christian ideas of “evil” and of the nature of Satan. In this regard we can not ignore the importance of the Gnostic (especially Ophite and Naassene: “serpentine”) interpretations on the role of the Serpent/Lucifer and his Promethean relationship with humankind.

This can be starkly contrasted with the orthodox Christian doctrine concerning the same Edemic myth. It will be apparent that a close, rational and objective reading of the “Myth of Eden” shows that the Serpent is indeed the “savior” of humanity, and its “creator” in a spiritual sense.

We will also see the remarkable history of the left-hand path within the Islamic tradition where we will meet some of the most self-aware followers of this path before this century.

Many people, modern practicing Satanists among them, somehow believe that the Middle Ages were a great time for Satanic activity. Nothing could be further from the truth. The medieval period was almost devoid of true left-hand path activity— although the Church often liked to believe, and encourage others to believe, that Satanic cults were lurking under every rock. This ended in the “witch craze” of the 16th and 17th centuries as a predictable manifestation of right-hand path ignorance and fear run amok.

One interesting outgrowth of the medieval tradition in Germany was the Faustian myth which leads us into the modern age and beyond. This will depend greatly on the transition from the ideas surrounding the Faustian magicians of the late Middle Ages to those surrounding Goethe’s *Faust*— the transition from the medieval mind-set (seeking of knowledge and power is inherently “evil”) to a modern mind-set (seeking of knowledge and power is good). Here we really have a return to ancient precepts. Images of the Devil in Classical and Romantic ideologies are certainly important to this transition in western culture.

The 19th century “Satanists” of France cannot be ignored, even though they offer up a disappointing picture when viewed from a left-hand path perspective. Most of them have little or no understanding of the positive traits of the left-hand path— but merely wallow in the darkness as an exercise in obscure aesthetics.

For the understanding of the rise of philosophical Satanism in the latter half of the 20th century no period of history is more important than the occult revival of the late 19th and early 20th century. The original Luciferian/Ophite-Gnostic doctrines of the Theosophy of H. P. Blavatsky (especially as expressed in *The Secret Doctrine*) form one branch of this tradition, while the Thelemism of Aleister Crowley forms another. Crowley must be viewed here from a totally philosophical perspective. He is doubtless one of the most important theorists concerning the left-hand path in the modern western world— yet he holds an extremely ambiguous relationship to it. In connection to Thelemism we must also discuss the German school of Saturnians, originally led by Gregor A. Gregorius (Eugen Grosche). The final part of the book will deal in detail with the two most important contemporary versions of left-hand path philosophy, Anton LaVey’s Church of Satan, and the Temple of Set.

Throughout this book I will try to cut through the confusion, misinformation — and even disinformation — about the left-hand path and practice of actual Black Magic based on the exact principles outlined in this chapter. This is not to say that I am not aware that throughout history certain of these terms have been used by followers of the right-hand path, or by those who have simply been misled by such sources for many years, in ways very different from the way I am using them. The distinction must simply be made that I am writing about the left-hand path from an internal perspective, while most other sources are written from an external one. Reading what someone from the right-hand path has to say about the left-hand path is rather like reading a book on Wall Street written by an economics professor schooled at the University of Moscow. He may have interesting insights but without the perspective of a Wall Street broker you will probably not get much closer to really understanding how the stock market works.

Historically the left-hand path has sometimes been identified by the *methods* it is said to use, such as necromancy (raising the dead for divinatory purposes) and sexual magic (it seems the right-hand path has always had a problem with sexuality). In point of fact there are no categorical methodological proscriptions on the left-hand path within its various traditions east or west. Methods are usually chosen for purely pragmatic reasons. If it works it will usually be implemented. There is often a strong antinomian element in the magical methodology of the left-hand path. Going *against the grain* of social conventions or natural boundaries is often seen as a mode of consciously exercising the divine faculty inherent in humanity. This factor must be seen in the broadest perspective, however, as some behaviors which may *seem* to be antinomian or against social conventions or propriety, e.g. ingesting massive doses of intoxicants, are actually roundly condemned by the most sophisticated practitioners of the left-hand path in the west. The philosophical basis for this is that such intoxicants impair the exercise of the individual will and self—the supreme faculty viewed from the perspective of the left-hand path. Drugs would, from this point of view, be more effective at attaining the self-annihilation sought within the right-hand path.

Another way in which black magic has sometimes historically been differentiated from white magic is the classification of entities with which, or with whom, the magician is said to deal. White magicians would invoke only “angelic” beings, while black magicians would call on “demonic” entities. This is, of course, predicated on medieval Christian angelologies and demonologies, and one quite often finds in the old grimoires that demonic forces are coerced by the power of the names of God to do the bidding of the magician—which could be virtually anything. Angels could be used to seduce or kill, demons to gain wisdom and discover truth. From the point of view of the left-hand path itself this distinction would be seen as hypocritical. Again the focus would not be on the “hows” but rather on the purpose, the “whys.”

In this regard the black/white distinction is sometimes historically made between maleficent and beneficent magic. Magic designed to do harm is black, that which is supposed to heal or do good is white. This distinction at least has some valid aspects. The only problems from the left-hand path viewpoint are that 1) it does not address any of the essential cosmological or theological questions regarding the two paths, and 2) it is generally unrealistic. “White magicians,” when push comes to shove, usually have no problem in asking (or coercing) God or angels into giving them victory over their enemies and vanquishing their “diabolical foes” (i.e., anyone who dares cross them). The left-hand path views magic as a technique or methodology of human action which in and of itself is devoid of moral value—magic doesn’t kill people, magicians kill people. The use of Black Magic would be viewed as being governed by the same ethical standards as all other categories of human behavior. The Black Magician refuses to be limited in his use of magic just because this activity belongs to a class of behavior usually condemned by orthodox religion. If a goal is worth attaining by *any means* it is perfectly acceptable to use magic if necessary to attain it. If a war is worth waging, or if a man has good reason to defend himself from attack, the Black Magician will have no problem with using magic to destroy his enemy. He also sees nothing but hypocrisy in the White Magician who prays, or who uses physical means for the same ends while condemning the Black Magician as evil. The use of Black Magic is simply a logical extension of human motives into the realm of magic.

Finally, there is the fundamental distinction between the two paths: that of union *versus* non-union, which has already been discussed. It is from this basic principle that even the other misguided distinctions can be understood best. From a position of magical independence the Black Magician would be able to employ pragmatically any magical technology he willed, deal with any kind of entity (or most probably dispense with interaction with exterior entities altogether), and seek any end he desired—in each case being guided by an *internal* sense of purpose and responsibility. Ultimate spiritual independence is the essential quality of the left-hand path. With the freedom this quality

provides comes the possibility for unethical behavior— this is, after all, the price of freedom.

The existence of the left-hand path is not easily discovered, but once its principles have been uncovered it slowly becomes apparent just how widespread the philosophy is. In this work I am concentrating on schools and individuals who either are self-avowedly followers of the left-hand path (e.g., *vamamarga*, Church of Satan, Temple of Set), or who have knowledge of it and perhaps though they try to differentiate themselves from it (at least publicly) seem to have actually been practitioners of the left-hand path when viewed from the perspective of the path itself (e.g., H. P. Blavatsky or Aleister Crowley). However, the basic precepts of the left-hand path have for centuries penetrated far beyond the sphere of magical and occult activity. Many ancient philosophies were based on principles held in common with the left-hand path and it was only with the advent of Christianity that those philosophies were either first suppressed as evil, or “Christianized” so as to be made palatable, e.g. the cult of Odin or Pythagorean/Platonic philosophy. More recently, modern philosophies and political ideologies have fully embraced principles basic and fundamental to the left-hand path, almost all of which have become the accepted norm in the west. It is quite understandable why the forces of orthodox Christianity fought every advance in scientific, political, or religious philosophy, for each advance in spiritual freedom and enforcement of the interests of plurality over unity is indeed a victory for the Prince of Darkness — the principle of isolate intelligence — over the monolithic, singular force of the rule of God.

Notes for Chapter 1

- (1) A chief source for this discussion is Michael A. Aquino's "Black Magic in Theory and Practice" (San Francisco: Temple of Set, 1987) [= *Crystal Tablet of Set*, pp. 1-61.]
- (2) Aleister Crowley. *Magick* (New York: Weiser, 1974), p. 131.

The Left-Hand Path in the East

Chapter 2

The Eastern Tradition

I contemplate in my heart the nonfearful divinity of shining darkness.
(*Shivatoshini* 1.1.14.)

— The Left-Hand Path in the East —

For the western reader the examination of the left-hand path, within the context of orthodox right-hand path cults of the east, will quickly demonstrate in a uniquely objective fashion the true structural meanings of what the left-hand path is really all about. It has the added advantage of showing this within cultures that have been *relatively* tolerant of the aims and motives of the left-hand path. By exploring the left-hand path from the perspective of eastern traditions *first* we can solve a few problems for ourselves later. The approach to the east will disentangle many of the arguments from the sometimes hopelessly confused jumble we find in the historical sources of the left-hand path in the west. It will eventually become apparent that the division into “eastern” and “western” branches has been done simply to present certain ideas in a clear and organized fashion. The left-hand path is an ever recurring answer to humanity’s questions beyond the restrictions of time and place.

Here I will consider as “eastern” the traditions which have their distinctive origins in the Indo-Iranian cultural sphere of southern Asia, that is: Hinduism, Buddhism and Zoroastrianism.

The east/west division dissolves with an understanding of the common traditional roots of both— in the substrata of Indo-European philosophies. Furthermore, the entirely cross-cultural nature of the left-hand path will become more obvious. The principles upon which the right-hand path / left-hand path distinction are based are found throughout the history of humankind and over a broad cultural spectrum. The true lords of the left-hand path have dwelled in the world at all times and in all places and can not be limited to any time or geographical area.

The ultimate roots of the Indo-Iranian (Aryan) religious and philosophical traditions are not to be found on the Indian subcontinent itself, but rather in the Caucasus region and on the planes of present day southern Russia. It was most probably in this region that a multi-phased migration of local populations began during the fourth millennium BCE.(1) This population is known by the cumbersome and unromantic name “Indo-European.” This is because the final migratory destinations of this originally unified group was to stretch from western Europe all the way to India and to the border of China.


The original Indo-Europeans were a semi-nomadic people who had first domesticated the horse on the open steppes, invented the wheel (essential to their war-chariots and wagons), and who had first learned to smelt metals as hard as copper. With this combination of horse, wheel and copper, they were virtually invincible in battle— and so spread themselves out over vast expanses of territory. They slowly conquered and subdued the local populations, largely imposing their culture, language and religious system on the

region by means of a combination of their military strength and their cultural prestige. So, roughly at the same time the cities of Mesopotamia were beginning to thrive, and the pyramids were being built in Egypt, there was in fact another “high culture” that descended from the north and spread itself throughout most of the known world. But whereas the Mesopotamians and Egyptians built in stone, the Indo-Europeans built *intellectual* monuments. The most striking of these is perhaps the *Rig Veda*, which has been orally transmitted from the time of its codification beginning at the end of the second millennium BCE to the present day. This invisible intellectual edifice has proved many times more durable than all the stones of other cultures— for it has remained *alive*, dynamic and meaningful throughout this time.

Ancient Indo-European philosophy and religion was not based on a unified cult, but rather on a stratified structure of several levels. These levels, or *functions*, have been most elaborately commented on by the French Indo-Europeanist Georges Dumézil and his followers.(2) The first order belongs to the realm of the *intellect*— both rational and intuitive. In the most archaic Indian system these were ruled by the gods Mitra and Varuna respectively, in the Germanic realm these same functions are filled by Tyr and Odin. The second order belongs to the realm of physical force— ruled over by the god Indra in the *Vedas*, the god Thor in the Norse *Eddas*. The third order is that of natural procreation or vitality, which is governed by the Ashvinau in India and by the Vanic deities Frey and Freya — the Lord and the Lady — in Germania. These mythic orderings are reflected in the society as well which is organized in an intelligentsia class — kings, philosophers, judges and magicians — a warrior class, and a provider class of farmers, craftsmen, entertainers, etc. This very ancient division is also reflected in Plato’s *idealized* society discussed in *The Republic* (ca 350 BCE),(3) where he outlines a state of tradesmen or craftsmen, auxiliaries or warriors, and guardians or philosophers all with their specialized functions in the organized society.

What is essential to realize here is that the religions or philosophical attitudes of those of the first order are radically different from those of the second or third. Those of the first function focused their attention on the intellect, on the soul or psyche of man. This was the center of their attention from the beginning. Even in the earliest texts of the *Rig Veda* the statement is made by the priests that “We created the gods,” meaning that the gods and goddesses were really projections of the true divine paradigms concentrated in the intellectual or psychic faculty of human beings. The second function concerns physical force and its use— especially in the capacity of the warrior. The third function is centered in nature and in the cycles of nature and organic life— the powers of production and reproduction. This external reality is the focus of their religions and philosophical conceptions. Thus we can see that even at this most archaic stage there was a certain dichotomy between those who “worshipped” the self or intellect and those who worshipped “nature.” But from the beginning in the Indo-European framework there was room and a place for both ends of the spectrum within a productive system. In this context it was not so much a matter of lateral division, right-hand path /left-hand path, but rather a vertical one, reflected in the “social structure” of divinities and humanity.

As mentioned above there was also an original division within the first function, between Mitra and Varuna or Tyr and Odin. Mitra or Tyr represent the rational, ordered mind— the rationality of cosmic order. Varuna or Odin represent the mantic, dynamic mind— the freedom of chaotic flux. This same configuration will later be recognized by the German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche as the Apollonian and Dionysian tendencies in humanity.(4) Both must work in an integrated fashion, much as the left and right hemispheres of the brain must work. But here too there may be a primal seed in the structures of the psyche which will at times be expressed in terms of the right-hand and left-hand paths.



Because the ancient Indo-European peoples would migrate, conquering and subduing indigenous populations with forces largely made up of those of the first and second stratum, the third stratum was often subject to broad influences from the religious and philosophical concepts and practices of the indigenous populations. However, it would be a radical error to assume that the original system did not already contain structures capable of assimilating the input from the native religions. This is why, for example, although historians of Indian tantrism will point out that much of tantric practice originates in the lower castes, and is anti-Brahmanical, there is already precedent for it in the oldest evidence of the *Rig Veda* itself.(5) The non-Aryan element did not create the system, but it radically affected its form as practiced in later Hindu times.

It has also been noted that the later "Vedic Way" of Hinduism is not an embodiment of the actual attitudes present in the Vedas themselves, and that paradoxically the tantric systems exemplify the spiritual attitudes of the Vedas much more vibrantly than the modern "Vedic Way."(6)

Right-Hand Path / Left-Hand Path

The actual origin of the right-hand *versus* left-hand path terminology itself is rooted in the vocabulary of Indian tantric sects. The two main divisions of these are the *dakshinachara*, "right-way" and the *vamachara*, "left-way." The variations in these sects will be discussed in the section on Hinduism below. The eventual elaboration of the right-hand/left-hand path distinction is quite complex, but its origins are most probably rooted in the widespread tantric doctrines of a natural flow of universal force through the human body along a left to right line—entering the left, exiting to the right. This is mirrored by a cosmic flow of force from the north to the south. When the human being is *oriented* toward the east this flow pattern is said to be in harmony with the one natural to his body, as his left hand is to the north, his right hand to the south.(7) Here are the roots of the key to the common antinomianism, reversal of normal patterns, found in left-hand path tantrism. To reverse the left to right pattern, contrary to nature and cosmic law, requires an exercise of the faculty of will. This is an act of rebellion against nature and against divinely ordained cosmic order. In almost technical terms the *dakshinachara* is going with the natural flow and the *vamachara* is going against the natural flow. In going against this flow, individuals more fully articulate — individuate — themselves within their environments. Independence and freedom are attained and maintained—perhaps even personal immortality is to be gained.

It has been noted that the essence of what came to be called the *vamachara* is actually the true *tantric* one and that the term and practices of the *dakshinachara* were only introduced later as a reform movement within tantrism.(8) Julius Evola remarks on distinction between the two paths:

The creative and productive aspect of the cosmic process is signified by the right hand, by the color white, and by the two goddesses Uma and Gauri (in whom Shakti appears as Prakashatmika, “she who is light and manifestation”). The second aspect, that of conversion and return (*exitus, reditus*), is signified by the left hand, by the color black, and by the dark, destructive goddesses Durga and Kali. Thus according to the *Mahakala-Tantra*, when the left and right hands are in equilibrium we experience samsara, but when the left hand prevails, we find liberation.(9)

Another fascinating delineation of the distinction between the two paths of spiritual development in the Hindu context is that found between the two pathways the soul may take upon death: the *devayana* (way of the *devas* [gods]) and the *pitriyana* (way of the *pitris* [ancestors]). The *devayana* is the polar path, marked by the summer half of the year, when the sun is moving toward the north pole. Those who take the *devayana* upon death are enlightened and become like gods, and will only reincarnate according to their wills. Those who take the *pitriyana*, which is the equatorial path, marked by the sun’s motion toward the equator in the winter half of the year, will reincarnate according to a natural order and will thus eternally re-incarnate their ancestors.(10)

Alain Danielou remarks that the left-hand path corresponds to a “disintegrating-tendency” (*tamas*) which “uses the power of Nature, the passions and instincts of man, to conquer, with their aid, the world of the senses... This way leads directly from the physical to the abstract because ... the descending tendency is at both ends of the manifested. [therefore the left-hand path] may utilize even eroticism and drunkenness as a means of spiritual achievement.”(11)

Clearly the left-hand path in Hinduism is associated both with the idea of *dis-integration* (separation) and with the practice of antinomianism— of “going against the grain” of conventions in order to gain spiritual power.

Within the Sanskrit terminology of the Indian sects, the right-hand path is that which seeks a union or merger between the *jivatman*, the individual self or soul and the *paramatman*, the supreme or universal soul. The left-hand path seeks only to differentiate the *jivatman*, articulate, individuate, evolve and immortalize it— without ever consciously seeking to merge it permanently with anything else.(12)

One who has attained this union with the *jivatman* is said to be in a state of *jivanmukti*— or an individually liberated state. The classic exposition of the concept of *jivanmukti* is found in a 14th century text by Vidyaranya (died 1386) *Jivanmuktiviveka*.(13) The idea of “liberation in life” was perhaps formally introduced by Samkara (655-687 CE) and it remains an important component of *Advaita Vedanta*— based on Samkara’s reading and interpretations of the Upanishads. The *Trpti-dipika* by Vidyaranya contains discussions of lives of *jivanmuktas*.

The Left-Hand Path in Hinduism

In recent times the most insightful and important studies of left-hand path spirituality in the Hindu religious context are the brilliant presentations of the teachings of the mysterious and shadowy Indian sage Vimalananda by the American Ayurvedic physician Robert Svaboda— *Aghora: At the Left Hand of God* (1986) and *Aghora II: Kundalini* (1993).

In general “Hinduism” is the name for a spectrum of religious sects all of which are based on the ancient Aryan tradition ultimately rooted in the *Vedas*. There are hundreds of sects within Hinduism. Often they hold opposing views on what might seem to be fundamental questions. There are, however, generally things upon which most of these

sects agree: 1) that the *Veda* contains infallible wisdom, 2) that the soul (*atman*) is immortal and real, 3) that the soul undergoes continual rebirth (*samsara*), 4) that this rebirth is tantamount to suffering, and 5) that the cause of rebirth and its suffering is action (*karman*). The aim of orthodox Hinduism is a cessation of rebirth and/or fusion with the universal absolute.(14) This fusion with the Absolute is called liberation (*moksha* or *mukti*). It is in the *methods* used to effect this end that the Hindu sects are so diverse.

The major sects of Hinduism are Vaisnavite (derived from the worship of Vishnu) and Saivite (derived from the worship of Shiva). These major sects are further divided into hundreds of sub-divisions. At one extreme end of the spectrum of Hindu “sects” are the philosophical schools chiefly found among the Brahmins. At the other extreme are found the tantric cults. These are rarely strictly Vedic and are often anti-Brahmanic. It is, however, a great mistake to think that all tantric sects are of the left-hand path.

Since the time of the rise of Buddhism (6th-7th century BCE) there can be said to have been truly heretical sects in Hinduism. Heresy as such would only tend to be a “problem” in a religion with an elaborate fixed dogma. Hinduism is remarkably free of these dogmas since its pre-historic transition from the Vedic religion. It is for this reason that sects and philosophies making up a wide spectrum of ideologies can be found within Hinduism and why what is called the left-hand path can be tolerated within the fold of Hinduism without its being entirely “orthodox.”

This toleration of the left-hand path traditions does not stem from any enforced or legislated moral sense of “fair play,” but rather from the fact that the original *multiplicity of paths* inherent in the archaic Indo-European system has been preserved in the Indian ways— both Hinduism and Buddhism. When the *ideal* is a many hued spectrum of variation, from left to right, and from bottom to top, the likelihood of developing dichotomized thinking in terms of black/white is lessened. Typically they do not think in terms of “this or that,” but rather “this *and* that.” In this system a sense of *layers* of meaning and reality is vigorously preserved. This underlying sense provides for a *systemic* tolerance more enduring than anything imposed dogmatically or legislatively. This does not mean, however, that orthodox followers of the right-hand path would typically think that the left-hand path is just as valid as their own path. It remains a trait of the right-hand path to think in terms of either/or, so most typically the orthodox will simply think of the practitioners of the left-hand path (or any path other than their own) as simply being “wrong,” or in error. This is explicitly outlined in the *Vaikhyanasasmarta Sutra* (4th century CE) of the Visaragas who are said to “walk the wrong path.”(15)

Within Hinduism (as elsewhere) the left-hand path can be distinguished first in a description of its aims or goals, and then in its techniques or methods. According to some self-proclaimed practitioners of the *vamamarga* the final destination of the left-hand path is the same as the right-hand path. It is said that they are two paths to the same end. But it remains a matter of the perspective of the speaker as to what the exact character of this end is.

Strictly speaking in Hinduism the aim of the practitioner of the left-hand path (*vamamarga*) is the individual’s union with the individual soul (*jivatman*) and the continued independence of that realized *jivatman* from the universal or supreme soul (*paramatman*). (16) Another way of putting this might be that the follower of the *vamamarga* seeks to actualize his individual self (*atman*) — the personal divinity — and then maintain the ongoing independence and freedom of that individuated self.

Historically, this is not that much, if any, different from the archaic Indo-European beliefs which held that men could become as gods if they lived heroic or magical lives. The “metaphysic” is the same as it always was, there has just been a reevaluation, or new value judgment, placed on the life of struggle and victory or defeat. Where the ancients saw it as a glorious existence— which they wanted to perpetuate throughout eternity— the “reformers” of Hinduism and Buddhism both saw this same “*cycle of becoming*” (*samsara*) as “suffering.”

Among others, Julius Evola recognizes that the Tantras actually carry on the oldest tradition of the Vedas — as *understood in the Vedic Age itself*.

It is through this [operative] worldview that a part of the spirit of the early Vedic age, despite all, remains alive in the Tantras. In that age humans did not live as ascetics, struggling with the world and with *samsara*, but rather as free, uninhibited forces, in the company of various gods and supernatural energies, rapt in a state of cosmic and triumphant bliss.(17)

Left-Hand Path Hinduism

Since the division into *dakshinachara* and *vamachara* is a relatively late one in the history of Hinduism— perhaps going back no more than a thousand to fifteen-hundred years — the sects of Hinduism which strictly can be said to belong to the *vamamarga* do not formally belong to the most archaic levels of historic Vedic religion. The technical term “left-hand path” actually comes from Hindu tantrism, of course. In the more global way that I am presenting the left-hand path it does not, however, have to be limited to tantric sects alone. Nevertheless discussions of the left-hand path fall most naturally within the framework of tantrism.(18)

Some tantric texts identify seven “paths” or “ways” (Skt. *acharas*). These are divided into the “right-path” (*dakshinachara*) and the “left-path” (*vamachara*) and certain other paths belong within these two.(19)

<i>dakshinachara</i>	<i>vamachara</i>
<i>Vedachara</i>	<i>Siddhantachara</i>
<i>Vaisnavachara</i>	<i>Kaulachara</i>
<i>Saivachara</i>	

It is said that one is born into one of the *dakshinacharas*, but that one must be *initiated into* any of the *Vamacharas*.(20) This is certainly in keeping with the often found non-natural tendencies found within the left-hand path elsewhere. Merely to follow the path *dictated* by nature, by birth, is to conform to outer circumstances. But to rebel against one’s lot, to determine consciously and willfully what one’s path is to be is an exercise of the faculty which sets the initiate apart from his environment.


The three levels of initiation in preparation for the *vamachara* are:

- 1) *Pashu*
- 2) *Vira*
- 3) *Divya*

The *pashu* is the “fettered man.” This is the non-initiated individual soul. The *pashu* transforms himself into a *vira* through the efforts of his own will. A *vira* can be recognized by his politeness, courage, intelligence and activity. Once the stage of *vira* has been established one becomes eligible for initiation into either the *dakshinacha* or the *vamachara*. If he goes into the right-hand path he will follow the ways of *bakhti* (devotion) and/or *jnana* (knowledge), but on the *vamachara* he will also learn *shakti-mantra* (mental power-patterns) and the *panchatattva* (five-elements)— both forms of theory and practice which include sexual rituals. The *divya* state is achieved when all of the qualities the initiate has gathered have “become part and parcel of himself, when they cannot be dissociated from his own entity.”(21)

Another way of looking at the various “paths” is that the Vedic, *Vaishnava*, and *Shaiva* are meant for *pashus*, the *dakshinachara* and *vamachara* are for *viras*, and the *siddhanta* and *kaula* are only open to the *divyas* of the left-hand path.(22) Although the *kaulachara* can be practiced symbolically by right-hand path initiates as well. (See figure 2.2.)

The Paths of the Hindu Sects



The *Kulavana-tantra* categorizes the *viras* of the *Vamachara* into several categories or levels: 1) *kshatriyas* (characterized by boldness and indifference to danger), 2) *siddhas* (who have reached a level of perfection, and who may be called “adept”), 3) *kaulas* (whose “law” [*kaladharmā*] obliterates all others).(23)

Vimalananda uses the word *siddha* to mean “...one who has achieved immortality and supernatural powers as a result of *sadhana*” [spiritual practice].(24)

Concerning the *kaulas* Evola remarks:

Nothing is forbidden to the *kaula* and to those who have achieved the condition of true *siddha-vira*, since they *are* and they *know*. They are lords of their passions, and they fully identify with Shakti [power]. As the supreme Shakti, or Parashakti, is over and beyond any pair of opposites, likewise the *kaula* is beyond good and evil, honor and dishonor, merit and sin, and any other value cherished by ordinary people, the so-called *pashus*.(25)

Shakti (Power) is often referred to as being “absolutely free,” and by the same token the *kaula* is called *svecchakari* (“one who can do as he or she pleases”). *Pashus*, or ordinary people, will often fear, shun or condemn the *kaulas* because of their behavior, or simply for their presence.(26)

One of the significant differences between the two tantric paths, although both are under the aegis of Shiva, is that on the right-hand path the adept always experiences “someone above him,” even at the highest level of realization. However, on the left-hand path the adept “becomes the ultimate sovereign” (*chakravartin* = world ruler).(27)

In a more general sense, and in a structure reminiscent of the levels of man outlined by the Italian Renaissance Neoplatonic philosopher Pico della Mirandola discussed in chapter 6 of this book, Vimalananda lays out three levels at which various types of humans can exist: as a *khara* (donkey), a *nara* (“man”), or as a *Narayana* (“God Himself”). The *khara* is said to believe “only in the three lowest chakras” (= eating, procreating, excreting) and that his realm is that of *abhibhautika* (the mundane). The *nara*, or true human, is said to live

exclusively in the upper three chakras. It is further stated that only a few *naras* live in the world at any given time. Their realm is that of the *adhyatmika* (the spiritual). Only a *nara* can become a *Narayana*— and technically they are said to do this by gaining access to the secret chakras located within in the head. (These are discussed below.) The realm in which he *narayana* lives is called the *adhidaivika* (or “astral”).(28)

Vamacharins may be found most commonly among persons belonging to sects devoted to the gods Ganesh, Rudra, Vishnu, Shiva, Svayambhu, Veda, Bhairava, Ksetrapala, China, Kapalika, Pashupata, Bauddha, Kerala, Vira-Vaishnava, Sambhava, Chandra and Aghora or to the goddesses Kali, Tara, Sundari, Bharavi, Chinnamasta, Matangi and Vagala. Here it is wise to keep in mind that the right-hand path and left-hand path are *methods* or approaches rather than sects in and of themselves.

Methods of the Hindu Left-Hand Path

Although *vamacharins* can be found in any of the various cults mentioned above, it is principally in the method of worshiping *The Goddess* (= Vama) — in the form of a human woman or symbols of her — that especially the male *vamacharin* will practice the left-hand path. Besides meaning “left,” the Sanskrit word *vama* can also mean woman, or the Goddess.(29) The real meaning behind this is that The Goddess and Woman are thought to be the embodiments of *shakti*, power.(30) Here it is quite clear, at least from the masculine perspective, that the essence of the *vamachara* is the total transformation of the human initiate into something superhuman or god(dess)-like. This lies at the root of why antinomianism (inversions of all kinds of normatives) is so important in the methodology of eastern forms of the left-hand path.

An often overlooked aspect of both individualism and antinomianism in the Indian systems of the left-hand path is contained in the doctrines of *hatha yoga*. Literally the Sanskrit word *hatha* means “violence,” or “violent effort,” though it has come to refer to yogic methods which primarily focus on the physical vehicle, the human body.(31) The practice of pure *hatha yoga* is said to be able to produce *jivanmukti*— and to give immortality to the individualized existence by preserving “all psycho-physical energies.”(32) The Upanishads state: “Every god is enclosed here, in the body.” The Tantras valorize the body and *individual existence*: “Jiva is Sadashiva” [= Shiva in his pure aspect of ‘being’]. In the Tantras, as in the Vedic Age, there is no contempt for the body— on the contrary there is the enjoyment and exploration of it for the revelation of secrets it affords.(33)

Externally, one of the chief distinguishing features between the methods of the *dakshinamarga* and the *vamamarga* is that the *dakshinacharin* practices “worship through substitutes,” while the *vamacharin* actualizes what is otherwise only symbolic. He may have to participate in exercises of cruelty and other aberrations of social and religious norms as a way of placing himself totally outside profane society. Thereby he is “unfettered” from the bonds and tabus of society as a way of unfettering himself from spiritual bonds.(34) (Remember the virtual identity between spiritual order and social order, as indicated in the Indian caste system.) The methodology of the left-hand path appears to be by far the more archaic of the two.(35)

One of the chief principles of left-hand path tantric practice is to attain liberation (here called *yoga*) while still being able to have enjoyment (*bhoga*). The method which makes this possible involves the identification (*smadhi*) of the individual self with a higher self *while* in a state of enjoyment (*bhoga*). (36) The *Kularnava Samhita* (5.219) states: “Through enjoyment one gains liberation; for enjoyment is the means of reaching the Supreme Abode. Hence the wise who wish to conquer [the spirit] should experience all pleasures.”

Vimalananda alludes to a reason left-hand path practitioners do not unify with the divinity outside himself. It is simply because they enjoy loving the divine object so much, and being in Her company, that they control their thoughts and emotions to be able to better enjoy the reality of the “company of the Beloved.”(37)

Those on the *vamamarga* eventually reject totally the methods and rituals of the *dakshinamarga* as being inefficient or of no real help in their progress. They may, however, continue to worship their deity during the day in a traditional way while they perform rites of the *vamachara* at night. Night worship is often a feature of antinomian schools.

Vimalananda distinguishes between two “ways”— that of *jnana* (“knowledge”) and that of *bhakti* (“devotion”). In *jnana* the disciple is said to split from his normal body and to self-identify with his “causal body”— and from that point on one follows the *adesha* (“commands”) of an internal guru. In *bhakti*, on the other hand, the disciple maintains continuous devotion to an entity conceived of as being outside the self. In discussing the question of unity with a divinity, in this case Krishna, Vimalananda says: “But most devotees of Krishna never want to unite with Him; they always want to maintain their own identities so that they taste His sweetness over and over again, forever and ever.”(38)

From a left-hand path perspective Svaboda adds further that “... on the path of *jnana* you actually become Shiva, while on the path of *bhakti* you worship but remain separate from Krishna.”(39) The distinction is an important one, and one that must be understood well. It seems universal in the practice of the left-hand path. On the path of *jnana* the practitioner is himself transformed into a being of the divine *typos* without sacrificing his individuated existence, whereas on the left-hand path of *bhakti* the practitioner seeks the company of the divine counterpart and exists in the presence of this divinity without *unifying with it*.(40)

Antinomianism is an element found in many schools of the left-hand path throughout the world. In each school the practice or philosophy has its own *raison d’etre*, but underlying them all is the left-hand path imperative to *transform*— one’s self and one’s world. In order to transform something, it must first be de-formed before it can be re-formed into the willed transformed object. In order to re-construct something, that thing must be de-constructed. This postmodern idea is very ancient indeed.

When discussing antinomian left-handed tantrism Renou states “... we observe the inversion of normal worship and common ethical principles. The fact that those objects are ‘worshipped’ is evidence that the stage has been passed at which they would be considered sinful.”(41) So objects or practices which would normally inspire shame, hate or fear in the orthodox (*dakshinachara*) Hindu will be willfully worshipped and engaged in with a sublimated attitude of sacrality— in order to cut the so-called three knots of shame-hate-fear. “The fundamental principle of the left-hand path is that spiritual progress cannot be achieved by falsely shunning our desires and passions, but by sublimating those very aspects which make one fall, as a means of liberation.”(42)

According to Daniélou the *Kularnave Tantra* [625] informs us that “‘the lord-of tears’ (Rudra) has shown in the left-hand doctrine that spiritual advancement is best achieved by means of those very things which are the causes of man’s downfall.”(43)

In discussing the *Kulavana-tantra* Evola further relates that the work of the *vira* on the path to becoming a *divya* consists of *icchashuddhi* (“purification of the will”). This pure will is characterized as being *naked, transcendent, capable of self-determination, beyond all antithetical values and all pairs of opposites*. In the practice of *icchashuddhi* the following eight bonds or fetters must be broken systematically: *daya* “sympathy,” *moha* “delusion,” *lajja* “shame” or “the idea of sin,” *bhaya* “fear,” *ghrina* “disgust,” *kula* “family, kinship, clan,” *varna* “caste,” *sila* “customary rites and precepts.”(44) As each of these bonds or fetters is broken the *vira* becomes progressively more liberated.

In many ways this technique of *icchashuddhi* is reminiscent of Anton LaVey’s injunction that his followers should *indulge* in the “seven deadly sins” of Christianity — greed, pride, envy, anger, gluttony, lust and sloth — in order to liberate themselves similarly from the conditionings of modern western civilization.(45)

Part of the reason why such techniques are considered effective in Hindu practice is that we are now living in what is called a *Kali Yuga*— a phase of history characterized by

materialism and a lack of interest in spiritual matters. In this kind of age “passion alone, when astutely directed, can overcome egoism and pride and sordid calculation. Alone it has the momentum to draw man away from the bonds that chain him to his interests, his beliefs.”(46)

The real importance of antinomianism lies in how it relates to the individual soul (*jivatman*) and how it is to be transformed into a divine being. This is effected by the union of the personality with its personal divinity, the *jivatman* itself. The limitations, or bonds, placed on the *jiva* (self) both internally and externally. Merger of the Self with the *jivatman* is impossible so long as the eight bonds constrict the will of the *vira*.

Although in the tantric context none of this can be equated with crude “egotism” an element of a “divine egoism” can be discerned in the teaching that the western face of Shiva, which is red, and which is called *Vamadeva* (“Left-handed Deity”) is equated with “I-ness,” the *ahamkara*, which is associated with fire, sight and action.(47)

Such radical *individualism* is essential to the character of the left-hand path. Svaboda relates that seekers should “...try to redirect their urge to individuation from Maya [unconsciousness/objectivity] to Chit [consciousness/subjectivity]” and should not allow themselves “to be carried along by the current of their lives and of their neighbors’ lives.”(48) He further states: “Aghoris never permit themselves to be passively defined by the external environment; they define themselves and by so doing define their surroundings.”(49) In a way reminiscent of the cosmo-psychological system of laws taught by G.I. Gurdjieff, Svaboda also relates:

...all of us are part of the manifested universe, subject to its laws until we develop the power to redefine ourselves in other terms. A Tantric aims to become *sva-tantra* (“self-functioning”), to be free of all limitations, including especially the limitations of his or her own personality.(50)

The theme of the *creative* aspect of the practice of the left-hand path will be noticeable in many schools around the world and throughout history. The practice of the left-hand path is not simply a matter of finding a “program” and working with it— on the leftward way one does not worship a god but rather one *enacts divinity from a subjective perspective*. When describing the development of doctrines within Aghora, Svaboda says: “... precepts [are] engraved not on tablets of stone but on the heart of the individual practitioner who must use them to create an individual system, thereby carving his or her own spiritual niche.”(51)

Antinomianism includes the notion of (especially for men) Goddess “worship.” The *vamacharin* does not merely worship the Goddess in the form of a woman, but he himself seeks to *become a woman*. This *may* have its roots in a historical development in which men took over the priesthood function from women, and thus to practice that function with its timeless authority the men had to “become women.” In support of this idea are facts such as practices in which priests wear feminine robes to certain rites, or the myths and legends which show men transforming themselves into women.(52) This may be true on a historical level. However, there is a more profound and eternal, ahistorical principle of which these practices and beliefs may also be reflections. In Indian (and perhaps Indo-European) lore the structure or essence of a subtle or spiritual body attached to or contained within the physical body is thought to be feminine— at least for men. That is, there is a spiritual entity of the opposite sex within each person. (This is echoed in the lore of Iran, with its *farvashis*, and in Scandinavia, with its *fylgjur*, *hamingjur*, etc., not to mention the highly sympathetic modern psychology of C. G. Jung.) In the Indian system we also learn many technical details demonstrating why and how this is so. The seven major *padmas* (lotuses) or *chakras* (wheels) are said to be the seven seats of femininity inherent in every human being— each of these is the seat of a *shakti* (power) which is, of course, also feminine in nature.(53) So by awakening these *shaktis* and activating the *padmas* or

chakras (through the force of *kundalini*, serpent force, also feminine) the *vamacharin* slowly (or quickly) transforms himself into the Goddess within and thus “becomes a woman.” He has undergone a transformation into his “opposite.”

In a left-hand path context the aghori sage Vimalananda relates that the aim of *kundalini yoga* is to reunite Shiva and Shakti, in order to re-create Shiva in his eternal form as (*Sadashiva*). “Sadashiva’s left side is female and right side is male; the two principles have united but have not merged. If they were to merge that would be the end of the play [*lila*], and that would be no fun at all.”(54) Here it should be carefully noted that Vimalananda subtly distinguishes between *union* and *merger*. His ultimate reason for wanting to avoid merger hinges on the *pleasure* he would lose if such a merger were to occur.

The essential principle behind how the *kundalini shakti* (serpent-power) is caused to rise in the body depends on the ability to *reverse* the ordinary or usual (i.e. *natural*) flow-patterns of force in the body. The *prana*-energy, which naturally flows *upward* and *inward* in the body is made to flow downward and outward, and the *apana*-energy, which ordinarily flows *downward* and/or *outward* is caused to flow upward or outward. When these two meet, contrary to their normal paradigm of motion, it is said that they “kiss,” and it is then that *kundalini shakti* begins to rise. Here it is clear that “antinomianism” in the tantric system has extended itself even into the realm of esoteric physiology.

In the usual, or right-hand path, practice of *kundalini yoga* the purpose is to reach the *sahasrara chakra* above the head. But it seems that from left-hand path perspective the pint is only to raise the serpent power to the sixth chakra, or *anja-chakra* (“command-center”)—and from there to enter into the three hidden chakras. These are the secret chakras of *golata*, *lalata* and *lalana* located on the uvula at the back of the throat, above the anja chakra and within the soft palate respectively. The aghori or left-hand path tantric will not merge with the *sahasrara* wherein all discrimination between *this* and *that*, between “I” and “not-I,” or “I” and “Thou” disappear would disappear. But, as Vimalananda would say, that would be no fun.

Vamacharins are actually known to engage in various practices considered nefarious by more orthodox *dakshinacharins*. Among the *aghora* sects, for example, acts of necrophilia and cannibalism are known. These and other practices are not engaged in for perverse pleasure, but rather they are dependent on the fact that they represent deep seated cultural and religious taboos. It is by breaking these taboos and going beyond the barriers of good and evil that the *aghora* attains new levels of power and “liberation” (from his human limitations).

The word *aghora* literally means “the Non-Fearful,” and this quality is equated with the southern face of the five-faced Shiva. This face is blue-black in color, and embodies the principle-of-intellect (*buddhi tattva*) or eternal law (*dharma*). (55)

More usual than engaging in these extreme forms, however, are the milder practices of sexual mysticism. Many of these are meant to break down social, sexual, as well as dietary taboos. “Tantrism” has been used as a synonym for “sexual magic” in the west since the appearance of popular treatments of the subject in the 1960s and 1970s. There is much more to the tantric tradition than sexual mysticism, but especially the left-hand tantrics do make actual sexual rituals a part of their practices. (56)

The most essential form of sexual mysticism is contained in the rite called *panchamakara* (“five-M’s”). This is described in the *Kalivilasa Tantra* (X-XI), but there warning is also given that it must be practiced only with initiated women. The “five-M’s” refer to five elements used in the ritual, the Sanskrit names for all of which begin with the letter “M:” *matsya*, fish; *mamsa*, meat; *madya*, intoxicating drink; *mudra*, cereal; and *maithuna*, coitus.

On the right-hand path substitute substances are traditionally used: incense, food, sandalwood, a lamp and flowers. In either case there is a regular correspondence to the five traditional Hindu elements, or *tattvas*: aether, water, earth, fire and air respectively.

In a typical performance of the *panchamakara* on the left-hand path the two celebrants partake of the four food items before entering into an act of sexual yoga. These elements have been described as aphrodisiacs, and they are also usually considered taboo substances (generally thought to be profane by the orthodox Hindus) which have been sacralized through mental discipline and tantric practice. In other words, the substances and acts involved in the *panchamakara* are usually thought to be instruments of *bondage*, and therefore to be counterproductive to liberation— but the left-hand path practitioner uses these substances and experiences for the purpose of raising *kundalini* and is not used by them.

Another important variation of the sexual ritual is the rite known as *chakra puja* (circle worship). Here a whole group of tantrics engage in a sexual ritual in which men and women are paired by chance. One way of doing this is by the women throwing their bodices (*choli*) into a basket and having each of the men take a bodice from the receptacle. The woman to whom that bodice belongs will be his ritual partner for the night— be that woman his wife, sister, mother, or whatever. The participants will all sit in a circle, alternating male/female, with the man's partner always sitting on his *left*. This is the probable origin of the term "left-hand path," and also shows the ritual correlation between *woman* and *left*. In the middle of the circle a single girl — usually very young — is worshipped by the chief officiating priest. The rite, which lasts for several hours, ends in a collective *panchamakara*.(57)

These and similar tantric rites are not as straightforward to interpret as they might seem at first. An important element in their functioning clearly seems to be the idea of antinomianism— the sanctification of the profane. But the attitude of erotic enjoyment evident in advanced practices seems to indicate that this is not a continuing factor. The original magical or psychologically transformative aspect might have been the overcoming of inhibition and the breaking of conventional taboos, but once this stage is past the activities continue in a new re-sacralized sense. The fact that the relatively mild sexual and dietary taboos have been broken may contribute to the practices of more extreme sects which seek to push back even stronger taboos. Some sects reinterpret the five-M's to mean *meha*, urine; *mamsa*, human flesh; *mala*, excrement; *medha*, juice (i.e. blood); and *mehana*, penis (i.e. semen). But perhaps in keeping with the two poles or schools within the left-hand path, there are also those at the other extreme who interpret these "five essentials" (*panchatattvas*) not as carnal realities, but as spiritual symbols. Always the overriding factor seems to be the idea of a Nietzschean *Umwertung aller Werte*— a re-valuation of all values. Barriers are broken, social and psychological chaos created, out of which a new, revived, renewed and transformed order can emerge according to the will of the tantric.

Commonly the left-hand path tantric is said to be able to ingest poisons — perhaps symbolic of substances which hinder liberation — with nothing but beneficial results. This is made possible once the tantric has become [a] Shiva, that is realized his real Self or Soul, he possesses the power of Shiva to convert everything which he ingests into *amrita* (the divine nectar of immortality, or non-death).(58) The magical principle transforming or "purifying" any substance or experience to serve the purposes of the pure Will of the magician is typical at all levels of the left-hand path.

Another important *vamachara* technique which involves the reversal of norms or natural tendencies is that of the control of the flow of semen. On the surface this appears to be one of those many magico-technical aspects only tangential to the purpose of this study. But the *rationale* behind it, if not the philosophical sophistication or actual objective effectiveness, is an important left-hand path statement.

Among tantrics semen is thought of as the essence of Shiva,(59) and as long as they are able to retain it or reabsorb it they will have immortality. In esoteric tantric physiology it is conceptualized that the semen, or the spiritual component of it (Skt. *bindu*), has its origin in the crown *chakra sahasrara* and is normally and naturally transmitted downward through a subtle artery (*nadi*) and ejaculated and lost. This loss is a loss of power, self-hood, and life.(60)

It then becomes the task of the tantric adept to reverse the natural process in some way so that he can retain and reabsorb this spiritual substance. So the tantric may arrest the ejaculation, causing the *bindu* to rise again in reverse direction back to the crown of the head nourishing and empowering self-hood and immortality. Or a similar effect may be gained by ejaculating into the *yoni* (vulva) and then drawing it back up through the penis and up the subtle *nadi* to the crown *chakra*. It is also possible to ingest orally the “fallen” *bindu*.(61) Similar beliefs were perhaps held by certain Gnostic sects in which there was often talk of the “power to reverse the river Jordan.”(62)

In Hindu tantrism the importance of actual *worship* of Shakti in the form of womankind and the physical vulva makes it more likely that practices involving emission of semen and its mixture with female emissions before reabsorption takes place are more common than in Buddhistic tantrism.(63)

What is important here is the left-hand path technique or philosophical model of inverting or reversing *natural* processes through the power of will and consciousness. By being able to reverse natural “flow patterns,” be they in the body (subjective) or in the world (objective), practitioners of the left-hand path demonstrate or exercise their independence from the natural universe— thus establishing that which is divine in their individualities (*jivatman*). This it seems is the central philosophical and magical statement underlying the machinations of the tantric semen cult.

The concept of the sovereign power of a “lord” is highly consistent with the Hindu terminology surrounding those called *mahapurushas* or “great-souled” ones. These exist in four grades or levels of power: 1) *siddha* “an immortal one of special ability,” 2) *nath* “master,” 3) *muni* (or *mauni*) “silent one,” and 4) *rishi* “seer.”(64)

The *vamamarga* appears to be a path consistent with Hinduism’s most archaic roots and to be a logical flowering of certain aspects of Indo-European thought. The development of the individual self (*jivatman*) to the level of a divinity — and the maintenance of that level of being for eternity — never seeking the final liberation or total annihilation of the individual self in the universal self (*paramatman* or *brahman*) is the clear goal of the original vitality of Indo-European thought.

The Left-Hand Path in Buddhism

In Buddhism the position of the left-hand path is more philosophically paradoxical, but in fact and practice it is perhaps no less prevalent than in Hinduism. The reason the Buddhist left-hand path is paradoxical is that the very foundation of Buddhism lies on the basis that *there is no individual self*— that such a concept is only an illusion created by the mind. The Hindu holds that the self does exist, as do the gods and goddesses. The Buddhists original denial of these assertions, as well as their rejection of the ultimate validity of the *Vedas*, are the main reasons they were themselves rejected as heretics in India. Originally Buddhism was not so much a *religion* as it was a *technique* or *method* of “enlightenment,” or the realization of the nirvanic state. Historically many elements have accrued to the Buddhist method as it adapted itself to local cults and social conditions throughout Asia.

The historical Siddhartha Gautama, called the Buddha (“Awakened One”), died in 544 BCE. He was an Indian (Aryan) prince of a Ksatriya (warrior) tribe paradoxically using a Brahmanic clan name— Gautama, “descendant of the sage Gotama. Siddhartha established a radical teaching for gaining enlightenment. This teaching is based on the so-called Four Noble Truths: 1) life is inherently full of suffering (Pali *dukkha*), 2) that suffering is due to craving (Pali *tanha*), 3) suffering can be stopped by “eradication of craving” (Pali *nibbana*, Skt. *nirvana*), 4) “eradication of craving” can be achieved by following the Noble Eightfold Path (Pali *ariya*). This Eightfold Path consists of: 1) right understanding, 2) right thinking, 3) right speech, 4) right action, 5) right livelihood, 6) right effort, 7) right mindfulness (contemplation), 8) right meditation (one pointedness of mind). By following the Eightfold Path the practitioner will gain the awakened state of Buddha-hood.

Buddhism at this level is a highly developed and sophisticated doctrine which epitomizes the right-hand path. The root of this can be easily understood by analyzing the first of the Four Noble Truths. In a chain of causation, sorrow is equated with ignorance, ignorance causes imagination, imagination causes consciousness of self, which causes embodied existence, which gives rise to the senses, which cause perception. Perceptions cause emotion, emotion causes craving (*tanha*), craving causes attachment (to the things craved), attachment leads to becoming, which leads to rebirth—the principal phenomenon equated with “suffering” in both Hindu and Buddhist traditions. The ignorance which started the whole chain in motion is equated with an ignorance of the nature of the universe, that it is full of sorrow (*dukka*), instability or becoming (*anicca*), and “lack of self” (*anatta*). If Buddhists had remained true to those fundamental philosophical stances and practices, there could be no talk of a Buddhist left-hand path.

The most “orthodox” — or simplest — school of Buddhism has come to be referred to as Theravada (“teaching of the elders”), and is strongest in southern Buddhism in Sri Lanka and southeastern Asia. But beginning around the 1st - 2nd centuries CE learned monks began to develop a more esoteric tradition which came to be known as the *mahayana* (“greater vehicle”). In this context Theravada is often referred to as the *hinayana* (“lesser vehicle”). *Mahayana* eventually came to dominate in the north, in Tibet, China and Japan. The orthodox view is that each person is fully responsible for his own enlightenment and that the realm of bliss, *nirvana*, is fully separate from the realm of illusion, or *maya* (the phenomenal world).

There was a tendency in *mahayana* to bridge the gap of absolute separateness between *nirvana* and *maya*. One way was found in the doctrine of the *bodhisattva*, “one bound for awakening.” A *bodhisattva* was a near perfected being who could effect the enlightenment or development of less awakened people through a kind of magical intervention from his ascended state. (This doctrine, as found in Tibetan Buddhism, is apparently the main source for later ideas of “unknown superiors,” “secret chiefs,” and mahatmas found in certain Masonic, quasi-masonic and Theosophical schools in the west.)

Philosophically a certain school within the *mahayana* (called *madhyamika*) claimed that in fact there was no difference between *maya* and *nirvana*— both were equally void (*sunyata*) or alternately that the phenomenal world (*maya*) exists only in the mind of the perceiver.

These ideas might remind the reader of the “sense data” theories of the British philosophers George Berkeley (1685-1753) and David Hume (1711-1776), whose application of empiricism led them to conclude that we can only know the subjective contents of our minds as fed by impressions made upon them by the senses. The “reality” of the world outside our minds is uncertain. Already in ancient times the epistemologies of Hinduism and Buddhism had passed through the radical stages of subjective observation that would only be possible in the west after the demise of the intellectual hegemony of Christianity. (See chapter 6.)

The most striking development within the *mahayana* is the emergence of the *vajrayana* (“thunderbolt or diamond vehicle”), especially prevalent in Tibet. Philosophically, the *vajrayana* is virtually synonymous with Tibetan Buddhist tantrism. Thus, if *maya* = *nirvana* then indulgence in the phenomenal world can lead to the world of bliss. *Maya* is used to attain *nirvana*. In practical terms this opens the way to antinomianism. “Profane” things are made “pure” as an exercise of the mind. *Vajrayana* is heavily influenced on a philosophical and practical level by Indian (Hindu) tantrism, indigenous Tibetan religion (Bön), and central Asian shamanism. Again in an antinomian spirit the over-culture absorbs techniques from the under-culture.

In Buddhism, as in Hinduism, the left-hand path ends not in the absorption or annihilation of individuality in *moksha* or *nirvana* but in a perpetuation of that individuality on a more permanent plane of existence. Within Buddhist terminology, the practitioner of the left-hand path aims to attain only to the bodhisattvic state—and to remain there as a deity—“angelic” or “demonic.” The final annihilation is resisted.

Of course, when we look at the original Buddhist teachings, such aims are theoretically antithetical to the very premise of Buddhism. But in the history of religious ideas such contradictions often arise. Who would think, for example, that the teachings of the Nazarene, as reported in the Gospels, could be used to support such institutions as the Crusades and the Inquisition? So it is not surprising that Buddhism would develop within itself patterns out of synch with the founder's original intentions. Over the 1500 years following Gautama's death Buddhism spread from India in a largely peaceful way throughout the cultures of southeastern Asia, China, Tibet, Mongolia and Japan. With this kind of cultural diversity as its matrix, it is certainly no wonder that teachings at odds with those of the founder took root in the religious soil called Buddhism.

Left-hand path tantrism seems to have had various epicenters of development in the Buddhist world. Principal among these were Tibet and Bengal (present-day Bangladesh). In this latter region Buddhism was eventually driven out by Muslim conquest starting about 1200 CE, and from there it spread to Java and up to Nepal.

Methods of Left-Hand Path Buddhism

One of the chief aspects of left-hand path Buddhism is its positive attitude toward sexuality. The left-hand path Buddhist accepts certain Shakta ideas that the creative energy or "potency" of a deity, angel, demon, or bodhisattva is personified as his wife or consort. In the left-hand path Buddhist tantra the *shaktis*, or female aspects of supermundane entities, are worshipped as lovers. The Buddhist tantrik seeks sexual union with these *shaktis* in order to draw on their power and to use the power gained from such unions for further spiritual development. Another chief feature of left-hand path tantric Buddhism is the utilization not only of "deities" or "angels," i.e. entities considered generally beneficent, but also of "demons" and their consorts. The god Bhairava ("the Terrible") is worshipped, and elaborate rites are performed in burial grounds. Also, sexual intercourse and other activities considered immoral by the general population are utilized as practices which lead to spiritual development or salvation.(65)

The Buddhist left-hand path tantrism holds that the passions and desires which the right-hand path seeks either to annihilate or sublimate can be utilized in their direct unsublimated forms as vehicles for "awakening."

Evans-Wentz cites the following technical instructions from the Tibetan Buddhist text called the "Epitome of the Great Symbol" (87-88):

87. Whatever thoughts, or concepts, or obscuring [or disturbing] passions arise are neither to be abandoned nor allowed to control one; they are to be allowed to arise without one's trying to direct [or shape] them. If one do no more than merely to recognize them as soon as they arise, and persist in so doing, they will come to be realized [or to dawn] in their true [or void] form through not being abandoned.

88. By that method, all things which may seem to be obstacles to spiritual growth can be made use of as aids on the Path. And therefore, the method is called "The utilizing of obstacles as aids on the Path."(66)

Left-hand path Buddhism, like so many other expressions of the left-hand path in the world, eschews institutional forms and socially acceptable norms. It tends more in the direction of individualized expression and socially unacceptable behaviors.

In actual sexual practice the male Buddhist left-hand path tantric is more likely to retain his seminal fluid totally, or having ejaculated it, to reingest it in its entirety orally. The retention of seed (Skt. *bija*) is tantamount to retaining power and vitality— both physical and mental. Also, it seems although there might be a generally more spiritually positive attitude toward sexuality and womankind in Buddhist left-hand path tantrism, there is still the fear that women, and especially female demonic entities, can vampirize men of their vital spiritual powers.(67)

In philosophical terms, the Buddhist left-hand path concentrates more on a subjective — intrapsychic — process. The Buddhist view would be that such polarities as implied by the male/female dichotomy (or that of the right-hand/left-hand path) are illusory creations of the mind of the individual. Practices are engaged in to demonstrate this illusory aspect. The Buddhist left-hand path practitioner will tend to create his own subjective internally complete and closed system, whereas the Hindu left-hand path practitioner will tend to acknowledge as real the objective existence of the Goddess (*Shakti*).

Practitioners who hold that the realm of the five senses is purely a construct of the mind and in reality the product of illusion (*maya*) may often rely on what appears to non-initiates to be chicanery and tricks involving slight of hand. If the world we see before us is an illusion, then the magician is pointing this out to us not by means of philosophical discourse, but by means of a direct attack on those senses and the ways they (mis-)inform the mind. Thus, what may at first glance appear to be an attempt at deception or trickery is in fact conceived of as the most direct method of teaching about the central fact (from a Buddhist perspective) that the world is a creation of the mind— a much more entertaining approach to the problems addressed by Plato's "Myth of the Cave."(68)

Because of the long-standing and continuing proliferation of doctrines and sects within both Hindu and Buddhist tantra/shakta no unifying or definitive summary of either what they believe or practice, or final conclusion on what distinguishes them, can be reached with certainty. It only seems certain that the desire for continued — if continually transformed — individuality, and lack-of-annihilation, are universal (even if often obscured in actual texts of the left-hand path *Tantras*).

The influence of the left-hand path as practiced by philosophies based on Indian-derived systems — both Hindu and Buddhist — on the modern western forms of the left-hand path has been enormous. Historically, it would seem that this influence came in at least two great waves. The first came perhaps with the opening of cultural channels between "east" and "west" occasioned by the conquests of Alexander (d. 323 BCE). Following this time there was a flood of ideas from the "east" (India and Iran) which formed and reformed sects in the Mediterranean region. These in turn exercised a secondary influence on India with Christian missions (often gnostic in character) beginning in the first century CE.(69) The second wave of influence from the eastern left-hand path is better documented. In essence it came originally as a result of another "conquest" from the west— the extension of the British Empire into India (beginning in the 18th century). As the west was again increasingly exposed to ideas stemming from India and Tibet eventually this filtered down to a more popular level of culture where it emerged in forms such as the Theosophical Society (founded 1875) and the *Ordo Templi Orientis* (founded 1896 or 1904). In both instances, as discussed in chapter 7, doctrines of left-hand path Hinduism and Buddhism played significant roles.

The forms of sexual magic taught by Aleister Crowley and his followers as well as the antinomian chicanery practiced by Anton LaVey have analogs in the left-hand path practices of India.

Zoroastrianism and the Left-Hand Path

No system of thought shaped the classical form of western left-hand path mythology more than Zoroastrianism. The idea that there is a whole hierarchy of the forces of good arrayed as if in a battle against a hierarchy of the forces of evil came to the west from Iranian religion (in one form or another) through Judaism or Gnosticism in some cases— or perhaps directly into the heathen north in other cases.(See chapter 3.) Originally the Iranian religious system differed little from the Vedic system of India. This is because the Aryans and Iranians are merely stems of the same branch of the Indo-European tree of cultures and religions.

Because the Iranian systems have lent themselves so much to western left-hand path mythology, and because they are themselves often so dualistic and concerned with matters of good *versus* evil, it is all the more surprising that when one analyzes the systems there is

very little underlying tension over the essential philosophical questions which differentiate the left-hand path from the right-hand path both east and west. Iranian systems seem to have characteristics which in some way or another belong to the left-hand path!

The study of Iranian religion is complex and obscured by the fact that the cultural basis and epicenter of it was destroyed by the Muslim conquest of Iran over a thousand years ago. Many Zoroastrians escaped to India (the Parsis) where they continue the religion, and some non-Islamic practitioners of various forms of Iranian religion (including Zoroastrianism) have survived in Iran to this day. But their schools of sophisticated thought have long since been shattered.

Zoroaster (or Zarathustra), who probably lived around the time 500 BCE,(70) was essentially a reformer of the Iranian religion as practiced by various tribal groups. He was himself trained as a priest or *zotar* of this sacrificial religion. Even before Zoroaster the Iranian system had developed highly dualistic tendencies(71) which would continually find expression in Iranian religions both within Zoroastrianism and outside it. Zoroaster's reforms seem to have been aimed at creating a *moralistic* dualism within a theoretically "monotheistic" system. Zoroaster's chief opponents in his efforts were the ultra-conservative representatives of the old Indo-Iranian order— the *mairyas* organized in *haenas* or "men's" societies." This appears to be a logical opposition as monotheism would tend to divest the ruling *class* of its power and invest that power in a single ruler or *Shah*.

The *haenas* were the repositories of archaic religious practice and culture. They practiced animal sacrifice (especially of horses and cattle), and drank a holy intoxicating liquid (*haoma*, cf. Skt. *soma*). They were a society of horse-riding warriors who were accompanied on their ways by a troop of women called *jahikas* or *jahis*, who sometimes fought along side the warriors, but who were certainly the concubines of the men. On the spiritual level these *jahis* were reflected by the *farvashis* who were the protective and empowering souls of the warriors. The word *jahi* later became the name of the chief demoness of the Zoroastrians, *Jahi* or *Jeh*— "the Whore."

The religion of the *mairyas* was certainly one based on life and the preservation and continuation of life and the glories of the individual soul. As the "prophet" Zoroaster saw them, these bands must have seemed the very incarnations of the evil minions of Ahriman. They wore black leather (although they fought naked from the waist up), bore black weapons and flew a black flag emblazoned with silver dragons. Their hair was long and they wore it in braids. In their initiation rites they were known, like members of other Indo-European warrior bands, to don the skins of wolves— thereby transforming themselves into the likeness of wolves. Also they made use of a magical fury called *aeshma*.(72)

This *aeshma* is doubly interesting to us because on the one hand it is a close parallel to the magical fury or inspiration (*wod-*) attained by the Germanic warrior/magicians under the leadership of their god *Wôd-an-az* (Woden/Odin), while the word *aeshma* also found its way into the Judeo-Christian demonic lore in the form of *Aeshma-daeva* (the god/demon of fury). The Iranian form *Aeshmadaeva* eventually became *Asmodeus*.

Zoroaster vilified the religious culture of the warrior societies, and many of his reforms seem aimed at correcting what he saw as excesses in their practices and in their violent natures. Essentially his reforms consisted of a replacement of most (if not all) of the gods (*daevas*) of the traditional Iranian pantheon with hierarchies of personifications of largely abstract entities or principles (*yazatas*)

In Zoroaster's theology there is one god who is absolutely wise and purely good, but not all-powerful. He is called *Ahura Mazda* ("Wise Lord"). He created through Thought a hierarchy of all-seeing spirits. In fact he created a whole good universe, called *menok*. It is said that *Ahura Mazda* chose the Good of his own free will.(73) This clearly implies that somehow beyond the gods there is a system of morality to which they themselves are subject. Among the creatures *Ahura Mazda* engenders are the twins *Spenta Mainyu* (Beneficent Mind) and *Angra Mainyu* (Destroying Mind). *Angra Mainyu*, exercising his own free will, for the first time chose evil instead of good. The very existence of *Angra*

Mainyu in effect limited the good of Ahura Mazda. Angra Mainyu then began to plan an attack on the good creation of Ahura Mazda (who in some accounts is virtually identified with Spenta Mainyu). But Ahura Mazda with his all-seeing wisdom sees Angra Mainyu's plan and in defence of his pre-existing spiritual universe (*menok*), he created from its pattern a material universe (*getik*). This material universe is created by Ahura Mazda as a weapon or shield against Angra Mainyu. The later systems of Gnosis which contrived to make the material universe the creation of the "evil god" would have been highly heretical to Zoroaster himself.

In some accounts it is said that Angra Mainyu began a counter creation in which he made monsters (such as wolves and spiders) for each beautiful creature Ahura Mazda had fashioned (such as dogs and eagles). Other accounts have it that Angra Mainyu began to possess or indwell in the good creations of Ahura Mazda— corrupting them.

But what has Angra Mainyu — known as Ahriman in later sources — really done but give Ahura Mazda the licence he needs to extend his power limitlessly while only acting morally in defence of his good creation? Here it is seen that Angra Mainyu actually — unconsciously and involuntarily — collaborates in Ahura Mazda's plans of perfection. So Angra Mainyu can be seen as an example of "evil" which promotes the cause of good— just as Goethe's Mephistopheles says of himself:

*Ich bin ein Teil von jener Kraft,
die stets das Böse will und stets das Gute schafft.
I am a part of that force that would
always desire the evil, yet always work the good.*

(J. W. von Goethe, *Faust* I, Scene 5)

In the orthodox Zoroastrian system, mankind is exhorted — in imitation of Ahura Mazda — to choose the good always as a matter of free will. In so doing the evil machinations of Ahriman will be thwarted. Mankind is seen as the chief battle ground between good and evil— and mankind is seen as the fulcrum on which the fate of the world is balanced.


The Zoroastrians were by no means immediately successful in their efforts to reform the Iranian religion and their system does not appear to become the official religion of the court of the Shah, Darius, until around 522 BCE— approximately a millennium after the death of Zoroaster himself.(74)

Zoroaster lived and his system flourished most in eastern Iran (on the eastern side of the Zagros mountains)— but the various Iranian Empires (from around 800 BCE) and the realm of Iranian cultural influence spread through Mesopotamia into Asia Minor (present-day Turkey). In the western part of the Persian Empire the cult of the *magûs* (sing. *magû*, priest) remained strong and resisted Zoroastrian influence. *Magu* is the ultimate source of the term "magician." It was also Latinized as the singular *magus* (pl. *magi*) and used to designate highly initiated (and ostensibly wise) practitioners of sorcery. As time went on, however, the cult of the *magûs* became progressively more influenced by Zoroastrian ideas until they eventually came to be *identified* (by outsiders) as Zoroastrian priests.

In fact pre-Zoroastrian religious systems continued to flourish throughout this time both inside and outside the Persian empire— and some say they still persist. In any event, the native Iranian beliefs — forms of *daevas*-worship — are certainly known to have still existed in the mountainous region of Sogdia at the time of the Islamic conquest which took from 636 to 800 CE to complete.

The principal pre-Zoroastrian systems, which nevertheless began to include Zoroastrian elements over time (just as Zoroastrianism incorporated pre-Zoroastrian elements), were Zurvanism and Mithraism.

Zurvan is an Iranian deity embodying infinite time and destiny. According to the Zurvanites, Zurvan is the “father” of both Ohrmazd and Ahriman. This conception is apparently extremely ancient, perhaps even pre-dating Zoroaster’s system.(75) It is probably in the system of Zurvanism that the idea of the *moral dualism* preached in Zoroaster’s theology finds expression in a dualism expressed between spirit (as a manifestation of good) and matter (as a manifestation of evil). It can not be over emphasized that the spirit = good/matter = evil ideology is *not* Zoroastrian. It is an extreme heresy in orthodox Zoroastrianism to believe such a thing— although it does seem to be an Iranian idea. In Zurvanism Ahura Mazda (Ohrmazd) is reduced to a creature of Zurvan— which again is heretical for orthodox Zoroastrians.



In the Zurvanite system, the god Mithra (Vedic Mitra) is seen as a mediator between Ohrmazd and Ahriman. In Mithra we see another persistent manifestation of the pre-Zoroastrian religion throughout the history of Iranian religion and religious systems derived from Iranian thought. The Mithraic cult was strong for a long time among the *magûs* of the western Persian Empire— especially around the Black Sea. It is clearly a non-Zoroastrian warrior oriented mystery cult.(76) A close study of Mithraism reveals that it is a sophisticated system developed from the religion of the warrior bands (*haenas*) of early Iranian culture. This is often eclectically mixed with elements from religions and mystery cults with which the Mithraists came into contact. When the Romans came into contact with this cult (after the middle of the 1st century CE) it spread among soldiers throughout the Roman Empire.

Mithraism, as opposed to other common forms of Iranian religion, is remarkably free of dualistic thinking. It seems to be a highly developed survival of the old Iranian warrior cult. Mithras, who in some respects resembled another culture hero also born on 25 December, achieved salvation through the sacrifice of a bull. Eventually this bull-sacrifice cult lost out to the human-sacrifice cult of Christianity.

From the standpoint of orthodox Zoroastrian religion, both Zurvanism and Mithraism represent heretical, “evil” paths of darkness. Zurvanism both because it sees Ohrmazd as a subordinate to Zurvan and Ahriman as the complete equal of Ohrmazd, and because it reduces the material universe to a creation of the evil god. Mithraism is heretical and evil because in it one of the old gods (*daevas*), Mithras, is worshipped. What is more, he is worshipped at *night* (which in itself constitutes an evil act of “devil worship” among orthodox Zoroastrians) and he is a warrior god who sacrifices a cosmic bull to create the world— which is reminiscent of the sacrificial cult of the old Iranian *haenas*. The followers of Mithras take part in that sacrifice, becoming themselves creators.

Zoroastrianism and the Iranian religious systems in general have exerted tremendous, sometimes formative, influences on religious and magical traditions around them. These systems originated such important historical religious ideas as the strict dualism between the forces of good and the forces of evil, the idea of the coming of a world savior (Saoshyant) at the end of a linear stretch of time, the notion of all souls being judged— the good going to Paradise (from the Iranian word *pairi-daeza*, “a walled in garden or park”), the wicked to a realm of punishment, and the idea of the resurrection (or reconstruction and reanimation) of the physical bodies of the dead in a renewed world. In fact two of the most important Judeo-Christian myths are Iranian in origin: Certain aspects of Eden (Gen. 1-2) and the nativity of Jesus (Mat. 2:1-12).

The symbolic complex of the first man and woman (together with a malevolent female figure) and the tree of Paradise in conjunction with a serpent definitely seems to originate in Judaism (and hence Christianity) from Iranian sources.(77) While these symbols have been present in the near east for millennia, it is most likely that they entered into Hebrew mythology following the time of the Jewish liberation from Babylon in 539 BCE. After that time, until the conquest of Alexander in 332 BCE, Israel was part of the Persian Empire.

More obviously of Iranian — and specifically “magian” or Mithraic origin — is the myth of the Nativity of Jesus Christ. In the Iranian (Mithric) lore it was believed that the future Redeemer-King of the world would be born in a cave and that this would be signalled by a “star or column of light” shining above the cave. This explains why the three *magoi* (*magûs*) are said to have visited the Christ child in the accounts given in the Gospel of Matthew.(78)

Often the Yezidis, another Iranian people, are thought to be related to left-hand path ideas. It is just as likely as not that the original impetus and essence of that sect is Iranian (the Yezidis are Kurds, an Iranian people). Also, the apparent fact that they give some sort of honor to the god normally associated with evil, and that he is already been, or will be, forgiven by god, is consistent with heterodox Iranian beliefs.(79) I treat the Yezidis in more detail in chapter 4.

In the final analysis it seems virtually impossible to classify any of the systems of Iranian thought as either right-hand path or left-hand path according to the criteria set out in this study. This is because although there is usually a strong polarity between good and evil in these systems, the good is not a matter of following the Law of God, or in seeking self-annihilation either literally or as a by-product of “doing God’s will,” but rather it is doing or choosing the Good which the god himself must also seek to choose. The Good seems to be an objective construct comparable to the Platonic *agathôn*. The individualities of the good ones are not annihilated— but preserved and even resurrected in physical reality.

Because the “east” has historically been able to preserve more or less intact the full range of religious “paths” envisioned and practiced by humanity, and because sages and magicians have consciously worked these methods out in an atmosphere of relative philosophical toleration, the methods and vocabulary of *both* paths seem more precise there. Much of the dichotomy between the methods and aims we have identified as right-hand path and left-hand path for this study was originally developed in an eastern (Indo-Iranian) context. What we are immediately struck with when we look to the oldest foundations of European culture is the existence of the range of paths relatively free of the dichotomizing tendencies which lead to the left-hand path/right-hand path labels.

Notes For Chapter 2

- (1) See J. Mallory, *In Search of the Indo-Europeans* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1989).
- (2) For a critical study of Dumezil's works and ideas, see C. Scott Littleton, *The New Comparative Mythology*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.)
- (3) Francis M. Cornford, trans. and ed. *The Republic of Plato*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1941), pp. 119-129.
- (4) See Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy* (New York: Vintage, 1967 [1972]).
- (5) For a convenient introduction to the *Rig Veda*, see Wendy Donniger O'Flaherty, *The Rig Veda* (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1981).
- (6) Julius Evola, *The Yoga of Power: Tantra, Shakti, and the Secret Way*. trans. Guido Stucco. (Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 1992), p. 66.
- (7) For a discussion of tantric science, see Mookojee and Khana, *The Tantric Way* (Boston: New York Graphic Society, 1977), pp. 93-125.
- (8) J.N. Farquhar, *An Outline of the Religious Literature of India* (Dehli: Motilal Banarsidass, 1920), pp. 265ff.
- (9) Evola, *The Yoga of Power*, p. 30.
- (10) See Joscelyn Godwin *Arktos: The Polar Myth* (Grand Rapids, MI: Phanes, 1993), p. 33, and also Tilak, Bal Gangadhar. *The Arctic Home in the Vedas*. Poona: The Kesari, 1903.
- (11) Alain Danielou, *The Myths and Gods of India* (Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 1985), p. 382.
- (12) Mircea Eliade, *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969, 2nd ed.), p. 142.
- (13) Sastri, S. Subrahmanya and T.R. Srinivasa Ayyangar, eds. *Jivanmuktiviveka* (Liberation in Life) of Vidyaranya (Adyar: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1978).
- (14) Louis Renou, ed., *Hinduism* New York: George Braziller, 1961), p. 40.
- (15) Eliade, *Yoga*, p. 142.
- (16) Eliade, *Yoga*, p. 128.
- (17) Evola, *Yoga of Power*, p. 66.
- (18) One of the most coherent discussions of the process of personal transformation within tantrism is found in chapter 6 of Arthur Avalon's *Shakti and Shakta*. (New York: Dover, [1959]), pp. 136-187.
- (19) N. N. Bhattacharyya, *History of the Tantric Religion* (New Dehli: Manohar, 1982), p. 341.
- (20) Bhattacharyya, *History*, p. 341.
- (21) Bhattacharyya, *History*, p. 317.
- (22) Bhattacharyya, *History*, p. 318.
- (23) Evola, *Yoga of Power*, pp. 54-55.
- (24) Robert E. Svaboda, *Aghora II: Kundalini* (Albuquerque, NM: Brotherhood of Life, 1993), p. 85.
- (25) Evola, *Yoga of Power*, p. 55.
- (26) Evola, *Yoga of Power*, p. 55.
- (27) Avalon, Arthur (= John Woodroffe), *Shakti and Shakta*. (New York: Dover, [1959]), p. 164 and Evola, *Yoga of Power*, p. 55.
- (28) Svaboda, *Aghora II*, pp. 67-68.
- (29) Danielou, *Myths and Gods of India*, p. 258.
- (30) Bhattacharyya, *History*, p. 108.
- (31) Eliade, *Yoga*, pp. 228-229.
- (32) Evola, *Yoga of Power*, p. 68.
- (33) Evola, *Yoga of Power*, p. 66.
- (34) Margaret and James Stutley, *Harper's Dictionary of Hinduism* (New York: Harper and Row, 1977), pp. 67; 321.
- (35) Francis King, *Tantra for Westerners* (New York: Destiny, 1986), p. 95.
- (36) Danielou, *Myths and Gods of India*, p. 383.
- (37) Svaboda, *Aghora II*, p. 27.
- (38) Svaboda, *Aghora II*, p. 192.
- (39) Svaboda, *Aghora II*, p. 198.

- (40) In the Vedantic school the only way to liberation is through *jnana*. Bondage is due to *avidya* (non-knowing) and involvement with the phenomenal universe is due to *avidya* alone. (cf. S.K. Ramachandra Rao *Jivanmukti in Advaita*. Gandhinagar, Bangalore: Prakashana, 1978, p. 31.
- (41) Renon, *Hinduism*, p. 35.
- (42) Mookojee and Khana, pp. 28-29.
- (43) Danielou, *Myths and Gods of India*, p. 382.
- (44) Evola, *Yoga of Power*, pp. 93-100.
- (45) Anton Szandor LaVey, *The Satanic Bible*. New York: Avon, 1969, p. 46ff.
- (46) Danielou, *Myths and Gods of India*, pp. 382-83.
- (47) Danielou, *Myths and Gods of India*, p. 212.
- (48) Svaboda, *Aghora II*, p. 56.
- (49) Svaboda, *Aghora II*, p. 56.
- (50) Svaboda, *Aghora II*, p. 21.
- (51) Svaboda, *Aghora II*, p. 24.
- (52) Bhattacharyya, *History*, p. 109.
- (53) Bhattacharyya, *History*, p. 110.
- (54) Svaboda, *Aghora II*, p. 69.
- (55) Danielou, *Myths and Gods of India*, p. 212.
- (56) Benjamin Walker, *Tantrism* (Wellingborough, UK: Aquarian Press, 1982), p. 49ff.
- (57) Walker, *Tantrism*, pp. 64-66.
- (58) Svaboda, *Aghora II*, p. 89-91.
- (59) Eliade, *Yoga*, p. 239.
- (60) Walker, *Tantrism*, p. 52.
- (61) Walker, *Tantrism*, p. 50ff; King, *Tantra*, p. 92.
- (62) Benjamin Walker, *Gnosticism: Its History and Influence*. (Wellingborough, UK: Aquarian Press, 1983), p. 117.
- (63) King, *Tantra*, p. 92.
- (64) Svaboda, *Aghora II*, p. 85; 205ff.
- (65) Edward Conze, *Buddhism* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1961), pp. 191-192.
- (66) W. Y. Evans-Wentz, ed., *Tibetan Yoga and Secret Doctrines* (London: Oxford University Press, 1958, 2nd ed.), p. 138.
- (67) King, *Tantra*, p. 92.
- (68) *Republic*, pp. 227-235.
- (69) Walker, *Gnosticism*, pp. 163-165.
- (70) Mircea Eliade, *History of Religious Ideas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), vol I, pp. 302-305.
- (71) Eliade, *History of Religious Ideas* (1982), vol. II, pp. 309ff.
- (72) Geo Widengren, *Die Religionen Irans* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1965), pp. 23-26
- (73) Eliade *History of Religious Ideas* (1978), vol. I, pp. 309ff.
- (74) Mary Boyce, *Zoroastrians: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979), p. 54ff.
- (75) Eliade, *History of Religious Ideas* (1982), vol. II, pp. 309ff.
- (76) A basic studies of Mithraism is offered by Franz Cumont, *The Mysteries of Mithras* (New York: Dover, 1956).
- (77) Mircea Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (New York: Meridian, 1963), pp. 290-291.
- (78) Mircea Eliade, *The Two and the One* (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), pp. 50-55.
- (79) Insightful studies of the Yezidis have recently been offered by John S. Guest, *The Yezidis: A Study in Survival* (London: KPI, 1987) and Peter Lamborn Wilson, "Iblis, the Black Light" *Gnosis* 14 (Winter: 1990), pp. 2-47.

Chapter 3 Roots of the Western Tradition

Roots of the Western Left-Hand Path

With varying degrees of accuracy in European culture the phrase left-hand path has come to mean Satanism. This is both accurate and inaccurate. It is accurate insofar as the Judeo-Christian religious system — which coined the name “Satan” (from Hebrew *satan*, opponent; adversary) — saw in its conception of evil many traits and characteristics of left-hand path philosophy and religion. So when left-hand path practitioners looked at the orthodox Judeo-Christian systems, they would might feel a high degree of sympathy with and for the Devil. This seems to have happened with many Gnostic sects.

The equation of the western left-hand path with Satanism is inaccurate insofar as the practice of the left-hand path predates the imposition of the Judeo-Christian ideology in Europe. There was *and is* the practice of the left-hand philosophy in a purely pagan or heathen (i.e., pre-Christian) religious context, which does not *need* to refer to Satan or Lucifer to be intelligible. The left-hand path would have existed in Europe without the advent of Christianity (as it does and did in India). But when Christianity did arrive, it labeled not only the indigenous left-hand path practices of the heathens as diabolical, but the right-hand path ones as well. It was, however, only the left-hand path practitioners who were insightful and perhaps courageous enough to identify in some degree their ways with those of the adversary of the right-hand path Christians.

The Pagan Roots in Europe

The great Indo-European cultural and linguistic migrations beginning around 4000 BCE graphically shows the true root of “western” culture. The cultural roots of the peoples now speaking Celtic, Italic, Germanic, Slavic, or Hellenic (Greek) languages is probably to be found somewhere to the northeast of the Black Sea.(1) The national mythologies and religious systems of philosophy of these groups are closely related due to their common ultimate origin. What these migration routes also show, however, is the equally common origin shared between this western branch of the family and an eastern branch which is the Indo-Iranian tradition discussed in Part I.

Just as the left-hand path philosophy developed in the east, we could equally expect to find one developed in the west. In the west in fact, the basics of the left-hand path philosophy seem to have had virtual equal footing with right-hand path philosophies in the west— and seem to have dominated in the northern parts of Europe.

An important thing to remember about the Indo-European cosmology is that it postulates a divine order— which partakes of a higher or more permanent level of reality— that is reflected in the human order. The human soul, the *psyche*, is a gift of the gods and the social orderings are reflections of the orderings of the various pantheons of gods. This primal understanding was developed into an articulated *philosophy* by Plato in the “west” — just as it had been by the school of Indian sages responsible for the *Brahmanas* and *Upanishads* in the “east.”

History is full of tragedies and apparent tragedies. At least on one level, one of these tragedies was the slow erosion and ultimate destruction of the *established* forms of European religious systems through the incursion of an “exotic eastern religion” we now call Christianity. The

ecclesiastical institutions, or churches, supposedly based on the teachings of an executed holy man named Jesus, slowly and over a period of nearly 1300 years, disestablished the indigenous religious and philosophical traditions of the European nations and replaced them with the establishment of an international institution. This institution was characterized by an obsession for dogmatic unanimity on matters of “spiritual” teachings.

A map of the ideological campaigns of the Church would show a spread of Christianity from cities in the Mediterranean region northward and outward into the countryside. Of course, the church was nowhere able to impose itself absolutely. To be successful it had to compromise at every step along the way. But it was willing to do so in exchange for its ultimate prize— *universal establishment*.

Everywhere the church advanced, one of its standard practices was to turn the native gods into devils and to destroy the old temples and sacred groves and in their places build churches. We will return to the Christianization process in chapter 4, but for right now it is important to realize that: 1) the oldest roots of European and Indo-Iranian culture are identical (Indo-European), 2) the present established religious culture in Europe has its roots on foreign soil (the Middle East), and 3) the exotic Christian tree was only able to disestablish the native tree in a partial, external way.

So in very many ways what we call the “western tradition” is really largely *southern* and non-Indo-European in origin, while what is commonly referred to as the “eastern tradition” really has roots in common with actual European culture.

However, as the “western tradition” stands now, it is indeed a synthesis (albeit an awkward and uncomfortable one) of actual European and southern traditions derived from the Nilo-Mesopotamian (Egyptian and Mesopotamian) magical cultures. Therefore we must also examine the possible presence of the left-hand path philosophy in those regions as one of the possible roots of the modern left-hand path.

The Hellenic Left-Hand Path

In the history of the world perhaps no other single culture has been more influential over a wider expanse of time and space than the Hellenic. Moving down from the north, Hellenic, or Greek, tribes invaded and established themselves throughout the southern Balkan and Italic peninsulas and throughout the islands of the eastern Mediterranean Sea from about 1600 to 1100 BCE. The indigenous — non-Indo-European — culture which they overcame was an unusually vibrant and powerful one— having its apparent epicenter on the island of Crete. The Greek culture of the Homeric Age (850-750 BCE) is largely a true synthesis of Hellenic (Indo-European) and Minoan (Old European) cultures. *Synthesis* along with a sense of *harmony* and *moderation* are the major Hellenic cultural traits.

Because the Hellenic culture was so much a sea-going and mercantile one, it made deep-level contacts with the cultures of Egypt and other cultures of the eastern Mediterranean— for example, that of the Phoenicians. But whatever the cultural elements the Greeks might have adopted or borrowed from other cultures— such as writing (from the Phoenicians) or building in stone (from the Minoans) — the one aspect which remained thoroughly Greek — and Indo-European — was their *idealism*. Whether we see it in India or Ireland, in Rome or Greece, the Indo-European cosmology — or understanding of the world-order — hinges on the theory that this world is a material reflection of another, more real one — for example that of the gods and goddesses — beyond whom looms a yet more real world of abstract principles. This is expressed in the intrinsic linguistic dichotomy between *physis* (nature) and *psychê* (soul).

This idealism (ultimately codified by the philosopher Plato) coupled with the Greek language and writing system (one so simple and convenient even sailors and merchants could master it) allowed Hellenic culture to transform most cultures with which it had any long-standing contact.

— Prometheus and Pandora —
The Origins of Evil and its Transformative
Effects on Humanity

The exact age of the myth of Prometheus (whose name means “the one with foreknowledge”) is unknown. However, the idea of a transpersonal — or semi-divine — figure who is responsible for providing humanity with the spiritual faculty by which humans may *know* things seems to be a common Indo-European one. Such a figure would normally be considered a benefactor of humanity— in fact its true *creator* (in a spiritual sense). One 4th century source (Pausanias 10.4.4) even says Prometheus fashioned men from clay (see Eliade *HRI*, I, p. 255). This would seem to be a myth borrowed from the Middle East identifying Prometheus with Jehovah. Also, perhaps under the influence of the Middle Eastern notions concerning the “evil” of knowledge, the Greeks at one point turned this figure into a paradigm of the origin of human misery.

Hesiod’s *Theogony* (ca 700 BCE) is the oldest written reference to the myth of Prometheus. Hesiod portrays Prometheus as a titanic (pre-Olympian) entity who engenders a division between the gods and humanity— who had until that time lived in harmony together. Gods and men wished to part on good terms, so Prometheus institutes the first sacrifice of an ox to seal their pact of separation and independence. This rite is said to have occurred at a place called Mekone. After the slaying of the ox, Prometheus divides it into two portions: one of bone and one of flesh and entrails. The bones he covers with fat so that the smoke rising from them attracts the attention of Zeus, supreme deity of the Olympians. The meat is disguised by the fat of the ox. A choice is offered to the Olympian— and he chooses the fat-covered bones. When Zeus discovers the truth, he becomes angry at Prometheus and mankind and withdraws the divine fire which had presumably been one of those things previously shared by gods and humans.

This division of the sacrificial animal between edible parts, which are consumed by humans, and generally inedible parts, which are presumed to be the gods’ share, is common Indo-European practice and the myth is on one level a later attempt to “explain” this practice.

Again according to Hesiod, Prometheus responded to this by stealing the divine fire from Olympus. He carries it back to the world of men in a hollow fennel stalk. And once more Zeus is moved to punish mankind and Prometheus. This time Prometheus is pinned to a great rock— where an eagle comes daily to eat of his liver. To punish humanity Zeus sends them a woman— Pandora (“All-Suffering”)— out of whose box all the woes of mankind spring.

Hesiod’s portrayal of Prometheus is avowedly negative— although the primitive, pre-Hesiodic, roots of the myth may have not been so. After all, it is a myth of the self-determined and independent actions of our species— a myth of its “coming of age.” Such transformative myths always seem to involve rebellion against authority. Zeus himself had not merely disobeyed his father (Kronos)— he killed him and created a new divine order through his rebellion. By taking a negative attitude toward Prometheus’ actions, Hesiod shows himself to be one who longed for the “good old days” before humanity had individuated or differentiated itself from its divine ancestry. Belief in a divine ancestry is also a common Indo-European tradition.

That the negative attitude toward Prometheus was not universal is shown by the later version of the myth presented by the Attic tragedian Aeschylus (525-456 BCE). Aeschylus shows Prometheus as a tragic hero and savior of mankind.

Aeschylus apparently originally wrote three tragedies— a Promethean trilogy — but only the first of these *Prometheus Bound*, survives. In this version of the myth Zeus simply refuses to give humanity the divine fire— while at the same time he complains that humanity is wretched and deficient. Zeus plans to destroy humanity and create a new race. Prometheus protests man’s destruction, and tells Zeus that what humanity needs to fulfill its potential is the divine fire. Zeus refuses to relinquish it, so Prometheus steals the fire from Olympus and is punished for it in the same way as described by Hesiod. Where Hesiod had emphasized the fall of humanity from a “Golden Age” in which it was undifferentiated from the family of the gods, Aeschylus stresses a “myth of progress” in which the species begins to evolve faculties of consciousness after its contact with the gift of the divine fire.

Although the text of Aeschylus' final tragedy is lost, we know from accounts that in it Zeus releases and forgives Prometheus. He does this basically because the prediction of "the One with Foreknowledge" concerning the potential of humanity in possession of the gift of the divine flame turned out to be right— although the fact that Themis, the mother of Prometheus, has given him the secret of the future fall of Zeus also plays a role.

Historically this reconciliation of Zeus and Prometheus may have been spurred by the fact that in the time of Aeschylus — at the end of the Hellenic Age — there was an annual festival in Athens dedicated to Prometheus. Although this began as a festival mainly patronized by craftsmen, by the time of Aeschylus it was also popular with intellectuals. The cult of this "god of evil" had become a widespread phenomenon.(2) It may well be that the story of the forgiveness of Zeus was created more to promote Zeus as a god of forgiveness and wisdom than to rehabilitate the reputation of Prometheus. Zeus is even said to have forgiven his father, Kronos, and made him king of Elysium.

The Myth of Prometheus and the Left-Hand Path

In the history of the kind of thought we are calling left-hand path in the west, it is difficult to overestimate the importance of the myth of Prometheus. In it we have perhaps the oldest western representation of the myth of the Bringer of the Gift of Divine Light or Fire *portrayed as a villain* in the history of humanity. The fact that he is eventually reevaluated as a hero is also a significant western phenomenon we will see repeatedly.

It is curious to note that the American pioneer of modern Satanism, Anton LaVey, much admires the work of the sociologist Orrin Klapp and his book *Heroes, Villains and Fools* which analyzes the ways in which modern figures are transformed from among those categories of public perception.

In the Indo-European metalanguage of myth, the patterns of the right-hand path and left-hand path ideologies — although they openly vie with one another and compete for validation — are somehow reconciled and learn to co-exist. This is in marked contrast with the fanatical approaches of right-hand path systems of middle eastern — or southern — origin in which their "Satans" are never forgiven or reevaluated.

The myth of Prometheus is one which shows the spiritual or intellectual tutelage of a figure who provides humanity with its divine aspect — its intellect — and who is as such the true father of its spirit. Prometheus promotes the individuation of mankind from the gods and sets it as a species on its heroic quest to develop its own sense of divine power. As long as humanity was closely linked to the gods, it could not evolve in accordance with its own mysterious quest. Prometheus forced humanity out of its Olympian nest— and made it so that the species would have to fly or destroy itself. However, he also saw to it that the species was provided with *the one thing* that was absolutely necessary to flight— the divine fire of the gods. The myth clearly places the unbound exercise of the intellect — the divine faculty of consciousness — in the cultural mainstream of at least an aristocracy of intellectual merit.

Promethean mythology has been tremendously influential over the course of European cultural history. Since Aeschylus, the figure of the light-bearer was seen at least to some extent as a tragic hero. The myth itself probably did much to shape the lives of martyred philosophers such as Socrates and perhaps Jesus of "Nazareth" — or at least the literary representations of them. Beyond this it is interesting to note that Mary Shelly subtitled her Romantic manifesto novel, *Frankenstein*, "the modern Prometheus"— which implies a complex metaphor (and even the genesis of a neo-mythology) worthy of study in its own right.

The Greek Mysteries and the Left-Hand Path

The whole subject of the various mystery systems — their origius, interrelationships, and especially the exact nature of what they taught and how they taught it — remains, well, *mysterious*.(3) The initiatory function of the concept "mystery" (Gk. *mysterion*) is powerful and pervasive in many systems of religion, magic, and initiation— but its full significance is yet to be

discovered.(4) Also exactly what aspects of the Mysteries can be designated as right-hand path or left-hand path remain obscure, but I hope to be able to shed some light on this question here.

As Nietzsche was to emphasize centuries later, there are essentially two philosophical approaches are present in Hellenic (and by inference Indo-European) culture: the Dionysian and Apollonian. Of course, there tends to be the human, all-too-human urge to equate one with good and the other with evil, but this is always counterproductive. In fact, either philosophical approach to enlightenment can be used for right-hand or left-hand path spiritual aims— and a synthesis of both is perhaps the ideal.

The Dionysian approach is that of the *orgia* (orgy) by which human consciousness is united with that of the divine by means of a lowering of peripheral consciousness to a level where the divine — or “the other” — subsumes it. Dionysian spiritual technology makes use of rhythms (drumming, dancing, etc.) drugs (e.g. wine), and perhaps sex to lower the normal threshold of consciousness by overloading the physical senses which allows a union with the divine to occur.

The Apollonian approach is that of *katharsis* (purification) by which the consciousness cleanses and distances itself (through intellectual discipline and physical austerities) of impurities to such extent that consciousness is eventually raised to the level of divinity. Apollonian spiritual technology makes use of reason and physical austerities (such as dietary restrictions, vegetarianism, etc.) to raise the threshold of consciousness by suppressing the physical senses which allows the psyche to gain union with the divine.

Orphism or the Orphic Mysteries (so-called after the myth of Orpheus) make use of both technologies— though the Apollonian seems to predominate. Both the Orphic and Pythagorean mystery schools — which may share a common origin — practice vegetarianism. Whatever the historical origins of this practice, it is mythically traced back to that first animal sacrifice held by Prometheus at Mekone. Social participation was virtually mandatory in such sacrifices. In European practice such sacrifices was a matter of ritually slaughtering an animal and sharing the parts of the animal with the gods— the hard or inedible parts going to the god(s) and the edible portions being consumed by the faithful as an act of communion with the god(s). Animals were ceremonially slaughtered with a minimum of pain and fear to the animal as it was thought to embody a divine essence. The Orphics and Pythagoreans saw the institution of the eating of flesh as a sign of the presence of the “Titanic” (i.e. base or sub-divine) element in humanity and carnivorous practice as a perpetuation of that Titanic element. Their rejection of meat-eating also had the socio-religious effect of separating them from the mainstream of Hellenic society. They rejected the established practices of religion and society of their day.(5)

The over all process of initiation in these mysteries— which presupposed that humans were now a mixture of a Titanic nature and a divine nature — involved purifications (*katharmoi*), followed by initiation rites (*teletai*), and the constant leading of an “Orphic life.” Through these methods one could eliminate the Titanic element and become *bakkhos* — “separated out” and in a “divine, Dionysiac condition.”(6)

This theme of “separation” from the conventional social and natural order of the cosmos is one common to the left-hand path. Eliade concludes that the Orphic is “able to free himself from the ‘demonic’ element manifest in all profane existence (ignorance, flesh, diet, etc.)” and that the final goal is “the separation of the ‘Orphic’ from his fellow men and in the last analysis, the final separation of the soul from the cosmos.”(7) This same theme will also be emphasized in the Setian philosophy of Michael Aquino in the Temple of Set.

In the Orphic or Mystery traditions of the Greeks there are also some original contributions to the mythology of the right-hand *versus* the left-hand *paths*. In his *Republic* Plato, apparently drawing on mystery traditions, says that the dead follow two paths to judgment: the just “to the right upwards through the sky ... the unjust were condemned to the downward road to the left...”(8) This is no literary or heuristic invention by the philosopher, as shown by archaeological evidence of tomb complexes in southern Italy and Crete which have plaques with inscriptions indicating that those who go on the “right hand road” go “toward the sacred fields and grove of Persephone.”(9)

In this Orphic eschatology it seems that the good and just go the right hand road and are not reincarnated. They drink of the spring waters of *Mnemosyne* (Memory) and “reign with the other heroes.” But the wicked must drink from the spring called *Lethe* (Forgetfulness) and so lose all memory of the otherworld and are reincarnated in this world as “punishment.”¹⁰

In other words, the point of Orphic initiation was for the initiate to become a god— or god-like. In the underworld the Orphic initiate is told: “O fortunate, o happy one! Thou has become a god, having been a man.”¹¹

The attitudes toward what a desirable postmortem existence would be seem to have shifted over time. In the early historical phase it seems that the virtuous and good were rewarded with rebirth after rebirth in the world— which was seen as a highly desirable place to be. This amounted to an earthly immortality in ever rejuvenated bodies. Eventually these virtuous humans would be called by duty to the level of the immortal gods. However, the wicked in this early stage of such beliefs were “punished” with a permanent death, or non-existence. Later, there seems to have been a shift in some cultures’ (for example those of Greece and India) attitudes toward life in this world. In this phase it is believed that the wicked are *punished* with cycles of rebirth in this world and the virtuous are rewarded with a permanent existence among the gods and heroes.

Pythagoras and the Left-Hand Path

The doctrines of the Greek philosopher Pythagoras (about 582-507 BCE) are said to be drawn from a wide variety of sources— Egypt, Chaldea (Babylon), as well as Hyperborea (the extreme north).¹² However, virtually all of the major doctrines ascribed to Pythagoras can be derived from native Hellenic or Indo-European analogs. Although Pythagoras may have indeed travelled and learned in the far flung centers of esoteric knowledge— it seems most likely that he synthesized what he learned according to a uniquely Hellenic methodology. Most of the basic Pythagorean assumptions about the origin and destiny of the human soul are accepted from the Orphic mysteries. Pythagoras and his followers transformed the methodology of the process of initiation from an external or experiential one to an internal or *philosophical* one. Plato would further refine this Hellenic philosophical tradition.

Pythagoras made philosophy into a “whole science”— or a holistic understanding of existence. He postulated that number is the “root” or principle (Gk. *archê*) of all things. But in his philosophy numbers were more *qualities* than quantities,¹³ and therefore his apparently quantitative science was understood as a qualitative one. Mathematics revealed a hidden reality lying beyond the veil of appearances. To Pythagoras understanding the relationships and harmonies among numbers is tantamount to understanding the harmonies among things themselves.

The left-hand path characteristics of Pythagoreanism are more implicit than explicit. Pythagoras was primarily interested in discovering the bases of universal harmonies — of the ways all things fit together so beautifully — the “music of the spheres.”

Plato and the Left-Hand Path

Although even Plato himself would never have claimed to have invented his system of philosophy, as he understood all true knowledge to be a matter of “recollection” (Gk. *anamnesis*) of the soul’s inherent contents, he can be called the single greatest codifier and synthesizer of idealistic philosophy. Plato drew openly from a wide variety of philosophical sources — especially the Hellenic mysteries and Pythagoreanism — but he brought to those sources a clarity of objective purpose hitherto unseen.

The idealism of Plato should not be seen as the *beginning* of philosophy. It is a product of a millennia-long process of traditional speculation and intellectual inquiry begun at the dawn of Indo-European culture. Among all the languages of the world only the Indo-European and its derivatives has a true verb meaning “to be” in the sense of “to exist.” There were originally two verbs one meaning to be (in the sense of equivalence) — the chair is red — and one meaning “to be” (in the sense of existence): “To be or not to be, *that* is the question.” In the ancient tongue these two verbs were **bheu-* (to be equivalent) and **se-* (to exist). This came down to us in Old English in the distinction between *beon* and *wesan* respectively. With the demise of the innate Indo-European

system of thought— precipitated by the influx of middle eastern thought forms promoted by the church — the two verbs collapsed together. This is the reason why the verb “to be” in modern English is so highly irregular— it is derived from a mixture of two different stems.

What does all this have to do with Plato or the left-hand path? This is not hard to realize: Plato’s philosophy is an attempt to define **se-* and develop a system of training so that others may *know what exists*— what is real — about themselves and the cosmos.

Although *all* of Plato’s works are essentially focused on the development of the soul, many have practical applications as well. As viewed from the modern perspective, the chief practical benefit of Plato’s philosophy would be *political* not religious — as the Philosopher-Kings produced by the system would characteristically first exercise their knowledge in practical socio-political ways. In this aspect of his philosophy Plato harkens back to some very basic Indo-European assumptions— and structures. As in the ancient roots of his culture, the terrestrial socio-political arrangements were seen as reflections of such structures existing in the world of the gods— as laid out in the *Republic*, Plato wished to (re-)institute a political structure based on Indo-European principles:


Function	Platonic Terminology
Ruler/Priests	Guardians (Philosopher-Kings)
Warriors	Auxiliaries
Craftsmen/Farmers	Artisans/Tradesmen

But in Plato’s case it was not a wish merely to return to archaic models for their own sakes— but rather to realize and newly *understand* on a philosophical basis the principles and Forms on which these structures stood:

We shall not cease from exploration
 And the end of all our exploring
 Will be to arrive where we started
 And know the place for the first time.(14)

The Academy, Plato’s school near Athens, was to be a place where elite students could be trained as far as possible to hold right beliefs, think rationally, and ultimately to be able to intuit *rationally* and thus Understand the very Forms (Gk. *eide*) or principles which are the ultimate source of all things or phenomena in this world. To do this Plato devised a system of education based on a specific understanding of the soul (psychology) and theory of *how that soul(or souls)* can know its objects of knowledge. In many ways Plato’s system is a philosophical refinement (and in some cases a simplification) of the traditional psychologies of the Indo-European peoples.(15) Figure 3.1 shows the Platonic scale of knowledge. In this scheme the student, or initiate, can be moved out of the realm of totally subjective *conjectures*— the objects of which are not real things but only shadows — into the realm of right *beliefs* based on established traditions and “common sense.” This is the highest level of knowledge possible for the mass of humanity— and it is itself a great achievement. Beyond this, however, is a rational form of thought (*dianoia*) or logical thought based on mathematics. It is here that the influence of the Pythagorean school on the Platonic synthesis is most profound. Both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of number could be approached here. But this dianetic is not the apex of knowledge. Perhaps the establishment “academics” (an unfortunate etymological development!) consider the quantification of knowledge most desirable— to “know” something becomes tantamount to “get the numbers on it.” This is *an* aspect of *dianoia* but it is only a means to a greater end. This greater end has been virtually forgotten today in our “academies.” Logical training is really a preparation for *noesis* in which the initiate will be able to Understand the *real* principles which exist in the realm of Forms. At this point the initiate is the equivalent of a Guardian or Philosopher-King (or Queen!)

The Platonic Scale of Knowledge



The system of Plato, as codified by the Neoplatonists (including Kabbalists, Sufis, etc.), underlies most current western systems of initiation and occult training, but because the source has often been intentionally obscured, the essential roots are sometimes difficult to discover. One might still inquire into the nature of the connection between Platonism and the left-hand path as we understand it philosophically. The ultimate root of this teaching lies in the mysteries. The simple answer is that Plato taught a rationally based system for the attainment of a state of living “god-hood”— the Philosopher-King. This is the virtual equivalent of the *jivanmukti* state of attainment in the system of Indian philosophy.

Plato has arrived at a rational and *noetic* method of attainment of god-hood formerly attained in the mysteries by means of initiatory experiences and dramatic ordeals as well as purifications and physical austerities. The idealistic philosophy and *noetic* methods of Platonism would, in the history of western systems of initiation, be used as the underlying structure augmented and complemented by every sort of initiatory, philosophical, and magical technology in the ancient world. This synthesis would emerge in Neoplatonism (from the 2nd century CE onward) from which it would spread into many varied speculative initiatory schools, e.g. Kabbalism,(16) Sufism,(17) as well as Christian mysticism.(18)

Most, if not all, of these schools developed Platonic idealism in the direction of right-hand path mysticism. they aim not for the elevation of the individual intellect to the equivalence of divinity, or the Good (*agathôn*), but rather for the reabsorption or total regimentation of the individual in the substance of the One.

The pure Platonic aims have perhaps been revived — and placed in the context of a magical technology — most eloquently by Michael Aquino of the Temple of Set, who openly avows his initiatory debt to pure Platonism.

The Epicurean and Stoic Schools

Two philosophical streams of thought which have their sources in ancient (4th century BCE) Greece, but which are expressions of universal categories and ones that continue to influence life today are Stoicism and Epicureanism.

Epicureus (341-270 BCE) founded a school of thought largely based on the atomic physics of Democritus of a century earlier. Greek atomism declared that *everything* — including that which is called soul or spirit — is made up of *atoms*— particles so small they can be divided no further. The Epicurean holds that upon death the human soul, as well as the body, simply dissipates back into undifferentiated nature. Everything is material. However, the more rarified substance of the soul or intellect can help lead a person to the most perfect and happy state of being known as *ataraxia*— “unperturbableness” or “serenity.” As the senses are the only access points through which pleasure or pain enter the mind or soul, to attain the state of ataraxia an Epicurean must control the quality of sensual experience. He or she avoids pain and maximizes pleasure. The *outer* life must be harmonized with the ideal quality of experience.(19)

The Stoic aims for ataraxia also, but does so in a very different way.

Stoicism is named for a school of philosophers who used to meet in the 4th century BCE at the *stoa* (portico) of the market at Athens. The Stoic claims a separate, non-natural existence for the soul. The soul or psyche may then control the quality and/or quantity of sensual stimulus and thus attain ataraxia not by controlling the outer stimuli but rather how the mind responds to such stimuli. The Stoic conditions his or her *inner* life to harmonize with an ideal state of being. Outer events become — or can be made to become — inconsequential. The Stoics hold that the soul existed before the body and that it will continue to exist after the body dies in a future state of “rewards and punishments.” In this and other regards Stoicism was very much in harmony with other schools of the mystery traditions as well as Platonic philosophies. The Stoic typically needs a transpersonal ideal or principle to which loyalty and duty can be devoted in order for the philosophy to work.

Both of these philosophies were popular in Hellenistic Greece as well as Republican and Imperial Rome. Stoicism virtually became the “official philosophy” of Rome in the days of the Empire. The republican Cicero (106-43 BCE) and the Emperor Marcus Aurelius (121-180 CE) are two of its most well-known exponents.(20)

From our perspective, both of these ancient schools supply critical ideas for understanding the philosophy of the left-hand path. The Epicureans provide a materialistic, carnal cosmology essential to the ideology of the Lesser Branch of the Left-hand Path. While Stoicism develops further Platonic and Neo-Platonic idealism— even providing for the divinizing of the dead.

The Left-Hand Path in the North

The Germanic Left-Hand Path

While important roots of the left-hand path in the west were being developed in the Mediterranean region on a philosophical and anti-establishment basis, in the northern climes the roots of the left-hand path were found in the established cultural soil. Whereas the Indo-European god of law and order — Zeus-Jupiter — ruled in the south, in the north the god of magic and death— Odin/Woden held sway. This same original Indo-European divinity is called Lugh among the Irish and Lleu [pron. hligh] among the Welsh. Lugh/Lleu literally means “light”— and the common Welsh name Llewellyn means “light-bringer” (cf. Roman “Lucifer”)!

The figure of Odin and his myths which hold our attention when we seek to find the dark side of the northern world. The name Odin means “the master of inspiration.”(21) The Old Norse form is Óðinn. *Ódr* means “poetic inspiration,” and is derived from Proto-Germanic *wôd-*, “rage; inspiration.” This name is identical to Old English Woden. (It is a regular Old Norse rule to drop the initial /w-/ before certain vowels.) This is a decidedly “psychic” god in the sense that his name and function refer to essentially *soul*-related or psychological powers and faculties. He is often depicted as a dark god of intrigue and mysterious motivations.

Odin’s essential importance in the shaping of the world and humanity is clear in Norse mythology. He, with his two brothers (actually hypostases of himself) Vili (Will) and Ve (Sacred One), perform the first sacrifice by killing their ancestral father, the giant Ymir. From the parts of

his body they shape the material cosmos. To gain universal wisdom, Odin gives (sacrifices) “himself to himself” that he might take up the runes— symbols of articulated universal knowledge.(22) These runes he shares with certain humans. Odin further pledges one of his eyes — which is sunk into Mimir’s Well (the Well of Memory) that he may gain the special sight that drinking from the well gives.(23) He (along with his two other aspects) endows humankind with threefold spiritual qualities shared with the gods.(24) In the sharing of divine consciousness and the runes of wisdom Odin is very much like the figure of Prometheus in Hellenic mythology. The major difference is that in this act he is not transgressing against authoritarian rule of law.

Odin, in the guise of Ríg (Ruler) also engenders the three classes of human beings— farmers, warriors, and rulers — on three different human women.(25) Thus he is responsible for not only the psychological structure of humanity but for its social structure as well— both of which are reflections of the divine order. For these reasons he is called the Alfadir (All-Father). Odin, in the guise of Bölverkr (Worker of Evil), obtains for the gods and humans the poetic mead of inspiration through an act of oath-breaking deceit.

Even in ancient, pre-Christian times, Odin had a somewhat “sinister” or dangerous reputation. This is due to a whole complex of issues— but the most essential principle causing this reputation appears to be that he is immersed in things — universal order, mysteries, inspiration, death — that humans rarely understand and hence often fear and dread. Nevertheless Odin is acknowledged as the highest of the gods throughout the Germanic world— from Anglo-Saxon England to Germany and from Iceland to Sweden. Also adding to his sinister reputation is the fact that he committed the two greatest ethical crimes in pursuing his quest for power and knowledge. To create the world order, he killed a kinsman (a crime Odin shares with the Greco-Roman Zeus-Jupiter) and to rewin the poetic mead he breaks an oath. Those and other acts render Odin unreliable to the mass of humanity.

In the ancient Germanic tradition Odin is *both* the lord of light and the prince of darkness. He is the god of the elite nobles, and thus the god of royalty and rulership. He is the father of magic and the *power* to create and destroy. He is the god of poetry— of the art of effective linguistic formulations and codifications of *knowledge*. Both his magical power and “Gnostic” formulas are embodied in the runes (“mysteries”). Finally he is the lord of the dead, and rules over the phenomenon of death— and thus shows his mastery over all transformational processes. It might also be noted that the Celtic Lugh/Lleu shares almost all of these essential characteristics with his Germanic counterpart.(26)

The story of the conversion of the Germanic tribes to Christianity is pertinent to understanding subsequent left-hand path developments there and among the descendants of those tribes.

The earliest converts to Christianity among the Germanic peoples were some Gothic tribes who were part of the Arian school of theology. Arianism is named after a 4th century priest, Arius of Alexandria, who held that the Son was created by the Father and hence was not co-eternal with the Father. It is most likely, however, that the Goths developed their own form of uniquely Germanic Christianity— for all Germanic tribes that converted to the new faith did so with this “Gothic Church.” The Goths kept their religion and their people separate from the Roman Church and the citizens of Rome. This type of national self-determination is, however, an anathema to the universalistic and imperialistic Roman (Catholic) mind. The Gothic form of Christianity is marked by a willingness to make biblical texts available in the common language (the Gothic bishop Ulfilas translated the Bible around 350 CE), involvement of the people in the liturgy (the Roman Christians disdained the Gothic practice of rewriting traditional folk songs with religious lyrics), and a general belief that humans are born free of original sin, that they win salvation by their own virtuous efforts, and that Jesus was a man who had attained to a god-like status showing the way for others to follow. When these doctrines are compared to the orthodox Roman system outlined on page 00 below, the differences are obvious. In a free world — as the Germanic peoples had been used to — these cultural/religious differences would have been a normal and expected state of affairs, but the divine plan adhered to by the Roman Catholic (= universal) Church called for “one God, one Church, one Pope!”

The historical break came for universalism when the Frankish (“French”) king Chlodwig or Clovis (Ludwig/Louis) converted to Roman Christianity in 496 CE. He did so in order to get foreign military aid from Rome in his attempt to conquer southern France, then dominated by the Arian Visigoths. From that time onward the Frankish king was the chief military agent for the Pope. Eventually the Goths were eradicated and apparently their faith with them— although some “secret assemblies still claim to carry on their traditions.

The story of the conversion of Germany is generally a bloody one. Most of the conversions were carried out upon threat of death after military conquest by Frankish kings working as agents for the Roman Pope.

Around 597 CE an early Roman mission was sent to England which at the time was made up of a confederation of seven independent kingdoms. The king of Kent, Æthelbert, under the influence of his wife, converted to Roman Christianity and began a long program of military and ideological warfare was begun (oftentimes halfheartedly) on the other kingdoms. Finally by the middle of the 8th century England could be said to be at least nominally Christian.

In Scandinavia we find a variety of scenarios for the conversion to Christianity. Denmark was converted in an effort by monarchal forces to consolidate their total control of the land. Norway, which had been a loose confederation of free landholders, was the object of attempts to conquer the country by men such as Olaf Trygvason who then imposed monarchal control over the whole land. It was during these attempts that freemen left the region and settled on the previously uninhabited island called Iceland. Iceland peacefully converted to Christianity in the year 1000 by a vote of its parliament. The last region to be conquered by Christian kings was Uppland, in Sweden, where the last great heathen temple of Uppsala was burned in the year 1100.

The pre-Christian traditions, of course, continued long after official conversions had taken place. For hundreds of years there existed in Europe the same type of religious creolism or syncretism one now finds in the Caribbean basin. For the history of left-hand path ideas the all-important figure of Odin underwent a radical — yet predictable — splitting of image. He was — like all the other gods — portrayed as the epitome of evil. In parts of Germany the speaking of his name was forbidden. It is for this reason that the modern German name for the day of the week usually called after him was renamed *Mittwoch*, “Mid-Week,” while Thor (German *Donnar*) keeps his weekday name, *Donnerstag*. The original name survives in some German dialects as *Wodenestag* or *Godensdach*.(27) However, he also retained his patronage over the ruling elite— even after Christian conversion. All the Anglo-Saxon kings continued to claim descent from Woden,(28) and in the English language he retains his weekday name, Wednesday (Woden’s-day).

In the spiritual technology or magic of the ancient Germanic peoples the Odinic magician would, by using runic formulas, actually transform himself into a god-like being analogous to the general characteristics of the god Odin. In this transformed state he would then work his will directly upon the fabric of the world— again usually by using the sacred runes first won by his patron god, Odin. In the most ancient period these called themselves Erulians— which means “those who are ‘risen up’ into a god-like state.”(29)

The model of behavior provided by Odin — a brooding and relentless seeker of knowledge and power — can be seen as an archetypal foreshadowing of the early modern myth of Dr. Johann Faustus who broke all barriers in his search for these qualities.

What is essential to realize about the left-hand path aspects of ancient Odinism is that it provided a traditional, established method of self-transformation along a divine model without an intended melding with that god. Ancient Odinism, derived from the same ultimate religious stream of thought that we find in eastern Indo-European forms of the left-hand path, was a path of making the self godlike according to the mythic and heroic patterns exalted in the Germanic national traditions. It is into this general religious matrix that Christian ideas were inserted— and so left-hand path ideas rising up in the cultural context should not be unexpected. Note also that the form of Christianity first accepted by the Goths was one not lacking in left-hand path qualities!

The Slavic Left-Hand Path

The Slavic mind has always been one more “at home” with the Devil than perhaps any other European culture. This perhaps stems from the fact that the Slavs conservatively maintained up into recent years a cult of household spirits whose nature was quite ambiguous in terms of “good” and “evil.”

John Bennett in his introduction to Ouspensky’s *Talks with a Devil* remarks:

The devils are not hostile to man except in so far as man is a friend of God. It is they who have been responsible for every kind of technical progress: from them mankind learned the arts of iron working, brewing and distilling; the Devil himself discovered fire, built the first mill, and constructed the first wagon. The art of reading and writing was one of his gifts to mankind. All these were bestowed to make man independent of God and so break the link whereby man was able to help God in governing the world.(30)

Two kinds of devils can be identified in Slavic lore: one is called Likhavi, which means “crafty one,” and the other is Chort, which simply means “the black one.”(31) The “crafty” devil seems the more archaic and most truly Slavic. The appellation as *Chort* seems clearly to be an influence from the dualistic cults which became extremely popular in Slavic regions in the Middle Ages and after.

In Russian lore the Devil is often seen as a personification of the material world— a point of view informed by both the ancient Slavic idea of the Likhavi (providing skills and knowledge on how to manage the material universe) and by the idea of Chort (embodying the material world in opposition to the spiritual world).

This later dualistic aspect is clarified by M. P. Dragomanov who shows how Satanail, a medieval Slavic form of the name of Satan, plays central role in the creation of the world and man. God tells Satanail to dive into the primeval sea to retrieve earth and flint. Satanail gives God the material, God keeps some in his right hand and creates dry land on the sea— out of his left hand he gives flint to Satanail— who creates his angels: “hewed a numberless raging rout of carnal gods.”(32) Some traditions hold that Satanail created the visible world, God the invisible, while others hold that Satanail creates man’s body and God gives the soul. These ideas are clearly either influenced by Bogomil teachings, or are related to them in some way.

Indeed, a Bulgarian tradition holds that the devil — called Zerzevul — created a counter paradise to oppose that created by God. In triumph, Zerzevul says to his band of devils:

Ho, my band, have you seen that we too can make a paradise like what God can make? Come, go in, eat, drink, of everything that is inside; I don’t forbid you anything the way the Lord forbade something to the men he put inside to live with his wife; I give you freedom to do whatever you want to do. Say this to the people: whatever any one wants to do let him command. In my paradise there is food, drink, pleasure-seeking, as much as they ask of me.(33)

It might be noted that among 20th century writers in the Russian cultural field, Ouspensky saw the Devil as an obsession with the material world, while Gurdjieff saw him as an extraterrestrial being.

*The Slavic devil is an important, if usually obscure, prototype for the archetype of the materialistic libertinism of late 19th and 20th century Satanism, as expressed, for example by Anton LaVey.

Although there are significant differences between the root of pre-Christian western Indo-European ideology in Europe and the root of that same tree among the eastern Indo-Europeans, there are profound similarities as well. In addition, through the nomadic northern Iranian tribes, such as the Scythians and Sarmatians, eastern ideas probably influenced the Hellenic, Slavic and Germanic worlds. This contact was maintained from as early as 700 BCE to as late as the 6th

century CE. Indo-Iranian influence also streamed into the west— into the European as well as Middle Eastern regions for several centuries of the Hellenistic period— from about 300 BCE to 200 CE.

The similarities between the original western and eastern roots of the Indo-European worlds make it clear that had the western root continued its evolution along its own lines of development, there would indeed be an establishment oriented left-hand path tradition in the west today. Or if it were not a part of the establishment itself, it would certainly be tolerated — and perhaps even encouraged — by the mainstream culture.

However, the historical development of the western world portrays a split heritage. The ideologies of the Middle East— or the true *southern* tradition — invaded the north in the form of Christianity and eventually forged an uncomfortable symbiosis with the original European culture. Virtually all of the manifestations of “heretical,” “deviant,” or “diabolical” religious behavior in Europe from the time of the arrival of Christianity to the present day can be traced to native impulses present in the manifold pre-Christian culture of Europe.

It almost goes without saying that in order to understand fully the left-hand path as it developed in the west, one must grasp the essence of the Middle Eastern or southern tradition— both in its right-hand path and left-hand path manifestations. It is in these cultures that the popular modern attitudes and imageries of the left-hand path — often embodied in the word “Satanism” — developed and were spread.

Left-Hand Path among the Semites

For a complete understanding of the history of what would be thought of as “Satanism” in western Europe, no culture of antiquity is more important, with the possible exception of the Iranian/Zoroastrian, than that of the Semites in general and the Hebrews in specific. A complete survey of this field is not possible here,(34) besides which an investigation will only show that from the *philosophical* perspective the Hebrew tradition has very little to offer of an original character. Its chief importance is historical. The Hebrews forged a synthesis of several theological and mythic streams— from Mesopotamia, Egypt, Canaan and Iran— along with their own primitive Semitic religion.(35) But as the Hebraic religion, as we have records of it, is relatively monolithic, it gives us little evidence of the development or existence of anything autochthonous which is akin to the left-hand path. However, the synthetic Hebraic and later Judaic (after 586 BCE) religion provided a definite morphology and terminology for a whole “symbolology of evil” to the later Christian and Islamic worlds, and also to the Gnostics who made wide use of Judaic mythology to illustrate their (often left-hand path) ideas.

It will be seen that the Semitic view of the world, although not originally strictly dualistic, contained a hyperintensive feeling for the notions of sin and redemption, and of defilement and purification. This made for a kind of de facto dnalism that proved to be even more durable than that of Zoroaster— although the Semitic religion was certainly influenced by the mythology and theology of Iranian Mazdaism at a secondary level.

Currently to be able to understand fully the Semitic mind-set, we must start historically with a non-Semitic people: the Sumerians. These already heterogeneous people had their origins either in the north or east of Mesopotamia (present-day Iraq)(36) and by 4500 BCE had established themselves in the region around the mouths of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers. Their magnificent civilization would last in its authentic Sumerian form until around 1750 BCE— but it would continue in Semiticized form until after the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus II of Persia in 539 BCE. The springtime of Sumerian civilization was between 3200 and 2360 BCE. It would be oversimplifying to try to lump the Sumerians together with their successor Semitic systems. (J.B. Russell makes this error in his volume *The Devil*, p. 84ff.)

The Sumerians were apparently constantly fearful of sudden and catastrophic upheavals of natural and socioeconomic origin. This has been contrasted with the Egyptian idea of ordered processes within secure surroundings, and has been traced to the contrast in their agricultural cycles in their two river systems: the Nile dependent on the regular rising of the waters to flood the river valley, and the Mesopotamian region, dependent on rain and storm to bring waters to the

valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates. Be all that as it may, the original Sumerians seemed to have no real concept of immanent divinity throughout the cosmos with everything ruled by the divine force of *me* (divine order).

"Evil," as such, was understood as a disruption of *me* in the forms of death and disease. The introduction of death is not the responsibility of an evil figure, but rather of the Earth-God himself, En-ki, who, instead of "determining the destiny" of certain herbs, *eats* them. In doing this En-ki committed a "cosmic crime" in that he "did not behave in accordance with the principle that he incarnated." Eliade, 1978, pp. 58-59)

In the Sumerian religion the gods were forms or principles which worked together in *me*. Man's role was to "serve the gods," i.e. to serve *me*. It is, however, also recognized that it is the gods themselves — not man — who introduce the original disruptions in *me*. Thus when Gilgamesh, who is perhaps the oldest epic hero in the history of literature, struggles against death to attempt to gain immortality, he is not seen by the Sumerians as one who strives against the gods and who is thus "evil," but rather as one who is attempting to restore the original order of things (*me*). Gilgamesh is seen essentially as a *divine* hero, not as an evil transgressor. When looking at the originally Sumerian material in Mesopotamian religion one is struck by an ambivalence reminiscent of the Hindu tradition.(37)

The Sumerian culture underwent a curious metamorphosis. From as early as 2800 BCE Semitic peoples (later identified with the Akkadians) began to infiltrate Sumer from the north and west and began to "Semiticize" the culture, the language, and the religion from the lower echelons of the society. (38) From 2350 to 2150 BCE Akkadian kings ruled in Mesopotamia, a rulership destroyed by invasions of the Gutians from Iran who dominated Akkadia until the Sumerians underwent a renaissance and restored themselves to power in 2050. But by 1950 another Semitic group, the Assyrians, gained control. Semitic culture and language would dominate Mesopotamia until the Persian conquest in 539 BCE.

To a great extent the Mesopotamian Semites — the Akkadians, Assyrians and Babylonians — were Sumerianized in their religious and cultural forms. They adopted Sumerian writing (cuneiform), and outer cultic forms and mythology. The old Sumerian myths were virtually Semiticized. But the Semites were an essentially different people who brought their own connotations to these Sumerian forms.

The optimistic Sumerian anthropogenesis — in which man is created by the gods — is reinterpreted so that humanity is created from the blood of an evil entity: Kingn. Thus in the Semitic version man is "condemned by his own origin."(39) Here we have a basic idea very close to "original sin." This rather pessimistic anthropogenesis then virtually necessitates a new cult form of personal prayers and penitential psalms. Here we hear the penitent praying for the forgiveness of sins and the removal of transgressions.(40) It would also be a mistake to see the Mesopotamian Semites as mere forerunners to the Hebraic attitudes. The Babylonian view of human existence was far more optimistic than that of the Hebrews.

The so-called Canaanites were another important near eastern Semitic people. They occupied the region of the coast of the eastern Mediterranean Sea from as early as 3000 BCE. Really there were a series of apparently Semitic city-based civilizations in this region— each being in turn conquered by semi-nomadic "barbarians." The Hebrews, or Israelites, who invaded the territory around 1250 BCE, were just another in this series. We know most about this civilization, identified in the Old Testament as "Canaan," from texts found at Ras Shamra (Ugarit) on the Syrian coast. From this material it seems that the Canaanites had an ambivalent attitude toward what might be termed "evil." Ultimately, they saw the world locked in a struggle between the forces of life — represented by Ba'al and his sister Anath — and death — represented by Mot. There seems to be a recognition of this fact and an acceptance of its reality.(41)

From this brief survey of some non-Hebraic religious attitudes it is clear that the polytheistic systems of Semitic religion were not particularly obsessed with the evil nature of the world or of humanity. However, the Mesopotamian Semitic evidence does show an early predisposition toward a notion of "original sin." At the same time it is very difficult to talk in terms of a left-hand path / right-hand path dichotomy in early Sumerian or Semitic forms. This is probably due to the

fact that we do not possess enough knowledge about these people's philosophical understandings of the relevant issues. Gilgamesh stands out as a heroic individuated being, possessed of self-consciousness who desires immortality— which would qualify him at least in part as a paradigmatic figure on the left-hand path. It is most likely that the manifold and ambivalent traditions of early Mesopotamian and near eastern religion, like the old Indo-European or Egyptian traditions, contain the seeds of what will develop into a right-hand path / left-hand path dichotomy. In the view of the orthodox philosophies of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam the religious systems of Canaan and Babylon (as well as that of Egypt) were fundamentally “wicked,” i.e. essentially if not left-hand path at least open to the values of the left-hand path, among others. This allowance for such multifaceted religious freedoms would in and of itself be theological grounds for condemnation from an orthodox monotheistic perspective. But no such dichotomy was really possible until after the Hebrew synthesis.

The Orthodox Hebrew Synthesis of the Right-Hand Path

The Hebrew or Israelite synthesis of their own primitive nomadic Semitic beliefs with elements from the traditions of the Egyptians and Canaanites, as well as the Babylonians and Iranians, took place over a long period of time between about 1750 and 500 BCE. Hebraic nomads had become somewhat settled in the region around Hebron in the earliest phase— while somewhat later the Israelites (or more accurately the Arameans) settled down in the region of Shechem. These tribes lived on the fringes of the urbanized apparently indigenous Canaanite society. These Arameans had probably begun to assimilate certain features of the Canaanite religion during the time between 1750 and 1250 BCE. Into this region came a third wave of Hebraic settlers following about 1250 BCE. These were probably a mixture of Hebrew tribes that had been settled in Egypt for several centuries and perhaps some Egyptian and other non-Hebraic peoples who had been outwardly Hebraicized during the exodus from Egypt under the leadership of a (former) Egyptian priest named Moses. An important synthesis of ancient Hebraic, Canaanite and Egyptian philosophies took place in this cultural context during the centuries between 1200 and 600 BCE. The Israelite kingdom was utterly conquered by the Babylonians in 587, and from that time to 538 the Israelites lived in exile within Babylonia— the so-called Babylonian captivity. There they further assimilated Babylonian — but especially also Iranian lore — which is the most important catalytic element in the development of a Hebraic or Judaic “philosophy of evil.”

When looking at the Hebrew-Judaic material, i.e. canonical and apocryphal Biblical literature of that tradition, it must be remembered that these myths do not — as popularly assumed — constitute a continuous and coherent narrative. They are made up of fragments of myths and legends often pieced together with little or no effort being made in the text to make the narrative consistent. The first example of this occurs in Genesis, where one complete and coherent version of the creation myth is offered (I:2-4) and then later another quite different yet equally complete and coherent version is given (II: 4-25). The former is certainly an older version, the other being added later (probably after the Babylonian Captivity). This is typical of Hebraic mythology, but is an aspect of it usually clouded by popular assumptions that it is a consistent and unified “revealed” text, rather than the product of centuries of re-editing by historically and cross-culturally influenced writers. (42)

The only original and unique ideas the ancient Hebrews might have had on the subject of this aspect of “evil” have been submerged under layers of assimilations from other cultures. It seems likely that the Hebraic immigrants from Egypt brought with them a theological and ritual structure that had been heavily influenced by Egyptian thinking. It has been speculated that Moses was influenced by the ideas of the monotheistic reforms of the pharaoh Akhnaten, and it is further possible that the Hebraic ideas of who or what might oppose the divine plan was influenced by the shape of the established cult of Set during in XIXth dynasty (1300-1200 BCE). The end of this dynasty is the time most likely during which the “exodus” of the Semitic tribes from Egypt took place. The monotheistic reform of Hebrew religion undertaken by Moses would naturally lead to a model of belief in which the “One God,” called by Moses “Yahweh,” *could* be opposed in his

plans by another force in the cosmos. Before these reforms were begun, Hebraic polytheism would have accounted for “evil” — i.e., death and disease — as a part of a whole patchwork of cosmic reality— as the Canaanites had. So in Mosaic monotheism, perhaps coupled with knowledge of the principle represented by Set, the *potential* ground work was laid for this cosmic opposition. In reality, however, awareness of the full implications of this potential took centuries to develop.

As the third wave of Hebraic migrations came into the Levant, archaeological evidence strongly indicates that far from destroying everyone and everything in the “Promised Land,” to make it pure for “God’s Chosen,” (Joshua 1-18) the Canaanite “Land of Milk and Honey” almost completely seduced the Hebrews, as did the Moabite god, Ba’al-Peor (Numbers 25). The Hebraic religion from the time of the exodus to the Babylonian Captivity indicates a continuous assimilation of Canaanite myths and cult forms— and periodic opposition to this ongoing tendency by the so-called prophets.

The Canaanite influence on the Hebraic concepts of “evil” comes in one form in the idea of a cosmic *conflict* between the forces of life (Ba’al) and death (Mot). The Hebrew word for death is MOT (*mot*). Also the notion of a cosmic rebellion on the part of younger gods to overthrow older gods is very strong in Canaanite mythology(43) where we see that Ba’al is not only locked in combat with Death (Mot), but he is also trying to overthrow the older god, El. El is a “Name of God” also taken over into Hebrew, see *El Shaddai*, and in the plural *Elohim*. The plural can be used in Hebrew to indicate the magnitude of something without necessarily implying that there is actually more than one of them.

As far as the Babylonian influence is concerned, it probably came more indirectly through the agency of Canaanite theology than directly from the Babylonian into the Hebrew. This was true until the time of the Babylonian Captivity, at which time the Hebraic, now Judaic, theology was opened to two great direct influences: Babylonian learning, and Iranian cosmology and doctrine.

During the period of the Babylonian Captivity a learned priestly tradition developed within Judaism. The attitude of this priestly tradition toward “evil” was twofold. First it is the result of the *lust* of the “Sons of God” (Heb. *bene elohim*) for the daughters of men. (Gen. VI:1-7) The resulting mixture of divine and human natures ends in the revelation of forbidden divine *knowledge* to humanity by the “Sons of God.” In the “Enochian” literature there are lists of the (demonic) angels and the categories of “forbidden knowledge” they reveal to mankind. (I Enoch 8) “Thus the myth links the origin of culture and the origins of evil in the world... Lust causes the transgression of the boundary between divine and human; this results in humans learning forbidden mysteries, and this in turn leads us to the corruption of the earth.”(44) This myth of the origin of forbidden knowledge which results in the influx of “evil” is a parallel alternative (or allomorph) of the better known Edenic myth.

Evil is therefore associated both with *knowledge* and *carnal existence*— one an evil of the *psychê*, the other an evil of the *flesh*. These two poles will prove to be ongoing features of schools of the left-hand path in the western world.

Although in the earliest phase the Hebrew myth of the Garden of Eden, as well as the whole cosmology found in Genesis (1-2), is of Semito-Sumerian origin, the paradigmatic correspondences with Iranian mythology seem too close to ignore totally.(45) It is most likely that the basic *structures* of the Edenic myth were taken into Judaic lore from the body of Canaanite-Babylonian traditions and that only later were some of the interpretations of the myths “enlightened” by more abstract Iranian thought, which, along with Hellenic ideas, would form the basis of the secret tradition in Judaism (Kabbalah, etc.). These aspects will be discussed in more detail in chapter 4 concerning *gnosis*. In any event we again have an alternate way in which “evil,” in the form of *divine knowledge*, is introduced to humanity. This myth can be said to be a part of the lore of the left-hand path only in the traditions of non-Zoroastrian Iranian systems (e.g. Mithraism) or in some of the myriad of Gnostic sects (e.g. the Ophites).

The Hamitic Left-Hand Path The Cult of Set

Set is an Egyptian god-form that became a model of the paragon of evil in the latter days of the civilization. But that was not always the case with Set. Although Set was not always considered "evil," the characteristics which he displayed remained more or less consistent. It is the culture and its values which changed. We are, of course, especially interested in understanding this ancient god-form as much as possible due to the present day importance and influence of the Temple of Set on the contemporary left-hand path.

The culture of the Nile civilization had developed to a level of unique and independent existence before any significant contact was made with the Sumerian civilization around 3000 BCE(46)— this influence seemed only to provide impetus to an already ancient culture. Egypt began to take cultural shape around 5000 BCE, and to have become a distinct civilization in the pre-historic period between 3800 and 3200 BCE. From these foundations Egyptian civilization would continue in its singular and culturally independent form until its loss of political independence to Rome in 42 BCE with the death of Cleopatra. But the fact that knowledge of hieroglyphics continued to be preserved by Egyptian priests and scribes until the 5th century CE(47) indicates that we are dealing with an intellectual culture with a continuous living legacy of at least four thousand years. Thus the Egyptian civilization is the oldest, most continuous culture known to us. The only possible rival to this claim would be the Chinese civilization which has far more recent roots (about 1500 BCE), but which actually continues to the present day.

It is probable that in most of its fundamental aspects Egyptian religion had reached a refined and highly articulated stage of development by the beginning of the Dynastic Period around 3100-2750 BCE.(48) Although at this time the material culture found along the Nile between the Mediterranean and present-day Aswan was a fairly unified one, politically (and perhaps religiously— as the "politics" of the region was heavily influenced by cultic institutions) the land was divided into the northern delta region (Lower Egypt) and the rest of the Nile valley to the south (Upper Egypt). From the most archaic period it seems that a hawk-god (Heru/Horus) dominated in the north and a god symbolized by an unidentified beast (Suta/Set Ⲛⲓⲧⲟ) ruled in the south.



According to traditional Egyptian history, the north effectively conquered the south and unified the country in 3100 BCE under the first pharaoh, Menes, with his capital in the delta city of Memphis. Although the symbol of the unified country and unified cosmic principles represented by the dominant gods in each region is one depicting Horus and Set as a bipolar but single entity, there seems to have been the tendency to consider Set as the inferior, enemy aspect from this earliest beginning. However, it can not be overemphasized that the essence and power of Set was highly valued and honored by Egyptians until the close of the XXth dynasty (about 1170 BCE).

The continuity of the value of Setian ritual and magical symbolism can be seen clearly in the double crown of the pharaoh, which is made up of the red crown of northern Egypt and the white crown of southern Egypt, and the scepters of *was* ⚡ and *tcham* ⚡, which are clear symbolic representations of the Set-animal. These scepters were signs of the divine power which could be wielded by the gods and their incarnate agents, the pharaohs.

“Orthodox” Egyptian religion seems to have been dominated by two concepts or principles—the regulation of the cosmic/agricultural cycle embodied in the annual rising of the waters of the Nile which ensured material prosperity, and the continuance of the life of the individual in a transcendental realm beyond this world. There does not seem to be a shred of evidence beyond the statements of Herodotus (II, 123) that the Egyptians believed in any sort of earthly reincarnation or metempsychosis.(49)

It could easily lead to misunderstandings if the right-hand path / left-hand path distinction were made too early or too deeply when trying to comprehend the historical development of Egyptian religion. In many ways early Egyptian religion was much like the Sumerian or ancient Indo-European in that the strict moral dichotomy of “good” versus “evil” was lacking. However, as time went on the Egyptians pioneered this dichotomizing in a way very similar to that of the Zoroastrians in Persia.

The roots of one prototype of the right-hand path in the west is to be found in the Egyptian cosmic/agricultural cult built around the regular cycles of the rising of the Nile, perhaps coupled with the extreme isolation and xenophobia of the Egyptian land and culture. This religious and mythical tradition eventually became embodied in the cult of Osiris. This cult promoted and developed the idea of the regular and *internally ordered cycles* of existence and the resurrection of the body in a transcendent realm, which was perhaps understood in some way parallel to the cycles of nature experienced in the Nile valley. By the time of the ultimate development of the Osirian cult in the time of the New Kingdom (and Ptolemaic Period) it constituted an exclusionist right-hand path cult predicated on the harmonizing of human activity with the cycles of nature. These cycles were in turn symbolized by the community of Egyptian gods and goddesses.

The Egyptian word for “a god” was *neter* (pl. *neteru*). Erik Hornung devoted a whole study to this and other terms for “god” in Egyptian. The etymology of the word is unclear.(Hornung, pp. 33-42) But his conclusion on its meaning in part states:

In their constantly changing nature and manifestations, the Egyptian gods resemble the country’s temples, which were never finished and complete, but always “under construction.

The gods of Egypt ... are formulas rather than forms, and in their world one is sometimes as if displaced into a world of elementary particles. ... A god is combined with another and becomes a new being with new characteristics, and then in the next moment separates into a number of entities. What he is remains hidden, but his luminous trail can be seen, his reaction with others is clear, and his actions can be felt. He is material and spiritual, a force and a figure, he is manifest in changing forms that should be exclusive, but we know that within all this something exists and exercises power.(50)

But there was one who stood against the other *neteru* by virtue of his very character—Set. As we have already seen, the cult of Set stretches well back into the very beginning of Egyptian culture, especially in Upper Egypt. From the very beginning and throughout his history Set seems

to have stood for 1) *opposition* to certain natural processes, 2) the *outside* (desert, foreign lands, etc.), 3) *power* or force (physical or magical), and 4) *disturbance* of the natural order caused by the activity of these factors. These characteristics were at first seen as a necessary balance within the whole of the cosmos, but in time these very factors would become the programmatic paradigm for *evil* as seen from the Osirian Egyptian viewpoint.

Originally, however, Set was not thought of as evil so much as he was considered *overwhelmingly powerful*. Hornung writes concerning the Egyptian gods and evil:

The gods of Egypt can be terrifying, dangerous, and unpredictable, but they cannot be evil. Originally this was true even of Seth, the murderer of Osiris. Battle, constant confrontation, confusion, questioning of the established order, in all of which Seth engages as a sort of “trickster,” are all necessary features of the existent world and of the limited disorder that is essential to living order.(51)

The “political” factor has perhaps been over-emphasized in many discussions of how and why Set became a paragon of evil in the Egyptian system. It is true that he was the major god of the earlier subjugated Upper Egypt and that he was identified as the god of foreign forces of the Semitic Hyksos people who invaded and dominated Egypt from about 1700 to 1550 BCE, and that the conflict between the Osirian priesthood and those of Amen and Set were heavily overlaid with what today we might call “political” factors.

But it also remains true that in his very essence Set represents something which is almost always treated with suspicion: the human psyche in *opposition* to the natural vehicle of the body, expressed as a force from the *outside*, giving humanity a *power* to *disturb* the natural cosmos around it. Set was the god of the outsider and foreigner and represents that quality in the Egyptian pantheon and society. Among the gods only Set was possibly truly immortal. (Bonnet, p. 714; Hornung pp. 157-158.) Set has the power and will “to act against law and order” in the universe. (Cf. Bonnet, p. 714.) Here is the essence of why the cult of Set is seen as a prototype of the left-hand path in the western tradition.

Unfortunately the Egyptian tradition, despite the great number of ancient documents available, remains one of the most difficult to understand on a consistent philosophical basis today. This is due in part to the concrete mode of expression of (pre-Hellenic) Egyptian philosophy, and in part due to their latter-day attempts to vilify and darken the function of Set— but also largely due to the Egyptian habit of ritual henotheism. As opposed to the Sumerian and Indo-European tendency to identify certain principles or functions with certain god-forms, the Egyptians would identify virtually any and all functions with practically any god-form or name. This made it very easy for them to keep all of the important functions and symbols of Set— by transferring them to gods such as Amen-Ra, Thoth and Anubis. In the latest times it seemed of the utmost importance to avoid the use of the actual *name* of Set or the depiction of the “Set-animal.”

Already in the XIXth dynasty the epithet “follower of Set” was being used perjoratively. A scribe named Kenhirkhopeshef (who died around 1191 BCE) wrote a papyrus in which he described the “Marks of the Followers of Set.” The papyrus is in poor condition, hence the gaps in the text, but the description is clear enough:

The god in him is Set ... he is a man of the people - He dies by a death of fallings ... sinews ... He is one dissolute of heart on the day of judgment ... discontent in his heart. If he drinks beer he drinks it to engender strife and turmoil. The redness of the white of his eye is this god. He is one who drinks what he detests. He is beloved of women through his greatness — the greatness of his loving them. Though he is a royal kinsman he has the personality of a man of the people ... He will not descend into the west, but is placed on the desert as a prey to rapacious birds ... He drinks beer so as to engender turmoil and disputes ... He will take up weapons of warfare — He will not distinguish the married woman from ... As to any man who opposes him he pushes ... Massacre arises in him and he is placed in the Netherworld...(52)

From this description we can infer some clues as to the antinomian nature of some of the ancient Setian practices. When actual human beings are referred to as “followers of Set” in the ancient literature, it is usually their behavior disruptive to the order around them that is sited as the chief characteristic they demonstrate.(53)

By the twilight of the Egyptian culture from the XXIIInd dynasty and into the Ptolemaic and Roman periods, the Osirian cult carried out a virtual “inquisition” against the Setian cult, eradicating the images and temples of the god and celebrating festivals by torturing crocodiles—which they thought embodied the god Set. The only philosophical haven for Setian principles was in the Hellenized Gnostic sects in Egypt.

It is perhaps in this magical context of Hellenized Egyptian culture that Set reaches his greatest state of philosophical development. In one magical papyrus (Paris = PGM IV) Set is called the “Ruler over the Gods,” and even the “Creator of the Gods.” To a certain extent this may be explained by the old Egyptian magical tradition of henotheistic formulas, but there seems to be more at work here. It appears that during the first few centuries of this era (about 100 to 400 CE) within a sect of Gnostics known as the “Sethians” there occurred a great synthesis of Greek philosophy, Egyptian religion and magic, Judaic mythology and theology, as well as other elements from Iranian and other magico-religious systems in the eastern Mediterranean region.(54)

The ancient Egyptian god Set (Gk. Σηθ = *Seth*) became identified with, or passed into Hebrew mythology as, Seth (Heb. STh)— especially in Gnostic sects. But we do not have to go into Hebrew lore here. It is clear that the Gnostic interpretation of the “classical” myth of the conflict between Osiris and Set was interpreted as an analog to the dichotomy between the evil demiurge Ildabaoth (*Yahweh Elohim* of Genesis) = Osiris and the good (serpentine) god of light = *Seth-Typhon*. Thus the Gnostic Sethian sect could indeed be interpreted as a sort of Hellenized philosophical revival of the ancient Egyptian cult of Set. In fact the remnants of “orthodox” Egyptian religion referred to the Gnostics as a whole as “the sons of Typhon (= Set.)” In this Gnostic epilog to the history of the cult of Set, it can be seen clearly that the ancient philosophical meaning of Set as a god of opposition to natural static cycles of existence who enters nature from a position outside it to exercise his transformative power to disturb the natural order— was either continued or revived by the Hellenized Gnostic Egyptians of the early centuries of this era.

It has been theorized that the cult and figure of Set had some influence on the formation of the name and character of the Hebrew and eventually Christian *Satan*. This would be possible chiefly due to the influences that might have passed into Hebrew lore during the period in which the Hebrews were in Egypt and due to the fact that they seem to have been led from Egypt, probably around 1250 BCE by an Egyptian priest, named *Mesy*, Moses. The Egyptian *msy*, son, is also found in the name *Re-msy* or Rameses, “son of Re.”(55)

The name Set probably has no etymological connection to the Semitic *stm* (Heb. *satan*, Arab. *shaitan*). But the names were doubtlessly associated at an early time among the Hebrews. In the syncretic, Hellenized world reflected in the Greco-Egyptian magical papyri, it seems that Seth-Typhon may not only be linked with Satanic aspects, but with the One God of the Hebrews, Yahweh, as well. This is because the writers of the papyri were interested Yahweh (YHVH /IAO) as an expression of raw cosmic power on a physical level, not in his supposed theological role in orthodox Hebrew lore. Iao was “creator of this world”— and so his name could cause further magical transformations in it. A tendency of humans to “diabolize” the gods of their neighbors seems to be a constant theme, and a cause for continuing difficulties to historians of religious ideas.

We can hardly tell much about the ways in which the ancient Setians approached the essential questions of the left-hand path. But given the general characteristics of the god himself, it seems likely that the Setians of old practiced something very much akin to what we are calling the left-hand path. Perhaps one of the reasons why the sect was so persecuted is that it offered a path of deification for more than just the pharaohs.

Notes for Chapter 3

- (1) For a discussion of the original homeland of the Indo-Europeans, see J. B. Mallory, *In Search of the Indo-Europeans* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1989).
- (2) See Mircea Eliade *History of Religious Ideas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982) vol. II, p. 257.
- (3) There were a number of Mystery Schools in ancient Greece, see Walter Burkert, *Ancient Mystery Cults* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987)
- (4) See Eliade *History*, vol. I, pp. 299-301.
- (5) Eliade *History*, vol. II, p. 187.
- (6) Eliade *History*, vol. II, pp. 189-190.
- (7) Eliade *History*, vol. II, p. 190.
- (8) See Plato's *Republic* (edited by Cornford), p. 351.
- (9) Eliade *History*, vol. II, p. 190.
- (10) See William K. C. Guthrie *Orpheus and Greek Religion* (New York: Norton, 1966, 2nd ed.) and Eliade *History*, vol. II, p. 190.
- (11) Eliade *History*, vol. II, p. 191.
- (12) See the biographies of Pythagoras recorded by Kenneth S. Guthrie, ed. *The Pythagorean Sourcebook and Library* (Grand Rapids, MI: Phanes, 1987), pp. 57-156.
- (13) See Robin Waterfield, trans., *Theology of Arithmetic* (Grand Rapids, MI: Phanes, 1988).
- (14) Quoted from "Little Gidding" by T. S. Eliot.
- (15) For a study of the soul in Greek tradition see Erwin Rhode, *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality Among the Greeks* (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1972) and for an introduction to the topic in northern Europe, see Stephen E. Flowers, "Toward an Archaic Germanic Psychology," *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 11:1-2 (1983), pp. 117-138.
- (16) See Gershom Scholem, *Kabbalah* (New York: New American Library, 1978), *passim*.
- (17) See Reynold A. Nicholson, *Studies in Islamic Mysticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967, 2nd ed.)
- (18) No real school of Neoplatonic Christian mysticism arose, but individual philosophers or theologians used Neoplatonic concepts, see A. H. Armstrong, *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.)
- (19) The most coherent presentation of Epicureanism is by Lucretius *On the Nature of the Universe*, trans. R. Latham, (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1951). Also see the general introduction provided by Jason L. Saunders, *Greek and Roman Philosophy after Aristotle*. (New York: Free Press, 1966), pp. 13-57.
- (20) The classic text of later Stoicism is that of Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1964). See also the presentation by Jason L. Saunders, *Greek and Roman Philosophy after Aristotle*. (New York: Free Press, 1966), pp. 59-150.
- (21) See Edgar C. Polomé, "Some Comments of *Völuspá* Stanzas 17-18." In: Polomé, E.C. (ed.) *Old Norse Literature and Mythology: A Symposium*. (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1969), pp. 268.
- (22) Concerning the runic initiation of Odin, see E.O.G. Turville-Petre, *Myth and Religion of the North* (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 42 ff.
- (23) Turville-Petre, *Myth and Religion*, p. 63 ff.
- (24) Concerning the spiritual gifts of the Germanic gods see Polome, "Some Comments...", pp. 265ff.
- (25) See Turville-Petre, *Myth and Religion*, pp. 55 ff.
- (26) For a comparison of the Celtic Lugh and the Germanic Odin, see Jan de Vries, *Keltische Religion* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1961), p. 54 or Edred Thorsson, *The Book of Ogham* (St. Paul, MN: Llewellyn, 1992), pp. 36-40.
- (27) See Jan de Vries, *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1957), vol. II, p. 27.
- (28) Recorded by Jacob Grimm, *Teutonic Mythology* trans. S. Stallybrass (New York: Dover, 1966), vol IV, pp. 1709-1736.
- (29) See Stephen E. Flowers *Runes and Magic* (New York: Lang, 1986), pp. 334-335, *et passim*.
- (30) John Bennett "Introduction" In: P. D. Ouspensky *Talks with A Devil*, p. 1.
- (31) Bennett "Introduction" In: P. D. Ouspensky *Talks with A Devil*, pp. 1-2.

- (32) M. P. Dragomanov *Notes on the Slavic Religio-Ethical Legends: The Dualistic Creation of the World*. trans. E.W. Count. (= Russian and East European Series 23) (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1961), p. 131.
- (33) Dragomanov *Notes on the Slavic Religio-Ethical Legends*, pp. 10.
- (34) A review of the correlations between Zoroastrian and Hebrew traditions is provided by Neil Forsyth, *Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth* (Princeton: University of Princeton Press, 1989).
- (35) On the existence of a pre-Yahwist Hebrew religion see S.H. Hooke *Middle Eastern Mythology* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963), pp. 103 ff.
- (36) For a general introduction to Sumerian civilization see Samuel N. Kramer, *The Sumerians* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963).
- (37) Internal evidence shows a close connection between the Sumerian world and that of the old Indus valley civilization Kramer, pp. 280ff.
- (38) Kramer, *Sumerians*, p. 42.
- (39) Eliade *History*, vol. I, p. 73.
- (40) See J.B. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955, 2nd ed.), pp. 391-392.
- (41) For a convenient survey of Canaanite mythology see Hooke, *Middle Eastern*, pp. 79 ff.
- (42) For a convenient introduction to this problem, see S.H. Hooke *Middle Eastern*, pp. 103-164.
- (43) Forsyth, *Old Enemy*, p. 44.
- (44) Forsyth, *Old Enemy*, p. 174.
- (45) See above and Eliade, *Patterns*, pp. 290-294.
- (46) On the relationship between Egypt and Mesopotamia see Henri Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948).
- (47) E. A. Wallis Budge, *Egyptian Language* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958), p. 15.
- (48) Paul Jordan, *Egypt: The Black Land* (Oxford: Phaidon, 1976), pp. 78-83 and Frankfort, *Kingship*, pp. xxiv-xxv.
- (49) See the *Lexikon der Aegyptologie*, vol V, p. 13.
- (50) Erik Hornung, *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt: The One and the Many*. tr. John Baines (Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982), pp. 256-257.
- (51) Hornung, *Conceptions of God*, p. 213.
- (52) John Romer, *Ancient Lives: Daily Life in Egypt of the Pharaohs* (New York: Henry Holt, 1984), p. 67.
- (53) Romer, *Ancient Lives*, pp. 90; 92.
- (54) Jean Doresse, *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics* (Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 1986), pp. 249-309.
- (55) Eliade, *History*, vol. I, p. 178.

Chapter 4

The First Millennium

At the dawn of the time that we have come to call the “Common Era” the religious and philosophical cultures of the Mediterranean and near eastern regions were in a high state of flux and dynamism. Politically and militarily the Romans had become the dominant force in that part of the world, but in the realm of philosophy Hellenic thought remained the most prestigious. But from the east — especially from the Iranian cultural sphere — religious systems of all sorts (dualistic and non-dualistic) had a continual influence on the development and reformation of sects in the west.


In philosophy the most important school of thought was that of Neo-Platonism, which can be dated from about 244 CE, when its chief proponent, Plotinus, became influential in Rome. This philosophy, essentially based on a system of Platonic idealism, was to be a decisive influence on all schools of “mysticism,” the Judaic Kabbalah, Islamic Sufism, as well as Christian schools of mysticism. Hellenic thought also became the matrix for the reception of Iranian systems, and from such a synthesis of east and west many sects such as Mithraism, “Hermeticism,” and various Gnostic systems were formed.

At this time certain sects or cults found great favor among contemporary sophisticated and philosophically trained Roman politicians, e.g. Mithraism or various Egyptian cults, while others — especially those directly connected with Judaism were reviled as being “paradoxical and degraded.” (1) This is mentioned here only as a way of in some small measure giving a more balanced view to the popular image (essentially fostered by Hollywood) of the sophisticated and morally superior Jews and Christians being surrounded by barbaric and cruel Romans.

It is in this cultural milieu that Christianity, which was essentially in its earliest phase a Judaic heresy — had its origins. Early Christian doctrine can be shown to be a system developed over the years between the first and fourth centuries from a complex synthesis of Judaic, Hellenic (Neo-Platonic) and Iranian thought. From its beginning Christianity adopted and adapted elements from the various systems — theological as well as socio-political — which it sought to supersede.


This is obviously not the place to go into all the details of this process, so I limit myself to one of the most essential aspects of this development— the place and nature of “evil.” There have been many attempts to create a “Christian philosophy.” This is perhaps a contradiction in terms as a *philosophy* implies a system of open-ended inquiry, while “Christian” implies that the final conclusion is already fixed, and that the philosophical jargon is just being used to sound more convincing to those impressed by such rhetoric. These attempts were utterly thwarted by the fact that there seemed to be an ongoing effort to fuse two quite distinct philosophical cosmologies and concepts of “evil” into the Christian, essentially Judaic, world view.

The first of these two philosophical stances is that of Neo-Platonism, where we find the following model:



In Christian parlance, the triad of creative principles would be renamed “the Father, Son (Logos), and Holy Spirit.” Here we see a *gradual* or *hierarchical* model, i.e. one that posits a gradual decline or descent of *Being* (= the Good/the One) until it utterly ceases to “*Be*.” At the point where there is a *lack of Being* is the origin of evil. The Good is unity and Being, while evil is a negative state, a lack of Being. Each stage along the way down the gradual scale of Being is a descent into “relative evil.” One way to visualize this is to imagine a flashlight shining into the night sky, as its beam grows less dense and more diffuse the darkness which is considered “evil” becomes more dense until there is no more light. In this model evil does not exist in any real way— it is by definition a lack of reality.

This negative conception of evil, evil as a lack of Being was the one eventually adopted and promoted by orthodox Christianity, but another conception existed along side it (within orthodox thought as well as in numerous Christian heresies). This was the idea of *positive evil*, i.e. it posits a *real existence* of a force of darkness identified as “evil.” Historically this model was pioneered and perfected in Iranian systems derived from that of the prophet Zoroaster. The simplest representation of this model would be:



Here Darkness and Light are equally real and are locked in combat over the world and mankind which are considered mixtures of darkness and light. This system was to find a radical proponent in the prophet Mani (about 216-276 CE) who synthesized Christian, Buddhist, and Iranian ideas. Such dualism was to be the cornerstone of many of the heresies that orthodox Christianity battled for centuries. The root of the problem, or at least part of it, lies in the degree to which so-called orthodox Christianity and its scriptures have themselves been imbued with Iranian dualism. One only needs to remember that Augustine of Hippo was at one time a Manichean, or that the Hebraic myth of Paradise was perhaps heavily influenced by Persian (Iranian) thought, to realize why it seems so natural to ascribe *reality* to evil. Although from a "philosophical" perspective the theologian might say that evil is a lack of Being, on most other levels belief in a Devil with positive powers of evil becomes attractive to resist.

Gnosticism and the Left-Hand Path

Although the ideology that is commonly known as Gnosticism has its ultimate roots in Iranian dualism, its exact shape was determined by a confluence of philosophical, theological and mythological streams from Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Platonism, mystery religions Egyptian magic and philosophy, and the nascent form of Christianity. In fact, Gnosticism is a parallel development of "orthodox Augustinian Christianity." Gnosticism is the Judeo-Christian myth superimposed over the philosophical and cosmological patterns of Iranian dualism, as orthodox Christianity is that same myth applied to the Platonic and Neo-Platonic scheme.

Where Gnosticism departs from the Iranian model is in the belief that the world and the physical universe is actually the *creation* of the evil, dark spirit, not just the zone between the spirits of light and darkness. For the Gnostic, material creation is *a priori* evil and must therefore be the result of a creative act on the part of an "evil god."

In the time between the 1st and 2nd century, the period of Gnostic foundations, there were actually dozens of major schools of Gnosticism, e.g. those of Simon (Magus), Basilides, Marcion, Valentinus and sects, e.g. the Cainites, Barbelites, Sethians, Ophites and Borborians.(2) One of the major reasons for this tremendous plurality of systems is the fact that Gnostics did not attempt to unify their doctrines into an "orthodox" system, but rather encouraged the creation of diverse schools of thought. This put them at a distinct social and political disadvantage *viz a viz* the "orthodox" Christians who strove to create a monolithic body of catholic doctrine whereby "heretics" (such as the Gnostics) and pagans could be identified and subsequently eradicated. This process of attempted elimination of heretical and pagan schools of thought — which has ultimately failed — went on for centuries into the modern age. Some vestiges of it may still be seen in fringe groups in society today in the form of free-lance hate groups using Christian dogmas to attempt to suppress religious freedom.

There are many St. Cyrils waiting to martyr today's Hyposias and bring about a new dark age. "The got the library at Alexandria— they're not getting mine!" as the button reads.

One of the most important of the early Gnostics, perhaps a true lord of the left-hand path from antiquity, is Simon Magus. Mostly we know about his philosophy from treatises written against it by early "Church Fathers." Their recounting of his philosophy seems rather accurate, as it can be corroborated with other actual Gnostic texts, but the apocryphal tales about his magical duels with the apostles, and so forth, seems like typical sectarian propaganda.(3) The figure of Simon Magus is perhaps best known from the account given of him in Acts (VIII), although the Simon mentioned there may in fact be another one and not the Gnostic "Magus" vilified by the Church Fathers.

Simon was born around 15 CE in Samaria, a region known for its irregular culture from a Jewish point of view. he was the son of an ostensibly Jewish sorcerer, but was educated in Alexandria in Egypt. Simon became the disciple of an "Arab" named

Dositheus, who had perhaps been a follower of “John the Baptist.” This Dositheus may or may not have been the author of a text found in the “Nag Hammadi Library” called the *Three Steles of Seth* (or the *Revelation of Dositheus*).⁽⁴⁾ Simon is said to have traveled widely, to Persia and Arabia, as well as Egypt and elsewhere always in search of magical lore. In any event, when Dositheus died (around 29 CE) Simon took over his school called, until then the Dositheans, now the Simonians. Dositheus had had a female disciple named Helene, and Simon later traveled with his main disciple, a former slave and prostitute from Tyre, also known by the name Helene. However, they were probably not the same person. But it is certain that Simon did have a companion whose with whom he practiced erotic magic, some of which made use of semen and menstrual blood. (A practice shared by tantrism and later sexual magic practiced by Aleister Crowley.) Because this and other features of Simon’s practices which link up with certain eastern ideas, it is most likely that the accounts were not merely propaganda by his enemies. Simon is said to have died in Rome where he was engaged in a magical contest with the apostles Peter and Paul. One account has it that he died while trying to fly to heaven (while Peter prayed for his fall).⁽⁵⁾ Another report has it that he was buried alive, but failed to resurrect himself.⁽⁶⁾

It is quite possible that Simon was an initiate of the occidental branch of the “Iranian mysteries,” hence the appropriateness of his cognomen “Magus.” This priesthood was quite strong in Mesopotamia and Asia Minor at this time. But Simon’s true importance is his role as a nexus for certain preexisting ideas, a possible originator of new realizations, and a teacher of future Gnostic leaders. He was the teacher of Menander, who practiced a “bath of immortality” in which a visible fire descended into the water to bestow miraculous power on the initiate. Menander was in turn the teacher of Saturninus and Basilides, both important Gnostic teachers.⁽⁷⁾

Simon taught a cosmology that was an ingenious synthesis of Iranian dualism and Platonic idealism. He held that the One, the undivided and eternal Divine Mind (Gk. *Nous*), reflected upon and within itself, thus giving rise to the First Thought (Gk. *Epinoia*) and thus also the first aeon (Gk. *Aion*), also called *Ennoia* or *Sophia*, wisdom. Unity is broken, Duality is begun, and the Fall into manifestation has been set into motion. Hans Jonas summarizes that “... through the act of reflection the indeterminate and only negatively describable power of the [One] turns into a positive principle committed to the object of its thinking, even though that object is itself.”⁽⁸⁾ This process of reflection is continued as successive emanations, each having less of the original Unity of divine *Nous*.

Simon taught that the One Mind, the True God of Light, had nothing to do with the creation of the material universe, and that in fact the One Mind was not even aware of its existence. This world, he taught, was the creation of a wicked demiurge, whom he identified with the Creator of Jewish tradition. It is because he had determined Yahweh Elohim to be evil that he concluded that his Laws were also actually wicked and led men to evil, not to good. This, then, is the root of Simon’s libertinism and antinomianism—the practice of willfully breaking normative codes to attain higher spiritual truths.

In Simon’s system, the First Thought, the Aeon *Epinoia*, fell through all of the successive Aeons and was eventually incarnated as a human woman. She had transmigrated from female body to female body throughout history as the Rulers (Gk. *Archons*) fought to possess her. She had been Helen of Troy, for example. Simon believed that he had found the current incarnation of *Epinoia* in the persona of his consort, Helene, the whore of Tyre. He also held himself to be the incarnation of the Divine Mind itself. So in the terrestrial act of saving and redeeming Helene, Simon saw a reflection of the Ultimate Subject, the *Nous*, redeeming its First Object, *Epinoia*.

Many of the doctrines taught by Simon, whether he originated them or not, became mainstays of Gnostic thought throughout the centuries. Hans Jonas epitomizes his novel teaching as “...the revolt against the world and its god in the name of absolute spiritual freedom.”⁽⁹⁾ In this bold doctrine Simon Magus shows himself to be a true heir to and prophet of the left-hand path.

Gnostic sects are especially difficult to study because the creation of differing systems was part of the initiation into them at the highest levels. Leaders were encouraged to innovate and generate more sects. But there are certain common characteristics among most of them which make them *Gnostic*.

The major Gnostic tenets adhered to by most sects are:

- 1) Dualism, i.e. that there is a strict dichotomy between *spirit*, or that which is good and created by God, and *matter*, or that which is evil and created and ruled by the Archons.
- 2) Absolute transcendence of God, i.e. God, as the "Father of the Spirit," is in no way mixed up with the matter of this world.
- 3) Gnosis, i.e. that "salvation" is to be gained by *gnosis*, "knowledge," of a suprarational, experiential kind. This is not intellectual knowledge as we usually think of it, but a direct comprehension of the transcendent absolute: God.
- 4) Election, i.e. the individual Gnostic is "called" or "elected" to his status from the transcendent source of light beyond the cosmos (natural order).
- 5) Aions or cycles of existence which act as gradual barriers between this world and the realm of transcendent light.

Some of these tenets are, in some form, shared by other schools of thought, such as Neo-Platonism or Hermeticism but this combination of tenets sets Gnostic sects apart from all others.

Gnostic sects hold that the material world is ruled by an evil force, and most say that the material world is actually the creation of the evil demiurge. What might be surprising is that when Gnostic thinking is applied to the Judeo-Semitic myth of Genesis, a picture which is the absolute reversal of the conventional understanding emerges. In the Gnostic mind the (*Yahweh*) *Elohim* of Genesis is identified as the demiurge, creator god of this world— that is, the Evil One.

Yahweh, called Ildabaoth by many Gnostic sects, created the world and the natural parts of humanity, but tried to keep mankind in slavery and darkness, separate from the transcendent light. The savior of humanity is the Serpent (Heb. *nachash*) who is the bringer of light from beyond the cosmos. Especially those schools which extolled the virtues of the Serpent, e.g. the Ophites (Gk *ophis*, serpent) and the Naasenes (from a Greek rendering of Hebrew *nachash*) could easily be identified on a superficial level as practitioners of the left-hand path. Their spiritual aim is to become god-men in life and to maintain their identities — as spiritual entities — as they pass through the *aions* to reach the ultimate source of light. Some see this as a true *imitatio Christi*.

To Ophite Gnostics the figure of Christ is identified with the Serpent — as the Son of the Good God. Christ came as a manifestation of the light-bearing Serpent. The identification between the Serpent and the Messiah can be made on the ground of the Greek occult science of *gematria* as well. In the Kabbalistic technique known as *gematria*, in which every letter has a numerical equivalent, the Hebrew word for the Serpent of Eden: *nachash* (= N.Ch.Sh. = 50 + 8 + 300 = 358) and the word Messiah, Anointed One. King (M.Sh.Y.Ch. = 40 + 300 + 10 + 8 = 358) work out to be the same. In *gematria* if two words have the same numerical value they are in Essence identical on a higher level of being. The Serpent brought humanity *knowledge* (*gnosis*) of good and evil (Gen 3:1-7) and can further aid man in gaining the fruit of eternal life, thus making man like God, or like Christ.

Of the five major traits of Gnostic thinking mentioned above, all but the radical dualism is in some way shared by the contemporary intellectual left-hand path philosophy of the Temple of Set. This rejection of radical dualism is also the principal distinction between what can properly be called Gnosticism and that which can be called Hermeticism. Gnostics have inherited the basic positive dualism of the Zoroastrians, while the more precise Hermeticists have maintained the Platonic and hence Neo-Platonic model. This

model was perhaps in some sense shared by certain Egyptian priesthoods, and it is noteworthy that the cradle of this Greco-Egyptian philosophy is to be found along the Nile.

It is, of course, this heterodox synthesis of Hellenic, Semitic, Egyptian and Iranian ideas which is the oriental matrix of the so-called western magical tradition. Those ideas were re-synthesized in late medieval and Renaissance western Europe, and then again renewed — during the “occult revival” of the late 19th and early 20th century. But before we can fully appreciate the heterodox value of these ideas, we must understand what is meant by “orthodoxy.”

Christian orthodoxy is really founded on Augustine of Hippo’s synthesis of Neo-Platonic philosophy and Judeo(-Christian) mythology.(10) Although he wrote extensively against all of the numerous “heresies” of his day, he too had at one time been an adherent of Manicheanism. The four pillars of doctrine upon which Augustine’s system of orthodoxy rests are: 1) that God is a *Trinity* (Father, Son and Holy Spirit)— three and one at the same time, 2) that *free-will* is enjoyed by God absolutely and that man at one time had this, but 3) man transgressed against God’s commandments and committed *original sin* which separates man from God and with which all men are born, and 4) only the *grace* (free-will gift) of God can save a man. What is specifically orthodox Christian about this is the idea that Jesus (the Son) was a unique historical phenomenon of God’s grace and is the way by which all men are to be saved.

There is a certain genius of sorts in Augustine’s system in that it is founded on an irrational basic theological premise (the *Trinity*), which is derived from the Neo-Platonic doctrine of *emanations* — the Logos emanates from the One and the World Soul is created by the Logos. man is put in the position of having transgressed against God’s law as a matter of his own fault — the fault for this can not be laid at God’s doorstep for, after all, he gave man free-will. Man choose to rebel against God (perhaps in league with Satan) and is thus eternally separated from God. In this position man can only be “saved” by God’s gift to him. If a man turns to God the orthodox view is that it is not by his own will or effort that it has been done, but rather it is a *sign* of God’s grace that a man does so. Thus in this system of doctrine, man’s *will* is utterly devalued— really made unreal. True free-will was only exercised by Adam and the punishment for his transgression is now visited on every offspring of the human species. This is by far the most complex and convoluted explanation of a right-hand path philosophy known. One of the main reasons for its convolution is the historical fact that it represents an attempt to create a dogmatic, *inflexible*, pseudo-rational hybrid between Judaic (Semitic) theology and Hellenic (Indo-European) ideology. This hybrid seemed workable with Gnostic flexibility; however, submitted to councils of Church Fathers who approved or disapproved dogmas the cracks in the system would always be obvious. If we are to understand the historical development of the left-hand path in the west a firm idea of the essence of the right-hand path is extremely helpful.

It is often tempting to be drawn into discussions of the Judeo-Christian models of *evil* when exploring the left-hand path philosophy in the west. It must be continually remembered, however, that in the “west,” as in the “east,” the right-hand path and the left-hand path are models of spiritual working— not models of “good” *versus* “evil.” The great problem in this is that from the right-hand path viewpoint it is usually understood as precisely that: a battle between *good* (= the right-hand path) and *evil* (= the left-hand path). This is most likely to be explained in terms of the psychology of adherents of the right-hand path. The essence of “knowledge” for followers of the right-hand path (especially in the west) tends to be *faith* or belief (Gk. *pistis*). Those who have *pistis* as the object of their knowledge — those who are true believers — tend to think always in “binaric”(11) terms of yes/no, right/wrong, good/evil, *ad nauseam*. Bnt in actuality there is nothing evil about the left-hand path, in fact most of what contemporary western man likes to point to as examples of evil are the results of the philosophies of blind *faith* — the Inquisition, concentration camps, gulags, and so on.


Was Jesus a Lord of the Left-Hand Path?

This may, seem a ludicrous question to ask, but the perfection of the left-hand path comes about from asking questions. Is it possible that the teacher called Jesus was in fact a virtual Satanist in his own day and time whose teachings were so corrupted by unscrupulous followers that what he taught is for all intents and purposes buried in a morass of conflicting dogmas and doctrines? I can not hope to answer this question fully here, but I think I can present some provocative evidence suggesting that Jesus was not what the institution founded in his name later made him out to be. To begin to answer this question I will use evidence both from within and outside Christian literature.

The criteria for being named a lord of the left-hand path, it will be remembered, are that the person either developed for himself and taught a magical (willed) system of evolutionary self-deification with an antinomian embracing of elements within the culture of the individual considered to be forbidden or taboo (hence "Satanic"). Perhaps shockingly Jesus fulfills most of these criteria if the evidence is viewed objectively.

Morton Smith's study, *Jesus the Magician*, is perhaps the greatest single trove of information concerning the probable true nature of the "Naasarene." Smith reports what the *non-Christian* contemporaries said of Jesus.(12) For us the important elements of this report are that he was said to be the illegitimate son of a Roman soldier (named Panthera) and a prostitute, that he became expert in magic and became "a son of a god" by these practices, that he taught his followers to despise Jewish Law and to practice a sexually libertine doctrine of love. Of course, I am well aware that ideological enemies can, and do, simply make up the wildest most unsubstantiated stories for propagandistic reasons. But surprisingly there is ample evidence for this interpretation within the very Gospel accounts themselves.

One interesting bit of evidence that, at least to outsiders, Jesus was thought to be a Satanic or "evil" god — or "son of a god" — is graphically portrayed in a well-known piece of graffiti in the imperial palace on the Palatine hill in Rome (ca. 200 CE):



The drawing — scratched in the plaster of a school room wall — depicts a donkey-headed figure being crucified with a man raising his hand below the figure. An inscription reads (in bad Greek): “Alexamenos worships god.” The donkey-headed figure is, in this cultural context, to be identified with Set-Typhon— by this time a god of evil in the Helleno-Egyptian mythology. So at least for some Jesus had perhaps been identified with Set-Typhon. Perhaps he was seen as the “son” of this god? Well, perhaps this is so, as the Jewish god *Yah(weh)*, in Hellenic manuscripts represented as *Iao* [pron. ee-ah-oh], was unequivocally identified with Set-Typhon by the Egyptians themselves. This is fitting since Set was the “god of foreigners” among the highly xenophobic Egyptians and the Jews were the largest foreign population in Egypt at the time. Besides the Egyptian (Coptic) word for donkey just happens to be *io* or *eio*— which sounded very much like the Hellenic representation of *Yah!*(13) Evidence inside the Gospels pointing to this symbolic complex includes Jesus’ riding into Jerusalem on an ass he told his disciples to steal from the town (Mt. 21:1-7)

Evidence inside the Gospels shows the antinomian nature of Jesus’ work and teachings— at least from the viewpoint of the established Jewish culture and religion of his day. Jesus rejected the practice of the Law. In words reported to be his own he says: “think not that I am come to send peace upon the earth: I came not to send peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, etc.” (Mt. 10:34-35). Jesus was a social revolutionary bent upon the annihilation of the family and tribes as the Jews had known them. In contradistinction to the orthodox Jewish belief in the salvation of the *whole people* at a future time, Jesus taught the salvation of the *individual* here and now: “... the kingdom of god is within you.” (Lk. 17:21). He not only performed miracles or magical feats himself but exhorted his followers to emulate him: “Verily, verily I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater [works] than these shall he do ...” (Jn. 14:12).

Curiously when Jesus is accused by the Pharisees of casting out demons by the force of Beelzebub — ruler of demons — he replies only with an attempt to baffle them with apparently logical formulas (Mt. 12:24-27).

But perhaps the most interesting and compelling evidence is comparative. Assuming that Jesus was in some way a historical person who did things roughly answering to some of the accounts given in the Gospels, what kind of man would he have been? He fits perfectly the profile of a magician, of his time and place. If Jesus *was* a magician are there any corollaries to his magical activities elsewhere in the cultures of his exact time and region? Yes, there is much of it in the form of the Greco-Egyptian magical papyri.(14) Smith deals with this evidence in great detail. What emerges is a clear picture of a Hellenized Jewish magician who, among other things, claimed to be the a son of a god, used verbal magical formulas to work miracles, and who did not send spirits or demons to do his work but who contained or absorbed a divine spirit and exerted it directly.

Several papyri outline magical procedures for obtaining a spirit in order to become a son of a god. One of these (PGM I:42-195)(15) says that the magician should purify himself, go onto a lofty roof and, among other things, blindfold himself with a “black Isis band.” At one point in the ritual the band is removed and a “falcon will fly down” and drop a stone as a first sign of the manifestation of the spirit in the magician. This spirit, or *daimon*, becomes identified with the magician from an outsider’s viewpoint so the magician in the words of the papyrus “will be worshipped as a god since [he has] a god as a friend.” Another papyrus (PGM IV:154-221) reads in part:

... there will be this sign of divine encounter, but you, armed by having this magical soul, be not alarmed. For a sea falcon flies down and strikes you on the body with its wings, signifying this: that you should arise. But as for you, rise up and clothe yourself with white garments and burn on an earthen censer uncut incense in grains while saying this:

'I have been attached to your holy form.
I have been given power by your holy name.
I have acquired your emanation of the goods.
Lord, god of gods, master, daimon.

...
Having done this, return as lord of a godlike nature which is accomplished
though this divine encounter.(16)

The parallel between these magical rituals and the story of the baptism of Jesus (Mk. 1: 9-11) in which he receives a "holy spirit" which appears as a dove flying down from heaven is remarkable. After this event he is able to perform magical feats by just "saying the word," i.e. some magical formula or "*mantra*."

A sorcerer who "had" a spirit or daimon might be called in the Greek of that day a *magos* (pl. *magoi*)— and was often considered a "divine man." Such a *magos* was more than a mere *goês*, or sorcerer, who could only command spirits outside himself. In Jesus' own time some apparently thought that he had obtained the spirit of the executed John the Baptist— and worked magic with it. But it is the "holy spirit"— that of a god who Jesus the man seems to have become — which is the true agent of his miracles.

A *magos* — because of his "divine nature" — can cause changes with his "word" (or directed conscious will) alone. The papyri are full of verbal magical formulas, such as *ablanathanalba*, by which the *magos* may work his will. There is even one such word recorded in the Gospel of Mark (5:41) where Jesus heals a little girl with the (supposedly Aramaic) phrase *talitha koumi*.

For each of the miracles of Jesus a parallel can be found in the magical literature of his day. Even the magical power of his own name was enhanced upon his death— for magic worked with the spirit (or "name") of an executed criminal was believed to be of special power. This is, of course, further bolstered by the knowledge that Jesus exhorted his followers to do this, saying that he would be in them always (e.g. Jn. 14:23; 15:4-9; Mt. 18:20; 28:20).

Jesus was a deified man— just as every *magos* is. Among many magicians of the time deification — and immortalization — was the highest goal of the art and practice of *mageia* (magic). Jesus' own declarations of his divinity correspond with the words from magical papyri in which the magician declares his divine qualities:

Jn. 10:36 "I am the Son of God."
PGM IV:535 "I am the Son..."
DMP XX:33: "I am the Son of the living God."

Jn. 6:51 "I am ... the one come from heaven."
PGM IV:1018 "I am the one come forth from heaven."

Jn. 14:6 "I am ... the truth..."
PGM V:148 "I am the truth"(17)

But was Jesus a master of the left-hand path? It would appear that from the most objective evidence and methods of investigation — filtering out the often self-serving redactions and interpretations of his followers — that the man and magos Jesus was a practitioner of the left-hand path. He was an antinomian, preaching an abrogation of the established Jewish Law and was thought to be "Satanic" by his contemporary rivals and critics (charges he did not directly deny). He taught the "salvation" of the individual— while practicing the *deification* of his own individual self. That so much of this comes through the deliberate (and successful) attempt to transform his teachings into a right-hand path doctrine is remarkable.

The parallels between Jesus and Simon Magus also include the fact that Jesus (despite what were perhaps later attempts to gloss over the circumstance) had as his consort a prostitute, Mary Magdalene. This seems to be an essential component in the myth of the *magus*.(18)

In the final analysis, however, because Christianity as an institution was founded and promoted by men such as Saul/Paul (who was an avid persecutor of early followers of Jesus and who was never taught by the “master”) and Jesus’ own brother James (who rejected his brother as insane in his own lifetime) we can not trust that any of the possible left-hand path teachings of Jesus survived intact. If Jesus was lord of the left-hand path, his teachings were at once betrayed by a group of his followers so that now no more of his true doctrines survive than do those of Apollonius of Tyana or Simon Magus. To risk stating the painfully obvious: All organized forms of orthodox Christianity — eastern or western, Catholic or Protestant — are monuments of right-hand path intolerance and hatred of the individual spirit.

— Islam and the Left-Hand Path —

In the southern — or middle eastern — tradition no other system of thought more perfectly embodies the ideals of the right-hand path than orthodox *Islam*. The very word means submission— submission to the laws of Allah. Philosophically Islam is the most radically monotheistic of the religions of the middle east. At the same time this radical theology actually allowed for a great deal of free thought *outside* the confines of the religious life— this is why the Muslims of Persia, Egypt and Moorish Spain were able to become such great collectors and interpreters of Hellenic philosophy and innovators in many philosophical and scientific areas.(19) The Muslims collected and read the works of Plato, Aristotle and the Neo-Platonists at a time when such works were considered to be pure diabolism in ecclesiastical circles in the Christian west.

Historically Islam is another cult form inspired by the Judaic or Hebrew mythology. It was founded by Mohammed (570-632 CE) who spread his form of religion by military conquest— Holy War (Ar. *jihad*). By ten years after the Prophet’s death Islamic armies had conquered Egypt, Palestine, Syria, Mesopotamia and much of Iran (Persia). By a century after Mohammed’s death the Moors were moving into France from Spain which had already fallen into their hands. They were only stopped at the battle of Tours in 732 by Charles Martel (“the Hammer”). But they continued to occupy the Iberian peninsula for 800 more years.

The root essence of Islam lies in the formula known as the *shadah*: “There is no god but Allah— and Mohammed is the Messenger of Allah.” Allah is derived from a common Semitic name for god we also find in Hebrew *El*. The Arabic form comes from *al-Ilah* “The God.” Submission to this creed and to the laws outlined in Mohammed’s book, the *Qur’an* or *Koran* (“the Recitation”) is the essence of Islam.

However, the culture of Islam often allows for certain unexpected irregularities. Once a man’s outer religious obligations are met in accordance with the rule of custom, he may be free— if only *secretly* — to pursue philosophical or magical interests liberated from moral restrictions. This type of pursuit is most often carried out in certain heterodox sects or brotherhoods. The main type of such sects are known as the Sufis. Within the context of Sufism characteristics of the left-hand path are often developed. Two other Islamic sects which attract some attention in discussions of the left-hand path are the Ishmailis (or Hashashin) and the Yezidis.

Before exploring these sects it would be helpful to understand the uniquely Islamic view of Shaitan (Satan) or Iblis as he is also known. The name Iblis is derived from the Greek word *diabolus*. In Islamic mythology Iblis refuses to bow down before Adam (humanity) as all Allah’s other angels had done when commanded to do so (*Qur’an* II:34). It is for this transgression or rebellion that Shaitan is punished with rejection.

One Sufistic school, founded by Ibn Arabi has another interpretation of why Iblis would not bow down. They say that Iblis represents the Imagination which would not prostrate itself to the Intellect. "Imagination ... both dissipates and concentrates the faculty of remembrance and seduces both to 'sin and rebellion' and to the vision of the divine-in-things."(20)

The term Sufi is used to describe a number of mystical sects within Islam. Sufism is an Islamic synthesis of mystical teachings often influenced by Gnosticism, Neo-Platonism and other religious sects. However, it contains many original features based on Islamic and native Arabic or Persian ideas. Solid evidence for the Sufi movement dates from around 800 and continues as a viable part of Islamic culture today. It appears likely that these tendencies in Islam are largely the result of original Persian or Iranian influence. One tradition holds that its ultimate root is to be found with the personality of Salman al-Farisi, Mohammed's Persian barber who lived in the Prophet's house. If there are left-hand path characteristics to be found anywhere in the philosophically right-hand path tradition of Islam, it should be in Sufism. Indeed there are important fleeting glimpses of sophisticated left-hand path ideas in these sects.

To some Sufis Iblis is seen as a manifestation of Allah's majesty. They say that he refused to submit to the God's command because he was totally focused on the Absolute and would not dilute that focus by worshipping anything else.

Islamic thought again brings up the topic of the dual heritage of the left-hand path—the carnal and the intellectual. A mystical view is that Iblis is the carnal soul (nafs):

"The carnal soul and Satan have been one from the first,
And both have envied and been an enemy of Adam."(21)

Iblis is said to have a special kind of link to the Absolute. This is due to the idea that he is the first model for the separate "I-consciousness" independent of the Absolute. So in a way, Iblis disobeyed Allah for the sake of love and for the sake of his loyalty to his One Beloved (the Absolute). He is cursed and punished for his disobedience—but even in this he takes satisfaction at being separated out for unique treatment by the Absolute. The parallel between this and the psycho-cosmology of the Gnostic magus is obvious.

One Sufi who was executed for his thoughts in 1131, Ayn al-Qozat Hamadani, spoke of those who have a special affinity for Iblis as "the separated ones." Those who thrive in a state separate from Allah. Wilson writes:

Ayn al-Qozat implies that separation-in-love is in some sense superior to union-in-love, because the former is a dynamic condition and the latter a static one. Iblis is not only the paragon of separated ones, he also causes this condition in human lovers—and although some experience this as "evil," the Sufi knows that it is necessary, and even good.(22)

Aleister Crowley, or his "Holy Guardian Angel," will echo some of these sentiments in *The Book of the Law* (I:29) wherein Nuit says: "For I am divided for love's/ sake, for the chance of union."

Al-Qozat goes to develop the concept of Iblis as the guardian of an inner chamber of divinity wherein there is a Black Light—a realm beyond all duality. It is "darkness, but it is light just the same."(23) Al-Qozat declares "... hear the word of God: 'Praise be to God, who has created the heavens and the earth and has established darkness and light' (*Qur'an* VI:1) How can black be complete without white or white without black be complete? It cannot be so."(24)

To some Sufis the figure of Iblis becomes a secret exemplary model. One rather notorious group, the *Malamatiya* (from Ar. *malama*, blame) sect practiced antinomianism reminiscent of the Ophite or Barbelo-Gnostic sects. Members of this sect believed that their

nearness to a divine state was proven by the level of contempt shown to them by normal humanity. They totally neglected religious laws and regularly committed sinful acts.(25)

One of the earliest Sufi practitioners whose ideas bordered on the left-hand path was Abu-Yazid of Persia (d. 875). He came to realize that God was the equivalent of his own soul. He wrote: "Glory to Me! How great is my Majesty!" Technically he was committing the intellectual sin of "incarnationalism" (Ar. *hulul*) by claiming to be God (or a god) incarnate. This seems to be a general tendency in Sufistic beliefs. Again we are reminded of the Gnostic sects where a practitioner could exclaim after some stage: "I am Christ!"(26)

Al-Junaid (d. 910) developed the idea that man's separate existence from God is a result of God's own will. However, God tries to "overcome" this separateness by pouring out the fullness of his own Being. This Sufi used the imagery of erotic love to articulate his theology of human separateness from God. The lover yearns for union but takes intense joy in the suffering caused by the separation.(27)

The most radical of the early Sufis, and a student of al-Junaid, actually identified himself as a god, or perhaps *logos* incarnate. This was Mansur al-Hallaj (d. 922) who equated himself with the *logos* of Truth. He wrote in his *Kitab al-Tawasin* (51):(28)

If ye do not recognize God, at least recognize His signs. I am that sign, I am the Creative Truth (*ana l-haqq*), because through the Truth I am a truth eternally. My friends and teachers are Iblis and Pharaoh. Iblis was threatened with Hell-fire, yet he did not recant. Pharaoh was drowned in the sea, yet he did not recant, for he would not acknowledge anything between him and God. And I, though I am killed and crucified, and though my hands and feet are cut off— I do not recant.(29)

For writing these words al-Hallaj was condemned to die having committed the gross blasphemy of equating himself with (a) god— and what was worse by using the model of Jesus Christ for doing so. For this, his mode of execution was that of his hero— crucifixion. Al-Hallaj is said to have reached a "Permanence of Self in the Real" (Ar. *baqa'*) by which he was able to ascend to Paradise after his martyrdom.(30)

The Assassins and the Old Man of the Mountain

Another faction with left-hand path implications is the Ishmaili sect within Shi'a Islam of Persia. The Ishmailis are also known to history as the Hashashin, or "Assassins." This sect has its origins in 1074 when the Persian Hasan-i Sabbah was initiated into Ishmailism in Cairo. In 1094 he moved his headquarters to a mountain fortress in Persia called the Alamut, or "Eagle's Nest." This effected a division in the sect into two branches, the oriental branch with its headquarters at Alamut in Persia and the occidentals in Egypt and Yemen.(31) It was the *shaikh* or "elder" of the fortress of Alamut — the so-called Old Man of the Mountain — about whom Marco Polo reported in his book recounting his journey to the east.(32)

Hasan-i Sabbah developed and taught a system of spiritual hermeneutics called in Arabic *ta'wil*: "to take something back to its source or deepest significance." *Ta'wil* is used to penetrate beyond the exoteric limitations of the Law (*shariah*) and Path (*tariqah*) of religion to arrive at the esoteric Reality (*haqiqah*) behind the outer forms.(Wilson 1988, p. 38) Hasan-i Sabbah declared: "Nothing is true, everything is permitted." (A phrase that has had immense literary and artistic impact today through William Burroughs and the modern movement called "Discordianism.")

In 1162 Hasan II (son of Hasan-i Sabbah) became the *shaikh* of Alamut. On 17 Ramazan (8 August) 1164 he declared the *Qiyamat*— the Great Resurrection. In doing this he declared: "The chains of the Law are broken!" The inhabitants of the Eagle's Nest were free of obligations of Islamic religious laws and a perpetual holiday was declared. Hasan II

can be said to have realized the "Imam-of-his-own-being" and he then invited all his followers to participate in this.(33) With the *Qiyamat* Hasan II maintained that the resurrection of the dead in physical bodies was possible *in life*. The Ishmaili initiate "dies before death" when he comes to realize the separative and alienated aspects of the self, the ego-as-programmed-illusion. He is 'reborn' in consciousness but he is reborn in the body, as an individual, the 'soul-at-peace.'"(34) In 1166 Hasan II was murdered.

It seems likely that Hasan II took his followers too far too fast. He had perhaps reached the spiritual "station" called Permanence (Ar. *baqa'*), but his doctrine of *Qiyamat* had been developed over several years through the gradual stages of Ishmaili initiation and based on the practice of *ta'wil*. But the stage that immediately precedes Permanence is said to be Annihilation (Ar. *fana'*).(35) This annihilation is not an end in itself, which may be true in the right-hand path, but is a phase to be passed through before individual permanence is possible. Hasan II tried to offer this intoxicated state of permanence to his followers in a direct and simple form, which they did not seem ready to accept or be able to achieve. From the left-hand path perspective, he attempted to transform a school of the intellectual, gradual Transcendental Path, into one of the sensory, immediate Lesser Path over night. Ultimately it did not work for all of the followers.

The Ishmailis came to believe that their leader or *Imam* was divine, and following 1164, the time of *Qiyamat*, many of them maintained the possibility of a "pure spiritual Islam, freed of any legalistic spirit, of all servitude to the Law."(36) Far from submitting to "God's will," in the final state of Ishmaili initiation (the IX⁰) "every vestige of dogmatic religion has been practically cast aside, and the initiate is become a philosopher pure and simple, free to adopt such system or admixture as may be most to his taste."(37)

In 1251 the fortress At Alamut was captured and destroyed by the Mongols, and the vast library there was burned. Afterward the Ishmailis found refuge in various Sufi sects.(38) In the 19th century the Ishmailis re-emerged under the spiritual leadership of the Aga Khans, and are today a wealthy sect headquartered in India.(39)

The Yezidi Devil Worshipers

To call the Yezidis an Islamic sect may or may not be correct. But it is perhaps within the cultural milieu of Islam that it makes most sense to discuss them. Also to call them "devil worshippers" — which has so often been done(40) — may or may not be correct. But certainly they have been called this so much that a discussion of their beliefs in the left-hand path context can not go unrecorded.

The Yezidis are a Kurdish people. Kurdish is a dialect of the Iranian branch of the Indo-European family of languages. Thus they are not part of the general Arabic population surrounding them in their homeland in and around the valley of Lalish near the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers in the northern part of modern Iraq. Evidence for the Yezidi religion dates only from the 14th century. Its peculiar lore may be the result of ancient pre-Islamic tenets being grafted into Islamic religious terminology, or it may constitute an original creation.

Historically the Yezidis trace the origin of their faith back to *shaikh* Adi ibn Musafir who came to the valley of Lalish from the valley of Baalbek in Lebanon by way of Baghdad. He was in Baghdad around 1100 where he was associated with various Sufis, including Ayn al-Qozat Hamadani. Among the Kurds of Lalish he founded an order which was outwardly orthodox, but which secretly venerated Melek Taus— the Iblis of al-Hallaj.

The word *Yezidi* is probably derived from the Persian word *yaz(a)d-*, "supreme being" which is part of the Zoroastrian terminology. The term was used by the Shi'ite Muslims of Persia as a term of insult— essentially meaning to them "heathen" or "infidel."(41)

In Yezidi doctrine the First Cause, or God (*Khuda*) created the cosmos through the agency of seven angels. The first among these, Azaziel or Asa'el, refused to bow down before Adam (man) who had been created directly by Khuda alone. One of the reasons for his refusal, by the way may be that Azaziel was formed of fire, while Adam was formed

from clay, and the angel refused to bow to a lower being.(42) However, Khuda has subsequently forgiven Azaziel—who is therefore not the spirit of evil the uninitiated make him out to be. The Yezidis consider the name Shaitan (Satan) as an insult to Azaziel and refuse to use the term—and if it is used by others in their presence retribution is demanded.

The name Azaziel is also rarely heard among them. It has been largely replaced by a cognomen: Melek Taus—the Peacock Angel. The Yezidis trust in Melek Taus and ask for his special knowledge and protection. They believe that Judgment Day is in the remote future and that the faithful live on through cycles of reincarnation (a belief also shared with the Ishmailis and Druzes). To the Yezidis evil is a fact of *natural* life and not the work of a supernatural being. Melek Taus' role in the “fall” of man is not that of a tempter—but he is revered as the brave provider of knowledge needed by mankind to survive.

One of the Yezidi holy books called the *Kitab el-Aswad* is Arabic or the *Mas'haf Rish* in Kurdish (both meaning “Black Book”) tells that God created Adam (*only* the male) and placed him in Paradise but forbids him to eat of *wheat*. After a hundred years Melek Taus asks God why Adam has not increased or multiplied. God replied by giving to the Peacock Angel administrative authority in the world. Melek Taus then instructs Adam to go against God's prohibition and eat of the grain. The Peacock Angel then *drives* Adam out of paradise. Only later was woman created (from under Adam's left armpit), and mankind is able to increase.(43) Here the positive evolutionary role of Melek Taus is clear.

How this positive evolutionary role is reflected in the spiritual lives of individuals is demonstrated by the words of a poem by *shaikh* Adi himself:

I am Adi of Shams, son of Musafir.

...

In the secret of my knowledge there is no god but me...

Praise be to myself, and all things are of my will.

And the universe is lighted by some of my gifts.

With the Yezidis and Ishmailis, as with so many of the other apparently left-hand path traditions, the essentially left-handed goal — immortal independent existence of the self in a quasi-divine state — is not clear except at the highest levels of initiation or at the leadership level. It is probably for this reason that the leaders and past leaders of the sects seem to be “worshipped.” Actually they serve as pioneering spirits who have walked the path before the aspirant and thus serve as exemplary models. It is interesting to note that one of the shrines, or actual images of the Peacock Angel (*sanjak*), in the Yezidi region is said to be dedicated to Mansur al-Hallaj—the Persian Sufi and apparent practitioner of the left-hand path executed in 922.(44)

It seems that the Yezidi tradition is the result of a syncretism of indigenous Kurdish beliefs (probably non-Zoroastrian Iranian sects), Iranian dualism, *shaikh* Adi's Sufistic teachings, Al-Hallaj's interpretation of Iblis, and perhaps Nestorian Christianity.(45) This synthesis may, however, only be a superficial one and perhaps the values and structures underlying Yezidi belief remain essentially ancient Kurdish ways. This is even alluded to in another of the Yezidi holy books, the *Kitab al-Jilwa* (IV): “The scriptures of strangers are accepted by me (Melek Taus) in so far as they accord with my ordinances and run not counter to them ...”(46)

It is curious to note that virtually all of the left-hand path traits present in the Islamic cultural stream seem to flow ultimately from the Iranian world— whether it is the heretical Sufis, the Ishmailis, or even the Kurdish Yezidis. I would speculate that the reason for this is that the left-hand path ideas were common— even if eternally controversial — in the pre-Islamic world and that these yearnings of the human spirit to attain to an independent, immortal and awakened state could not be stamped out entirely— even by the vigorously right-hand path tradition of the way of “submission.”

Notes for Chapter 4

- (1) Tacitus, *The Histories*. trans. K. Wellesley. (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975), p. 274.
- (2) Kurt Rudolf, *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1987), pp. 275-366 and Benjamin Walker, *Gnosticism* (Wellingborough, UK: Aquarian Press, 1982), pp. 133-160.
- (3) See Hans Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion* (Boston: Beacon, 1963, 2nd ed.), pp. 103-111; Rudolf, *Gnosis*, pp. 294-298 and Walker, *Gnosticism*, pp. 136-139.
- (4) See James M. Robinson, ed., *The Nag Hammadi Library* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1981), pp. 362-367.
- (5) Jonas, *Gnostic Religion*, p. 111)
- (6) Walker, *Gnosticism*, p. 138.
- (7) Walker, *Gnosticism*, p. 138-142 and Rudolf, *Gnosis*, pp. 298; 309 ff.
- (8) Jonas, *Gnostic Religion*, p. 105.
- (9) Jonas, *Gnostic Religion*, p. 110.
- (10) On the development of St. Augustine's thought, see Mircea Eliade *History of Religious Ideas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), vol III, pp. 38-50.
- (11) On the concept of "binaric" see Anton LaVey, "Binaric, or Don't Try to Teach a Pig to Sing — It Wastes Your Time and Annoys the Pig," *Cloven Hoof* (121) XX:3 (1987), 1-2.
- (12) Morton Smith, *Jesus the Magician* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978), pp. 45-67.
- (13) Smith, *Jesus*, p. 62)
- (14) The magical texts of the papyri have been translated by Hans Dieter Betz, ed, *The Greek Magical : Including the Demotic Spells* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), vol I, and the original Greek (with a German translation) is presented by Karl Preisendanz, ed., *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri* (Stuttgart: Teubner), 1973-74, 2 vols., 2nd ed.
- (15) Betz, *Papyri*, pp. 4-5.
- (16) Betz, *Papyri*, pp. 41-42.
- (17) Smith, *Jesus*, pp. 125-126.
- (18) Smith, *Jesus*, p. 9.
- (19) Eliade, *History*, vol. III, pp. 116-151.
- (20) Peter Lamborn Wilson, "Iblis, the Black Light." *Gnosis* 14 (Winter: 1990), p. 46.
- (21) Javad, Nurbakhsh, *The Great Satan "Eblis."* London: (Khaniqahi-Nimatullahi Publications, 1986), p. 67.
- (22) Wilson, "Iblis," p. 45.
- (23) Wilson, "Iblis," p. 45.
- (24) Wilson, "Iblis," p. 45.
- (25) A. J. Arberry, *Sufism: An Account of the Mystics of Islam* (New York: Harper and Row, 1950), p. 70)
- (26) Walker, *Gnosticism*, p. 128.
- (27) Arberry, *Sufism*, p. 58.
- (28) Arberry, *Sufism*, p. 60.
- (29) Arberry, *Sufism*, p. 60.
- (30) Peter Lamborn Wilson, *Scandal: Essays in Islamic Heresy* (New York: Autonomedia, 1988), p. 9.
- (31) Eliade *History*, vol. III, pp. 119-120.
- (32) Marco Polo, *The Travels*, (London: Penguin, 1958), pp. 70-73.
- (33) Wilson *Scandal*, p. 38.
- (34) Wilson *Scandal*, p. 40.
- (35) Wilson *Scandal*, p. 45.
- (36) Eliade *History*, vol. III, p. 120.
- (37) Edward Burman, *The Assassins: Holy Killers of Islam* (Wellingborough, UK: Crucible, 1987), p. 61.
- (38) Eliade *History*, vol. III, p. 120.

- (39) Burman, *The Assassins*, p. 174ff.
- (40) For example by Arkon Daraul, *A History of Secret Societies* (Secaucus, NJ: Citadel, 1961), pp. 141-155 and Anton LaVey, *The Satanic Rituals* (New York: Avon, 1972), pp. 151-172.
- (41) John S. Guest, *The Yezidis: A Study in Survival* (London: KPI, 1987), p. 31.
- (42) Wilson, "Iblis," p. 43.
- (43) See the *Black Book*, translated by Guest, *Yezidis*, p. 203.
- (44) Guest, *Yezidis*, pp. 40-41 and Wilson, "Iblis," p. 45.
- (45) Walker, *Gnosticism*, pp. 74-75.
- (46) Guest, *Yezidis*, p. 201-202.

Chapter 5 The Path of Satan

The Left-Hand Path in the Western Middle Ages 500-1500

In any given culture, the beginning of the medieval period may be marked from the time it officially accepts (by whatever means) the nominal authority of the Christian church. By the time of the advent of the Middle Ages in western Europe the basic church dogmas outlined by St. Augustine had become the standard of orthodoxy. However, the swarm of heterodox teachings, and even organized sects, remained unceasing until the present day. The orthodox call heterodox doctrines “heresies”— and as often as not equate them with the work of the Devil. At the same time the “heretics” almost without exception conceive of themselves as true Christians who champion the true teachings of Jesus against the orthodox forces— which are sometimes themselves characterized as being diabolical. For the most part, with some rare exceptions, the story of medieval spiritual dissent and warfare is one internal to the right-hand path.

Augustine’s dogmas of the Trinity, Original Sin, Free-Will and Grace became litmus tests for other doctrines. The seeds of many heterodox movements were planted early.

Arius (256-336), a priest in Alexandria, Egypt, taught that Jesus Christ was not god himself but a man who had become god-like. This teaching was condemned as heretical because it denied the dogma of the Trinity— that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are/is co-eternal and co-equal. This Christological controversy perhaps ultimately stems from two Greek words used to describe Christ *theotetos*, having the substance of god, and *theomorphos*, being akin to god. In actuality, Arius was trying to preserve the purity and simplicity of monotheism in his teaching. The orthodox elevation of Jesus to the level of God the Father did two things. It created a kind of duotheism (or tritheism) and it made Jesus ever more remote from humanity. As this happened it became increasingly difficult for the Christian believer to see him as an exemplary model for his own salvation, and at the same time it increased the power and necessity of the institutionalized Church in the spiritual life of the individual. In the Middle Ages things as apparently irrelevant to modern minds as Christology had a *direct* effect on the social, political, economic and, obviously, spiritual life of each individual.

Another important heretical thinker was Pelagius (died around 420) who taught that every human was born free of original sin and that all individuals were responsible for their own moral actions. Pelagius was of Celtic heritage (either Irish or Britonic) and was most interested in the improvement of the moral practice of Christianity. Even in this early period Christian moral practice was lax because there were always ways to shirk moral responsibility. Augustine taught that moral behavior was a sign of God’s grace, while it might be held that immoral behavior was somehow “caused” by the Devil— in either instance the individual is *not responsible*. Pelagius was condemned by the church and died in an unknown place in the Middle East.

Certainly neither Arius or Pelagius could be called practitioners of the left-hand path. However, the main points of their teachings—the heroic view of Christ as an exemplary mythic model for self-development, the basic *freedom* of human beings and their *responsibility* for their own actions — are elements of any coherent left-hand path philosophy.

The strongest exponents of this early form of Christian heresy were the various East Germanic tribes (Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Vandals, etc.) who converted to this Arian form of the faith. It is probably also true that their Gothic Christianity was not unmixed with elements of their native Germanic religion.(1) Nevertheless this form of Christianity — linked as it was with the Goths — was annihilated in a series of wars waged on the Goths by the Pope and various secular kings in the 6th through 8th centuries.

Gnosticism was the root of the most powerful challenge to orthodoxy in the later Middle Ages. This branch of Gnosticism, however, had its direct root in the doctrines of Mani (216-277) a Persian holy man who was raised in the Judeo-Christian sect of the Elchasaites. In 240 he broke with the sect and founded his own movement as a result of messages he received from the “King of the Paradise of Light.” Manicheanism is a synthesis of Iranian Gnostic thought with Judeo-Christian mythology and certain Buddhist teachings.

Mani taught that there are two principles — light and darkness, and three great epoches of cosmic history: a time when light was separate from darkness, this time in which the darkness attacks the light, and a coming time in which the darkness will again be separated from the light. A person can be saved from the world of darkness — or flesh — only through *knowledge* (*gnosis*) of this reality.(2)

From these Persian, Manichean, origins sprang many heretical sects in western Europe. Some of these were highly ascetic — such as the Cathars, while others went in the libertine direction — such as the Brethren of the Free Spirit. Indeed these are the same tendencies present in all Gnostic movements.

The church fought dissenters and protesters throughout the Middle Ages. Virtually all of those it oppressed, however, were also (and usually more aware) followers of the right-hand path. After the success of one of these group’s movements — the Protestant Reformation begun by the German priest Martin Luther — interest in the possibilities of secret underground diabolical movements increased. This was true both in the Protestant north as well as the Catholic south.

In the first half of the Middle Ages — until about 1200 — the religious intolerance of the church was largely reserved for pagans (peoples adhering to their national native traditions) and national Christian religions (such as Gothic Arianism). These were usually opposed in open warfare in an alliance between the Pope and relevant secular authorities—this most often being the French king or the Holy Roman Emperor.

A foretaste of what was to come occurred in 385 when Priscillian was executed in Trier for holding heretical beliefs. But the institutionalized persecution of heretics, witches, magicians and the like did not begin in earnest until around 1200. By this time all overt paganism in Europe had been stamped out— so the forces of intolerance and spiritual totalitarianism *turned inward* to begin the persecution of those who professed to be Christians but who did not meet orthodox standards of belief.

Pope Innocent III in a bull of 1199 formally established the church-wide institution of the Inquisition. By 1273 Pope Gregory IX appointed the Dominican Order as the official Inquisitorial body. This was later modified to include the Franciscans.

The level of institutionalized violence and hatred embodied in the Inquisition has rarely been equalled in the course of human history. Its record is too well known, and too vile, to repeat here in any detail.(3) Our purpose in this book is not to recount the history of *evil*— for if such were the case surely the history of the left-hand path would make a poorer subject than the history of the forces of institutionalized orthodoxy— Christian, Muslim, Communist, or National Socialist. But to appreciate the level of resistance faced by spiritual

dissenters of all sorts— including practitioners of the left-hand path — the nature of the forces bent on their destruction is important to remember.

It is also noteworthy that the Inquisition of the Roman Catholic Church was (or *is* for the institution still exists under the name “Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith”) not the only body in Christendom which engaged in these intolerant and spiritually totalitarian practices. “Freelancing” Protestant witch-hunters or witch-finders along with local Protestant clergy and secular authorities persecuted those thought to be in league with the Devil no less vigorously than the Catholics had done.

Although heretics of all kinds were considered to be at least indirectly in league with the Devil, it was not until the 16th and 17th centuries that widespread “satanism” or “witchcraft” was suggested by the forces of orthodoxy (Protestant or Catholic). Not surprisingly this is a time when we also find little in the way of true left-hand path practice.

The whole “witchcraft scare” of the 1500-1600s seems to have been for the most part a malicious (and profitable) fantasy on the part of churchmen. In a brilliant study, Norman Cohn(4) has shown how later Christians used earlier Roman descriptions of what they thought occurred at Christian *agapê* feasts and modified the descriptions over time to suit any heretical group churchmen wished to slander.

Two examples of the process should be sufficient to illustrate the point. Concerning what Romans think Christians do in their services, Minucius Felix (active at the end of the 2nd century CE) wrote:

A child ... is set before the would-be novice. The novice stabs the child to death ... Then ... they hungrily drink the child’s blood, and compete with one another as they divide his limbs. Through this victim they are bound together; and the fact that they all share this knowledge of the crime pledges them all to silence.

On the feast-day they foregather with all their children, sisters, mothers, people of either sex and all ages. When the company is all aglow from feasting, and impure lust has been set afire by drunkenness, ... they twine the bonds of unnameable passion as chance decides. And so all alike are incestuous, if not always in deed at least by complicity ... Precisely the secrecy of this evil religion proves that all these things, or practically all, are true.(5)

Some eight centuries later, around 1050, a Greek philosopher Michael Psellos, wrote a dialog *On the Operation of Demons* containing what the orthodox Christians thought of the rites of the Bogomil heretics:

They bring ... young girls whom they have initiated into their rites ... and throw themselves lasciviously on the girls; each one on whomever first falls into his hands, no matter whether she be his sister, his daughter or his mother ... When this rite has been completed, each goes home; and after waiting nine months until the time has come for the unnatural children of such unnatural seed to be born, they come together ... on the third day after the birth, they tear the miserable babies from their mother’s arms. They cut their tender flesh all over with sharp knives and catch the stream of blood in basins. They throw the babies, still breathing and gasping, into the fire to be burned to ashes. After which they mix the ashes with the blood in the basins to make an abominable drink ... (6)

Let it suffice to say that the latter description is no more likely to be true than the former. What is remarkable is that such descriptions could still be heard on television “news” programs in the 1980s and 1990s— including stories about “breeders” and infants

being burned and devoured (so there was no "evidence" for the crime). See Appendix A on the "Urban Legend of Satanicism."

It is certain that we would learn little concerning any genuine left-hand path schools, traditions or philosophies by relying on medieval Christian descriptions of the activities of their adversaries— real or imagined. However, the *symbols* engendered during this period would serve to stir the rebellious imaginations of antinomian Romantics in the late 18th to 20th century.

The Christian Heretics

The Dualists

Even when we look to those who spiritually rebelled against the authority of the church during the Middle Ages we find mostly only other right-hand path practitioners.

The great dualistic heresies — which have been referred to as being "Satanic" by orthodox theologians — had few left-hand path tendencies. As can be seen from the "learned" description of their activities reported by Psellos, the orthodox believers really had no idea what the Bogomils or Cathars believed— and they were not interested in knowing. The orthodox wanted only their extermination. This extermination could only be completed by means of open warfare on the sects involved. This was the so-called Albigensian Crusade (1207-1221). Even after that it took until about 1330 to wipe out the last vestige of the Cathar movement in Europe.

What did these "vile heretics" teach?

Derived ultimately from the Manichean tradition (probably in the "Paulician" or "Messalian" forms in Asia Minor, Bogomilism was founded around 950 by a village priest in Bulgaria calling himself *Bogomil*, "Beloved of God."

Bogomil preached that God — Bog — had two sons: Satanel and Christ. Satanel rebelled in heaven and caused one third of all the angels to follow him. As a result of the rebellion Satanel created the material universe— of which he is god. Bogomil equated, as do most Gnostics, the Jewish God of the Old Testament with Satanel.

As a result, Bogomil believed all flesh, and material things of all sorts, to be evil tricks of Satanel. The orthodox priesthood and its sacraments and miracles — all works through matter— were thus held to be manifestations of evil.

The ultimate aim of the Bogomil believer was to unite with Christ— the good god. To do this he or she must lead an ascetic lifestyle, be vegetarian, not indulge in wine, sex, marriage or procreation. It is interesting to note that the English term bugger, meaning "Sodomy, anal or oral intercourse" is derived from *Bulgarus*, Bulgar. This is because the Bogomil heresy, with its prohibition against procreation, was so widespread among these people in the Middle Ages they became identified with such practices!

Most of the propaganda written against them, a sample of which appears above) is useless as evidence for what they really believed because it seems to be merely repetitions of charges made indiscriminately against any and all whom the church wished to slander and destroy.

The Bogomils were the object of frequent persecutions by the orthodox authorities. This in part caused them to send missions north of the Balkans and the west into Italy, France and western Germany, where they developed into various movements, e.g. the Cathars or Albigensians and Waldensians.(7) By the beginning of the 14th century the Bogomils were effectively suppressed as an open religion, and with the Ottoman conquest of the Balkans in the late 14th century the religion disappeared. Most Bogomils eventually converted to Islam.(8)

The Cathars had a theology and cosmology almost identical to that of the Bogomils. However, they were much more successful in organizing themselves, especially in southern France or Provence.

Probably the chief reason for Cathar popularity in Europe was the widespread and thorough corruption of the Roman Catholic institution. Catholic priests lived in carnal luxury. Many were married or simply lived together with concubines, they ran taverns and

charged extra fees for all their religious services. This latter practice was necessitated by the need of priests to pay off their patrons within the church who arranged for their appointments to office. The Cathars, on the other hand, seem to have been devoutly and *radically* spiritual in all that they did.

Cathar internal structure was simple. After a long apprenticeship an adept entered the sect by means of a rite called the *convenza*. The second and last level of initiation was celebrated in a rite called the *consolamentum* after which the initiate is called a "Perfect." These were the true *Cathari* — "Purified Ones." (*Catharus* comes from the Greek *katharos*, pure.)

After one had become a Perfect it was expected that one would sin no more. Although the Cathars were lenient on the laity— their standards of morality at the "Perfect" level were so harsh that many practiced the *endura* — allowing themselves to starve to death — after the *consolamentum* rite. This was done in order that they might ascend into the realm of light without sin. For the Cathars there was no Hell below this world— this world of flesh and matter was the prison of the spirit and the true Inferno. Their ideal was to set into motion a process which would end the existence of humanity in this world, propelling it into a realm of pure spirit.

Although Manicheans, Bogomils and Cathars would often be referred to as "Satanic" by orthodox propagandists it can be seen that they have virtually nothing to do with the left-hand path. From the Cathar point of view the Roman Catholic Church was in reality Satanic. This is the common charge / counter-charge tactic typical of the right-hand path. In the case of the Roman Church it might, however, seem plausible when one reads a study such as *The Bad Popes* by E. R. Chamberlin.

The strict moral dualism of the Manichean kind — or even the implicit and elusive dualism of the orthodox variety — is simply not conducive to a true left-hand path philosophy. Such dualism that does exist as a part of the analysis of the cosmic or human order must be accepted and *utilized* for the evolution of the self into an ever more perfected and god-like being to be true to left-hand path premises.

Pantheistic Free Spirits

Another kind of Christian heresy especially popular in Germany, northern France, the Low Countries and England was the so-called Brethren of the Free Spirit. This movement was present throughout these regions from about the beginning of the 1200s all the way to the end of the 1600s. One of the reasons the movement as a whole could continue beyond the grasp of the Inquisition is that it had no formal structure and the members tended to be both highly intelligent and mobile. Many, however, were burned at the stake for their beliefs. "Spiritual Libertinism" was equally widespread among women and men. The sect often flourished *within* the social context of the wider communities known as the Beghards (men) and Beguines (women).

Their traditions tended to be *oral* and hence original texts are scarce. Three of the most important original sources for Free Spirit thought are *Schwester Katrei*, Marguerite Porete's *Mirror of Simple-Souls*, and a tract by an English "Ranter" (a Free Spirit offshoot) called *A Single Eye*.(9)

The Brethren of the Free Spirit may indeed be said to belong to the more libertine branch of "Gnostic" thought— just as the Cathars represented an extreme form of the ascetic branch. However, extreme dualism is not a feature of their thought. It is more in keeping with the known facts to call the Free Spirit movement "pantheistic."

On the surface the Spiritual Libertines, as they are also called, would seem to be prime examples of left-hand path thought and practice and be in many ways similar to the left-hand path antinomian tantrics of the east. Norman Cohn says they represent "a system of self-exaltation often amounting to self-deification." If we delve beyond the surface we can see some distinctions that bear emphasis.

The overriding cosmological feature of Free Spirit belief is the realization that "God is all that is" and that "every created thing is divine."(10) These formulas, as well as the essence of their practice point to a Neo-Platonic model of reality as the root of their beliefs. Cohn, however, points out that their teachings seem to stem from the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius and John the Scot Erigena— and to have taken no further attempts to homogenize Neo-Platonism into the Christian mainstream of orthodoxy.(11)

Another important influence on their understanding of the world seems to have been supplied — if indirectly — by the visionary Joachim of Fiore (1145-1202).(12) Joachim divided the history of the world into three phases or stages: that of the Father (or Law), of the Son (or Gospel) and of the Holy Spirit. The advent of the Age of the Holy Spirit would usher in a transformation of the world. The first Age was one of fear and servitude, the second of faith and filial submission— but the third Age "would be one of love, joy and freedom, when knowledge of God would be revealed directly in the hearts of all men."(13) The Brethren of the Free Spirit had a similar doctrine in which they held that the Incarnation of the Son (Christ) was being surpassed by the Incarnation of the Holy Spirit in the bodies of the "Spirituals"— the highest initiates of the Free Spirit movement. They could at that point declare: "I am the Holy Spirit!"(14)

The pantheism of the Spiritual Libertines comes to the forefront when we observe their attitudes toward the self of humanity. Cohn concluded that the core of the Free Spirit system hinged on an attitude toward the *self*. The Spiritual Libertine believed he had attained perfection and so was *incapable* of sin. This awareness inevitably led to certain antinomian practices. It became a virtual requirement for the initiate to engage in forbidden acts.(15) In a world in which sexual pleasure was perhaps the greatest of forbidden pleasures, it was only natural for the practices of the Spiritual Libertines to gravitate in this direction. There is evidence for a tradition of "free love" among them— but little to none of public orgies (often ascribed to them by their orthodox enemies).

Those who had realized their unity with the divine considered themselves to have returned to the *Adamite* state of being— free of sin and unashamed. The Free Spirits seem to have practiced ritual nudity as an expression of this realization.

But *how* did the Spiritual Libertines attain to this Adamite state of sinless innocence and immortality? Unfortunately most of the texts that might have been used by the sect were destroyed by the Inquisition. In the fragments of the system which remain, however, a few things are clear.

The first phase of initiation — which may go on for years — involves self-abnegation and self-torture. There is the cultivation of absolute passivity and obedience (sometimes to a "master"). During this phase one is not a true Spiritual Libertine, but the as an apprentice one is being trained to receive the Incarnation of the Holy Spirit. The second phase is the actual transformation into God. At that point one becomes Adamite (or Evite), restored to the original state of being.

The *Mirror of Simple Souls* describes a more detailed process of seven steps of initiation. The first three involve ascetic practices of self-denial and obedience. Levels four and five prepare the way for the state of exultation— one is blinded by the light of love, preparing the way for the recognition of one's own sinfulness at the fifth level. This *experience* of the immense gulf between the self and God allows the light and love of God to sweep into the self. The will of God becomes the will of the self. At the sixth level one becomes a true Free Spirit— the soul is annihilated in the Deity so that there is nothing but God: God = Self. In the seventh and last level the self rejoices permanently in the divine state of being.(16)

The Spiritual Libertine is not just united with God— but becomes identical to God. This identity is furthermore permanent. Because of the evolutionary quality of Free Spirit theology, that is that this phenomenon represents a new stage in the development of deity and humanity. The Free Spirit initiate could claim to be superior to God as understood in texts from previous Ages.(17)

As with many Gnostic sects, the Brethren of the Free Spirit considered this world to be the realm of Hell and punishment. But it was not because it was made of matter, rather it was because of the existence of the gulf between man and God and the presence of man's feelings of guilt and conscience which torment him due to his ignorance of reality. By attaining identity with God, the Free Spirit is liberated from these pangs of conscience—which is tantamount to the liberation from the torments of Hell.(18)

The praxis or spiritual technology of the Free Spirits, like those of so many sects — especially those of the left-hand path — can be dangerous if misunderstood. Spiritual Liberation is not in fact something that just suddenly decides is true and acts upon. It could then be nothing but an excuse for vile or criminal acts. (There is no record of such acts committed by true Free Spirits.) An actual process of self-transformation must be undertaken. This process will invariably involve a long period of discipline and self-denial, of spiritual and physical austerities.

A great deal of the Free Spirit sect's beliefs and practices certainly accord with the general characteristics of the left-hand path. They seem to deify the self, which is dynamic and evolutionary, and direct these efforts toward an immortal existence. Socially they are antinomian, but not particularly so when it comes to religious symbolism. They do not, for example, worship a Devil. There is, however, an important and subtle difference between this and the other schools of the left-hand path. Left-hand philosophies emphasize the *individual* development and immortality. The emphasis is on the deification of the unique and separate self— each individual is “raised” to the level of deity (either in this life-time or in some *post mortem* state). With the Free Spirits the emphasis is quite different. The Holy Spirit descends and incarnates in individual humans filling them individually and collectively with the undifferentiated substance of the Holy Spirit. Although the individuality appears to be preserved, this is only an illusion viewed from the outside. In reality the individual soul has been annihilated and the self identified with the Holy Spirit *in toto*. This is similar to the more orthodox views of the state of *jivanmukti* (individual liberation) in Hinduism. For this reason the Spiritual Libertines must ultimately be excluded from being called practitioners of the left-hand path.

Before leaving this topic I would like to mention that many of the ideas underlying the Free Spirit movement were embodied in — and in turn influenced by — the contemporary German mystical theologians Meister Eckhart, Heinrich Suso and Johannes Tauler.(19) The thought and writings of these and many of the other heretics of the medieval period often find much more sympathetic readings today than the orthodox dogmas of that time or this. The reasons for this will become apparent later.

The Witch Craze

Anton LaVey's Ninth Satanic Statement reads: “Satan is the best friend the church has ever had, as he has kept them in business all these years!”(20) This formula is true on many levels. It could be made both with regard to the definitions of the actual Satan (i.e. the carnal or of the principle of isolate intelligence) or with regard to the fictional character of Satan hatched in the lurid imaginations of repressed churchmen, freelance witch-hunters and hysterical members of the peasantry and middle class.

Once the great organized heretical movements were thought to be demolished, or under control, more widespread and deep-level spiritual dissent began to take root. This would bear fruit in the form of the Protestant Reformation. Heretics, whether Gnostic dualists or pantheistic Free Spirits, were always portrayed by churchmen as “Satanic” — which simply meant they *opposed* the official orthodox and exclusively valid “party line” of the church dogmas. By the 16th and 17th centuries there were no great heretical movements or pagan nations to conquer— so the churches turned *downward* to the grass roots of society to find its victims of “evangelism.”

It is well known and well documented that the early church “diabolized” the native gods and goddesses of local populations as they converted them to Christianity. Given the

monotheistic theoretical basis of the faith this was not an altogether illegitimate attitude. The pagan deities could not be wiped away overnight—and in fact were never fully eradicated by the church. The lore, myths, rituals and beliefs of Christianity actually had to accommodate themselves in many instances to pagan practices. Striking examples of this are found in everything from the adoptions of the pagan calendar of festivals to popular things such as the Christmas tree, Santa Claus and the Easter Bunny. Indeed, pagan forms and practices survived in syncretization with Christian customs both positive and negative. The old ways were canonized or sanctified in some aspects and diabolized in others.

The *Indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum* (Index of superstitions and pagan practices) is a remarkable document from early medieval Germany (around 740). The list must represent things that were still occurring in central Europe at the time the *Index* was published. The list reads:

1. On the sacrilege at graves and of the dead.
2. On the sacrilege among the buried dead.
3. On the purification festivals in February.
4. On the little houses, i.e. enclosures for the gods.
5. On sacrileges performed in churches.
6. On holy places in the woods, which are called Nimidas.
(*Nemeton* = Celtic word for sacred enclosure)
7. On the practices which they carry out on top of rocks.
8. On services to Mercury (= Odin) and Jupiter (= Thor)
9. On sacrifices, which are given to a saint.
10. On amulets and magical bands.
11. On sacrifices at wells.
12. On magical incantations.
13. On auguries by means of birds or horses or from the manure of oxen or from their kidneys.
14. On divination or sortilage.
15. On fire produced by friction from wood, i.e. the Need-fire.
16. On the brains of animals.
17. On the heathen observations of the hearth-fire, or the ignition of these things.
18. On uncertain places, which they hold sacred.
19. On the bundle of straw, which the common folk call St. Mary.
20. On the festivals, which they give to Jupiter (= Thor) or Mercury (= Odin)
21. On the waning of the moon, which they call *Vince Luna*.
22. On tempests and horns and spoons.
23. On the furrows around the yards.
24. On the heathen meeting called *Irias* with torn clothes and shoes.
25. On the belief that they consider every dead person a saint.
26. On idols made from dough.
27. On idols made from cloth.
28. On idols which they carry across fields.
29. On wooden feet or hands according to heathen practice.
30. On the opinion that the hearts of people can be taken away according to the heathens, as women conjure the moon.

This primary evidence shows the nature and scope of continuing heathen practice. We can see that none of it is particularly “diabolical” in character—at least not by modern standards.

The shift from heresy to “witchcraft” as a basis for religious persecution was facilitated most of all by the publication of the *Malleus Malificarum* (Hammer of the Witches) in 1486.(21) It became the “witch-hunters’ manual” and was reprinted in 14 editions by

1520.(22) From this time to around 1700 was the period of the so-called “witch-craze.” Persecutions of people suspected of witchcraft and witch-trials were sporadic throughout Europe during this time. It would die down in one place only to flare up again elsewhere. Even the British colonies were not immune. From the 1640s to the 1690s witches were hung in the colonies of Connecticut, Rhode Island and Massachusetts.(23)

The *Malleus Malificarum* appears to be largely a work of learned fiction— but a deadly fantasy it is. In it we are told that witches will do four things: renounce the Catholic faith, devote themselves body and soul to evil, offer unbaptized children to the Devil, and engage in sexual orgies. Of course, these were the same literary fictions invented by the Romans and repeated by early churchmen almost 1500 years before the publication of this witch-hunters’ manual.

Now the fact that the witch cult did not exist in *reality* was far from a hindrance to the witch-hunters. Since there were no *obvious* suspects— anyone and everyone could be made suspect. This significantly broadened the social scope of the persecutions. Since “evidence” was almost always obtained under torture the witch-finders could suggest just about any wild fantasy and have it affirmed by the delirious object of his cruel occupation.

The Protestant Reformation might have held out a more rational alternative to the Inquisition of the Roman Catholics. But Martin Luther’s own obsession with evil and witchcraft, along with the Protestant cultural tendency to allow the laity to engage in witch-hunting activities for God and profit — the “work ethic” meets the Inquisition — made the newly Protestant northern Europe no less likely to persecute witches than the conservative Roman Catholic south.

What does all this mean for our purpose of exploring the essence of the left-hand path? Ironically, and perhaps unfortunately, the vast storehouse of western European imagery relating to “Devil worship,” witchcraft and “Satanism” is for the most part the invention of the church and witch-hunters. This leads us to conclude that the invented evidence is largely useless for the discovery of any true left-hand path ideas current in this period. To rely on this evidence to discover anything about the Satanism of the period would be somewhat like trying to determine the actual character of modern Satanism from Dennis Wheatly novels and Hollywood horror films.

The Faustian Path

At the end of the medieval period in Germany a whole tradition of magic arose which was associated with the name of Dr. Faustus. The tradition originated at a time contemporary with other great magical thinkers, such as Agrippa von Nettesheim (1486-1535) and Paracelsus von Hohenheim (1493-1541), and the spiritual revolutionary Martin Luther (1483-1546). The study of the Faustian tradition is best understood on several levels. There is the actual historical man, probably named Georg Faust(us), the legends which grew up around and attached themselves to his figure after his death (around 1540), and the subsequent complex artistic tradition which actually continues to grow. Without doubt, since the demise of the ancient ways in the north, this man was one of the first new masters of the left-hand path— for through magic and dealing with the Dark Side he managed to become part of myth and legend and has become thereby immortal.

The historical Faust was probably born in or near Knittingen in southwestern Germany in 1480 and died near there at Staufen in 1539 or 1540. He was born with the first name Georg (or Jorg). An early tradition changes the name to Johann(es) for some unknown reason. The name or title “Faust(us)” could either be from the plain German name *Faust* (“fist” or “club”) with the addition of the Latin ending *-us*, or it could be a later title from Latin *faustus* (“favored” or “lucky one”).(24) (It has been noted that Simon Magus also went by that title in Latin.)(25) In one primary document he also calls himself Sabellicus. This could be a mythic reference to the ancient tribe in Italy called the Sabellians — thought to be experts in magic — or perhaps it is only a Latinization of his ordinary name, which might have been Zabel.(26)

Whatever the man's name, there are some definite details of his life and travels, even if these details are scanty. He was reputed to be an expert — if only semi-learned — in magic, astrology, necromancy and all the occult arts of his day. From about 1507 to 1513 he lived and taught on a freelance basis in Heidelberg where he came to be known as “the demigod of Heidelberg.” In 1513 he was active in Erfurt— where he conjured images of Homeric myth while giving lectures to awestruck students. In the 1520s he lived in or near Wittenberg— the epicenter of Protestantism where Martin Luther had nailed his 95 theses to the church door in 1517. At least at the beginning of this time (in 1520) he appears to have been employed by the Roman Catholic bishop of Bamberg— which suggests all sorts of intrigues.

A document from the city of Ingolstadt dated 17 June, 1528 states that Faust was forcibly exiled from the city— but only after he had vowed not to take (magical) vengeance on the city leaders. It appears that Faust was often eventually ejected from cities where he made impact. He always lived in university towns and taught and influenced students there— but not as part of the official faculty. Magically he claimed to have restored the lost teachings of Plato and Aristotle and to be able to equal the miracles of Christ.(27) In 1534 there is evidence that Faust wrote a set of predictions for the German explorer Philipp von Hutten before a voyage to South America. Von Hutten wrote to his brother in 1540 to confirm the predictions.(28) During his career Faust is said to have openly declared that his knowledge and power were the result of a pact he had made with the Devil. Whenever he was exhorted to repent and return to the church he would reply that he preferred to remain loyal to the Devil because he “has fairly kept what he promised me and therefore I intend to keep fairly what I have promised and signed away to him.”(29) Shortly before his death Faust returned to his native region in southwestern Germany and was found dead in the city of Staufen. His enemies assumed he had been taken to Hell— approximately 33 years after he first came on the scene as a disciple of the Devil in Heidelberg in 1507.

In the years immediately after Faust's death legends and tales about his life proliferated and grew in magnitude. Even in Faust's lifetime his exploits were being merged with those of legendary magicians. Within 25 to 30 years of his death a Latin manuscript concerning him was written by an anonymous student in Wittenberg. A German translation of this text was made sometime in the 1570s and the Latin original was eventually lost. The German edition of the first *Faustbuch* (Faust-Book) was published by Johann Spiess in 1587 at Frankfurt am Main. Its full title reveals much of its nature and purpose:

History of Dr. Johann Faustus, the notorious magician and necromancer.
How he sold himself to the Devil for an appointed time, what strange
adventures he saw in that interval, himself inventing some and living through
others, until he received at last his well-deserved requital.

The book was immensely popular. It went through several reprintings that year and the text was exported at once to England, as well as France (1598) and Holland (1592).(30) A new edition of a *Faust Book* appeared compiled by Georg Rudolf Widmann in 1599 which contained more sensationalistic material and an even more moralistic tone. The main purposes of the early *Faust Books* appear to have been to make as much money as possible off of a lurid account of a wretched sinner and at the same time to preach with righteous indignation against the prideful excesses of the human spirit. This combination of puerile fascination and religious intolerance (mixed with a profit motive) is not foreign to our world today.

It has been noted that the books are of a strongly orthodox Lutheran bias with anti-Papal sentiments. In them the evil Dr. Faustus is sometimes contrasted with the good Dr. Luther.(31) Basically the early Faust Books were reflections of the ordinary — and still medieval — prejudices of the masses of the 16th and 17th centuries.

The Faust legend as recounted in these books became the main source for later literary treatments. In the *Faust Book* the hero — or “villain” — is portrayed as a peasant’s son who inherits a fortune. He goes to Wittenberg to study theology. He is talented, but displays unusual characteristics which make him suspect. After a while he abandons theology and takes up magic and medicine. In time he becomes a great physician knowing the secrets of herbology and drugs. (This no doubt is a reflection of the historical figure of Paracelsus.) But all this soon leads to his conjuration of demonic entities — and finally the signing of a pact with Mephistopheles. In this age when it was still thought that “seekers of knowledge outside the church were suspected of traffic with the minions of Hell”(32) it was widely believed that such a quest would be expressed through just such a pact with the Devil. This would be in the form of a legal contract in which the seeker promised his soul in return of sinful indulgence (or knowledge) for a specific period. In most Faust stories this was for 24 years.

After the pact is signed Faust is indulged in all kinds of things. He receives food, drink, clothing, money— as well as knowledge about Hell and the demons. He travels widely over all of Europe— and loves to go play practical jokes on the Pope in Rome and the sultan in Constantinople. Faust also visits Egypt and Asia— where he even sees the Garden of Eden. But Faust soon turns his attentions to love. He summons Helen of Troy— and spends years indulging in sexual excesses. In the end Faust is overcome with remorse and fear and at a “last supper” with his students he exhorts them to follow Christ. But on his last night Faust is indeed taken to Hell by a hoard of fiendish spirits.

In the first German *Faust Books* the chief sins of the magician are his “speculative” interests, that is, his attempts to discover ways to enjoy pleasures which medieval morality stigmatized as having their origins in the “seven deadly sins:” pride, greed, lust, anger, gluttony, envy and sloth.(33)

As we know, the Faust material at once went over to England where it struck a responsive cord. The poet Christopher Marlow (1554-1593) began his drama *The Tragical History: the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus* as early as 1588, probably finished it around 1590— but it was not printed until 1604. Marlow was the first to write at all sympathetically about Faust and bring the ideas of the Renaissance to his subject. In *The Tragical History* it is clear that Faustus sells his soul not only for pleasure but for knowledge and power. It is his will to become an earthly god through magic and to be able to direct worldly politics by influencing the Pope and Holy Roman Emperor. Despite whatever sympathies Marlow might have had with his subject, in the end Faustus is condemned as in all the *Faust Books*. The complete “Faustian” treatment of Faust remained for a more Faustian man to complete— J. W. von Goethe. We shall return to a transformed Faust in the next chapter.

The Faustian tradition is not limited to the historical personage of Faust or artistic fictionalizations of his adventures. There is also a tradition of practical magical manuals or *grimoires* (“grammars”) which were reputed to be the very texts actually used by the magician to conjure spirits and demons. These are important because they show that the tradition was not merely literary but reflected an authentic school of magical operations. In German culture of the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries the Faustians were not only exhorted by literature to follow in the footsteps of their exemplary model, but were provided with practical manuals purporting to tell them how to do just that.

There are a number of manuscripts referred to as Faustian grimoires— supposedly ones used or written by him. Most are in German, though some are in Latin. These were collected as early as 1846 in J. Scheible’s series *Das Kloster*.(34) They bear titles such as *Doctor Faustens dreyfacher Hollenzwang* (Dr. Faust’s Threefold Conjuration of Hell) or *D. I. Fausti Schwarzer Rabe* (D[r.] J[ohann] Faust’s Black Raven). These works are part of the same general tradition that gave rise to the *Sixth and Seventh Books of Moses* examples of which were also produced in Germany at about this time.

Almost all of these books appear to have been supplied with false dates and places of publication. The printed dates sometimes go back before Faust's time, while the places — including Rome and Vienna — betray an interest in making the magical practices contained in them particularly Roman Catholic.

The type of magical practices reflected in these books is fairly standard for medieval sorcery. The magician draws a circle around himself which is full of prayers, names of God or sacred symbols meant to protect him. Outside the circle there is a place — sometimes within a triangle — where the sign (sigill) of the spirit to be summoned is placed. Then, through prayers, conjurations and even threats, the magician calls up the angel or demon to his presence in the triangle outside the circle before him. Once there the magician deals with the entity, bargaining with it to try to obtain the particular gifts which correspond to that entity.

In essence this kind of magic, whether it deals with angels or demons, is a right-hand path practice insofar as it keeps the source of power and divinity (or diabolism) *outside* the self and the magician. In the final analysis it will not be the power or gifts bestowed upon the Faustian magician which will lead to his becoming a god-man, but the breadth and depth of *experience* provided by this magic. It is what the Faustian magician learns from his quest into the realms of the unknown beyond the limitations of time and space that is the secret of the *Black Raven*.

The legends and even the motivation for the publication of the grimoires, had a purely right-hand path bent. The creators and publishers of the material were trying to hold onto medieval thinking and philosophical morality for as long as possible and keep their societies in its thrall. One authority puts it well:

Numerous are the legends built up around the personalities of men who defied the taboos of their times and sought to probe the unknown nature of man and the universe. Their strength lay in their "magic," their power over the "right" word; their weakness lay in their isolation, which invited distrust and condemnation.(35)

The western Middle Ages were singularly inhospitable to left-hand path philosophy because of the essentially anti-human bias of official church dogmas which tended to dominate the period. The Renaissance would partially, but only partially, compensate for the cultural losses incurred during the medieval epoch. It would not be until the 20th century that the spiritual baggage of the Middle Ages could be dispensed with completely. But even now the medieval period casts a shadow that can be seen in the shapes of modern-day witch-hunters to TV evangelists. Nothing that has made an impact on the course of human culture ever seems to disappear totally. Indeed the spirituality of the Middle Ages can be seen alive and well on American cable television on a regular basis.

Notes for Chapter 5

- (1) Thomas S. Burns, *A History of the Ostrogoths* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1984), pp. 143-162.
- (2) Mircea Eliade, *History of Religious Ideas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), vol. II, pp. 387-389.
- (3) See Henry C. Lea, *History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages* (New York: Macmillan, 1888).
- (4) Norman Cohn, *Europe's Inner Demons* (New York: Basic Books, 1975)
- (5) Cohn *Europe's Inner Demons*, p. 1.
- (6) Cohn *Europe's Inner Demons*, p. 19.
- (7) Eliade, *History*, vol. III, p. 184.
- (8) Eliade, *History*, vol. III, p. 182.
- (9) Concerning these and others Free Spirit works of literature, see Norman Cohn, *In Pursuit of the Millennium* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961, 2nd ed.), p. 315 ff.
- (10) Cohn, *In Pursuit of the Millennium*, p. 172.
- (11) Cohn, *In Pursuit of the Millennium*, p. 172.
- (12) On Joachim of Fiore see Cohn, *In Pursuit of the Millennium*, pp. 99 ff. and Eliade, *History*, vol. III, pp. 108-112.
- (13) Cohn, *In Pursuit of the Millennium*, p. 108.
- (14) Cohn, *In Pursuit of the Millennium*, p. 154-155.
- (15) Cohn, *In Pursuit of the Millennium*, p. 150.
- (16) Cohn, *In Pursuit of the Millennium*, p. 183-185.
- (17) Cohn, *In Pursuit of the Millennium*, p. 175.
- (18) Cohn, *In Pursuit of the Millennium*, p. 177-178.
- (19) See Raymond B. Blakney, *Meister Eckhart: A New Translation* (New York: Harper and Row, 1941) and more generally Eliade, *History*, vol. III, pp. 197-216.
- (20) Anton LaVey, *The Satanic Bible* (New York: Avon, 1969), p. 25)
- (21) H. Sprenger and J. Kramer (Institoris), *Malleus Malificarum* (London: Pushkin, 1928).
- (22) Jeffery B. Russell, *History of Witchcraft*, (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980), p. 79.
- (23) Russell, *History of Witchcraft*, p. 103.
- (24) Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Faust*. trans. and introduced and edited by Charles Passage (Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs and Merrill, 1965), p. xxii.
- (25) Hans Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion* (Boston: Beacon, p. 111.
- (26) R-M. S. Heffner, et al. eds. *Goethe's Faust* (Lexington, MA: Heath, 1954, p. 18.
- (27) Heffner, *Goethe's Faust*, p. 19.
- (28) Passage, *Faust*, pp. xiv-xv.
- (29) Passage, *Faust*, p. xiv.
- (30) Heffner, *Goethe's Faust*, p. 20.
- (31) Heffner, *Goethe's Faust*, p. 20.
- (32) Heffner, *Goethe's Faust*, p. 20.
- (33) Heffner, *Goethe's Faust*, p. 21.
- (34) J. Scheible, *Das Kloster* (Stuttgart: [private], 1846), *Faust grimoires* in vol II, pp. 807-930; vol V, pp. 1059-1195.
- (35) Heffner, *Goethe's Faust*, p. 19.

Chapter 6 Lucifer Unbound

The Modern Age and New Understandings 1433-1900

Presaging the birth of the historical Faust in northern Europe certain social circles in southern Europe — and especially in Italy — were undergoing radical transformations. The northern Italian cities of Florence, Milan, Genoa and Bologna became the cradles of the Modern Age in that period of cultural renewal we call the *Renaissance*.

Throughout the intellectually depressed period of the Middle Ages the spiritual treasures of the humanities — the writings of Plato, Aristotle and other pagan philosophers — had been grudgingly preserved in monasteries or had been cultivated in the intellectual haven provided by a more tolerant Islamic culture. In the west these treasures were not appreciated for the ideas they contained, but only for their utility in bolstering Christian dogmas or their usefulness as rhetorical textbooks for classical studies.

In the decades just before and just following the watershed year of 1500 the western world underwent a number of “revolutionary” changes. Throughout the 15th century northern Italian guilds and trade associations had — using newly refined financial institutions or banking — been able to build up powerful trading empires with connections to the eastern Mediterranean. There they did business in centers such as Tyre, which was at the end of trade routes reaching eastward to India and China. The wealth of this new class of men and families — such as the Medicis, Borgias and Sforzas — allowed them to create a new culture separate from that dominated by the church or the old aristocracy. With this new power came new interests in pagan national traditions and pagan rational philosophy. The powerful families of the Florentine Renaissance became interested in “things that worked.” It was this pragmatism that motivated much of their patronage of the arts and sciences.

It is ironic that the most lasting result of the Crusades — the church-inspired wars designed to “liberate” the sites in Jerusalem holy to Christians Land from the Muslims — was an opening of Christendom to the economic and cultural influences of Islam and other “eastern” civilizations. The “Holy Land” remained ultimately in Muslim hands.

Besides the crusades which sent tens of thousands of Christians (including children)(1) to their horrible and useless deaths the Church had committed a number of other acts which corroded its previously unquestioned position of spiritual authority— the Inquisition and widespread institutional corruption of the priesthood and sacraments of the church. These furthered widespread doubt about the veracity of church authority and dogmas. While on the topic of that, there came such world shattering discoveries as Columbus’ discovery of a “New World” (unrecorded in the previously thought to be universal book of knowledge—the Bible) in 1492 or Copernicus’ discovery that the sun, not the Earth, was the center of the planetary system, major cosmological underpinnings of the medieval world were turned upside down. The final blow to the Middle Ages came with the success of the Protestant Reformation (beginning 1517). For the first time since the beginning of the medieval period the absolute ideological authority of the Roman Catholic Church had been challenged effectively in the west. Within a generation all of northern Europe had broken with Rome.

The early Renaissance flourished in the protected, yet often volatile and fragile, havens for learning and the human spirit provided by the northern Italian families of patronage. It was a time of true rebirth. Some were so bold as to attempt the overt revival or renewal of the pagan Greco-Roman cult,(2) but the main purpose of most thinkers was to attempt a synthesis of sophisticated pagan philosophy with medieval Christian symbolism. The dominant philosophy emerging from the Florentine Renaissance was Neo-Platonism. In its Renaissance form this philosophy was to be a pagan system of thought gilded with Christian imagery for the sake of the consumption of the masses and of churchmen. It is perhaps shocking, yet manifestly true, that the greatest art treasure of the Vatican itself — the frescoes of the Sistine Chapel created by the “divine” Michelangelo — represent Neo-Platonic allegory using Biblical scenes.(3)

The greatest exponents of Neo-Platonism in the Italian Renaissance were Marcilio Ficino (1433-1499) and Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463-1494). What was most relevant to the further development of the left-hand path in Renaissance thought was the new found stature of the individual human being and of humanity in general.

Ficino wrote an essay called “Five Questions Concerning the Mind” (1495)(4) in which he makes it clear — in keeping with pagan philosophy — that the human mind or will is able, through rational means, to liberate and enlighten itself. So far, he is only in agreement with most other pagan systems east or west which do not posit the necessity of God’s *grace* in this process. The aim of the mind could still be either belonging to the right-hand path (seeking ultimate union with the divine) or with the left-hand path (seeking permanence and divinity for itself).

Perhaps one of the most inspirational documents of the Renaissance relevant to the (re-)development of the left-hand path in the west is Pico della Mirandola’s “Oration of the Dignity of Man.” (1486).(5) In this “oration,” which was to be the inaugural speech for a series of disputations concerning his 900 theses at the university in Florence, Pico discusses two major themes: the nature and dignity of humanity and the pursuit of the “unity of truth.” In the latter he began syncretizing all philosophical and religious systems to find the unity holding them all together in truth. It is, however, the first theme that concerns us most.

The “Oration” contains a passage in which Pico has the Creator say to Man:

The nature of all other beings is limited and constrained within the bounds of laws prescribed by Us. Thou, constrained by no limits, in accordance with Thine own free will, in whose hand We have placed Thee, shalt ordain for Thyself the limits of Thy nature. ... Thou shalt have the power, out of Thy soul’s judgment, to be reborn into the higher forms which are divine.(6)

Pico holds that humanity finds itself in this world in an unfinished or *indeterminate* state of being. Humanity stands at the center of creation— it can evolve to the divine or devolve to the bestial. The soul of an individual is what is responsible for these transformations. It is precisely because of the “self-transforming nature” that mankind can be seen as noble. Man is the only creature not determined by *nature* but by *will* or consciousness, he *can* exist outside the hierarchy of nature and God in a separate order.

— “Old Nick” —

Another side of the Renaissance was shown by the first master of modern politics— Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527). His most famous book, *The Prince* (written 1513) develops a political philosophy radically at odds with the Christian theory. Instead of deriving all power from God, Machiavelli sees that dealings with God must be based on pure faith, while political aims must be pursued in an atmosphere of pure reason— in order that the rational and *virtuous* ends of government may be achieved. The morality of the means used to realize these ends is measured purely in terms of their effectiveness. The

ends justify the means. As a ruler, Machiavelli concludes, it is better to be *feared* than to be *loved*— “since love depends on the subjects, but the prince has it in his own hands to create fear, the wise prince will rely on what is his own...”(7)

His cosmology, at least for political purposes, did not place God in a central position. He saw political affairs as largely the result of the interplay between *virtue* and *fortune* (or “fate”).

The ideas and theories of Machiavelli had a profound effect on the advent of the modern world. His words have echoed throughout history since his death— as he dared to write what others only kept hidden in their hearts.

Machiavelli did not attack religion or Christianity directly, and always focused his attention on the practice of *virtue*, and “the Good,” but because he largely *ignored* the importance of the Church and God in his political theory he was seen as a threat to the power of the religion. This which may have earned him his cognomen “Old Nick.”

The Renaissance represents the infancy of the Modern Age which would eventually allow for the practice of more left-hand path philosophies. This Modern Age with — its increased interest in the stature and nobility of the individual human spirit along with reason, coupled with a new valorization of nature or physicality as the matrix of divinity rather than a barrier or hindrance to it all — led to later developments in the left-hand path.

— Lucifer and the Enlightenment —

In reality the Renaissance had been as much or more a revival of ancient things or a continuation of medieval ones than it was an innovation of new forms of thought. More radical solutions were sought by the liberated minds of the 17th and 18th centuries. Tradition of all sorts was suspect of gross error and *scientific* methods were pursued by which each individual could prove the nature of himself and the world (seen and unseen) around him. If Satan — the Adversary of God — is ever to be equated with the independent, incarnate, human mind in a rationally enlightened state of being, then it is in the Enlightenment that he finds his first home since the advent of Christianity in Europe.

The foundations of the Enlightenment rest with such thinkers as Francis Bacon (1561-1626) in England and René Descartes (1596-1650) in France. In his major work *Novum Organum* (1620) Bacon championed a purely inductive method of reasoning which challenged all forms of received or “revealed” knowledge. All intellectual or spiritual authority was questioned more radically than ever before. Descartes, on the other hand, attempted to create a mathematical system of deductive reasoning. (His most famous formulation, *cogito ergo sum* (I think, therefore I am), is in fact one of the keystones to any left-hand path philosophy. What can be known with the most certainty about reality is our existence as individual entities. This brings psychecentricism again to the forefront of western thought. Descartes himself realized the “diabolical” implications of his ideas on some level and tried for much of his life to reconcile his system with Christianity. But the genie was out of the bottle. By 1687 Isaac Newton (1642-1727) had published his *Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy* in which he presented a unified, rational, coherent theory of the mechanics of the universe as known in his time.

— To Rule in Hell —

The English poet John Milton (1608-1674) gave expression to some of the new religious attitudes and paradoxes in his epic work *Paradise Lost* (1667). Milton’s protestant subjectivism allowed him to *feel* his way into the mythological figures in the Old Testament tale of the rebellion of Satan so deeply that when he gives voice to Satan and other demons of the pit— a heroic and highly sympathetic characters emerge. This is especially true in the first part of the poem.

In the Second Book of *Paradise Lost* Mammon speaks and puts words on the grievances of the minions of Hell:

Suppose he should relent
 And publish Grace to all, on promise made
 Of new Subjection; with what eyes could we
 Stand in his presence humble, and receive
 Strict Laws impos'd to celebrate his Throne
 With warbl'd Hymns, and to his Godhead sing
 Forc't Halleluiahs; while he Lordly sits
 Our envied Sovran, and his Altar breathes
 Ambrosial Odours and Ambrosial Flowers,
 Our servile offerings. This must be our task
 In Heav'n, this our delight; how wearisom
 Eternity so spent in worship paid
 To whom we hate. Let us not then persue
 By force impossible, by leave obtained
 Unacceptable, though in Heav'n our state
 Of splendid vassalage, but rather seek
 Our own good from our selves, and from our own
 Live to our selves, though in this vast recess,
 Free, and to none accountable, preferring
 Hard liberty before the easy yoke
 Of servile Pomp. (II: ll. 237-257)

Perhaps unconsciously Milton gave voice to the Romantic rebellion against conventional moral and religious authority in the generations to come.

In part perhaps because the Age of Reason was moving away from traditional images of God, there was also a move away from the images of the traditional Devil. Bolstered by the scientific theories of Newton, a new school of religious thought called Deism arose. Deists posit that a perfect and good God would only — and *could* only — create a perfect and good universe. From this it may be seen to follow that all apparent “evil” is actually misperceived good. This is the essence of the philosophy of Optimism championed by Gottfried W. Leibnitz (1646-1716) and the English poet Alexander Pope (1688-1744) who wrote in his *Essay on Man*:

All nature is but art, unknown to thee;
 All chance, direction, which thou canst not see;
 All discord, harmony not understood;
 All partial evil, universal good;
 And, spite of pride, in erring reason's spite,
 One truth is clear, Whatever is, is right.

However, there was also a more rebellious side to the Enlightenment, one that saw the political, religious and philosophical establishment — all predicated on the Christian concept of God — as an ideological foe. These, more than most, might tend to see the image of the old Christian Devil as a hero and role model. This rebellion of reason on earth was seen by some to be a reflection of the Rebellion in Heaven undertaken by Lucifer—who could now be restored as a figure bearing the light of reason and liberty. Some hundred years after the Enlightenment anarchists such as Mikail Bakunin will also see Lucifer in this same role. (See below.)

— The Hell-Fire Club —

One of the organizations of the past widely thought to be Satanic in nature was the so-called Hell Fire Club in England. This group was repeatedly written about in dozens of books about Satanism and black magic from its own time in the 1700s to many lurid

accounts written in this century. Eric Towers in his book *Dashwood* discusses and refutes most of these in some detail.(8) The Hell Fire Club was supposed to have wild orgies and Satanic Black Masses as a regular part of their activities. The true nature of the Club was much more complicated—and ultimately much more dangerous to the establishment than mere debauchery and mockery of Popery.

There were historically two separate and apparently unrelated groups to which the name “Hell Fire Club” was attached. Only the first of these, the one founded by Philip the Sixth Duke of Wharton in 1719, ever called itself by that name. The purpose of the Club was “to proclaim a profound contempt for established morality, thought and theology.”(9) This Club met in the Greyhound tavern near St. James Square. They named the Devil himself as their president and three of the leading members went by the names “Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.”(10) This association attracted a great deal of attention to itself and was eventually banned and disbanded (in 1721) after much bad publicity. Philip went on to found the “Schemers”—a sort of society of rakes who occasionally got together for sexual escapades in the company of women who were customarily masked. This masking was ostensibly because the ladies were reputed to be of high stature in society.(11)

However, usually to the group founded by Sir Francis Dashwood (1708-1781) that the name Hell Fire Club (and most sensationalistic activities) have been ascribed. Dashwood founded two relevant societies: the Society of Dilettanti (in 1736) and the club that met near his estate of West Wycombe at Medmenham Abby after about 1751. The Dilettanti group was set up for the social gatherings of young Englishmen who had traveled to Italy. They would meet on the first Sunday of the month at the Bedford Head tavern in Covent Garden to dine and have learned and ribald discussions about their adventures in Italy. The actual name of the latter society is uncertain, but it seems to have been formed from Sir Francis’ first name as a pun on the Popish order. The Friars of St. Francis or the Society of St. Francis are possible conjectures.(12) The “Friars” group is the one erroneously referred to as the “Hell Fire Club” in popular literature.

The good “Friars of St. Francis” were mostly well-to-do local friends of Sir Francis and not especially highly placed government officials; although Dashwood was a Member of Parliament, even becoming Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1763, and remaining a government official until his death. He was a close acquaintance of Dr. Benjamin Franklin of Pennsylvania but their association appears to have been more of an official nature. There is no evidence for Franklin being one of the “Friars.” Franklin did visit West Wycombe in 1773 and at one point Dashwood gave him a copy of a draft of a new version of the *Book of Common Prayer* Dashwood had written. In it Sir Francis had deleted all references to the Old Testament and made the whole more brief. He said of the Old Testament: “[It] is allowed to be an accurate and concise history and, as such, may and ought to be read at home... It is a Jewish book, very curious, perhaps more fit for perusal of the learned rather than suited to the capacities [sic] of the general illiterate part of Mankind.”(13)

Dashwood was certainly not a “Satanist.” But what he was was perhaps more damaging to the cultural establishment than any occult antics would have made him. Like his acquaintance Ben Franklin, and like many of his Age of Reason contemporaries, Dashwood was outwardly orthodox but inwardly he was a Deist. This allowed for many divergent intellectual and spiritual views in Dashwood’s life. His interest in Classical antiquity and spiritual values is reflected in his (what at first seems whimsical) construction of Temples to Apollo and Bacchus (Dionysius) on his West Wycombe estate. Dashwood had perceived the divergent tendencies of rationalism (Apollo), and of intuition and ecstasy (Dionysius) in Greek religion a full century before that other “Antichrist” Friedrich Nietzsche did so in his *Birth of Tragedy*.(14)

Another curiosity in the history of magic is reflected in the inscription Dashwood had placed over the entrance to the Abby: *Fay ce que voudras*, Do what you will. This was lifted directly from a reference to the “Abby of Thelema” in Rabelais’ work *Gargantua and Panturel*.(15) This was, of course, again taken up by the English magician Aleister

Crowley. (See chapter 8.) The Abby at Medmenham, by the way, had been a genuine Cistercian establishment in the 13th century. The building ruins were in the Gothic style, which was further enhanced by Sir Francis who wished to have a "Gothick" — or northern — aesthetic to complement the classicism of the temples to Apollo and Bacchus.

Unfortunately Dashwood did not leave behind extensive writings detailing his philosophies— or if he did they were destroyed. But if he had it is certain that they would have been little serious discussion of Satanism in them.

The late 18th century was a time of violent and bloody revolution. In America the king of England, George III, who held himself to rule by Divine Right, by the Grace of God Almighty, was indicted by Thomas Jefferson of Virginia as a gross violator of Natural Law. On the principles of Reason and Natural Law the revolutionaries declare their enmity to the Divinely ordained tyrants of 18th century Absolutism. In the much extoled, yet now little read, "Declaration of Independence" Jefferson wrote:

When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

George's defence would be that he, as king, was placed in his position by the Grace of God— and that to oppose the will of the king was tantamount to opposing that of God.

The revolutionary Republicans of America and France were seen by the authorities as agents of the Devil trying to "import" the otherworldly revolt in heaven to the political systems of the states of the world. In principle the establishment of the day was correct, and events of the 20th century have recorded at least a partial victory for this Temporal Revolt. Revolutionary Republicanism goes against every idea of medieval Christian political theory essentially based on the Pauline formula: "...there is no power but of God" (Romans 13:1) coupled with strictly authoritarian hierarchical theories of political organization inherited from Middle Eastern sources through Roman Imperialism. Republicanism, without abandoning the pagan ideals of an aristocracy of merit, attempts to pluralize the power centers of society. From the viewpoint of medieval Christian sentiment this would amount to a "Pandemonium."

Satan was little championed among the Republicans but the authority of the Church was widely and vigorously challenged in the name of Deism and Pietism. The point of view was usually taken that Jesus was a good and noble man and teacher of great moral values and truths who had been betrayed in death by unscrupulous followers. Thomas Jefferson went so far as to create the so-called "Jefferson Bible" which consisted of the words of Jesus extracted from the rest of the Biblical narrative, which he rejected.(16) The Old Testament was roundly rejected by Deists *in toto*. The great American patriot Thomas Paine wrote a scathing attack on the Bible in his controversial work *The Age of Reason*.(17) In this book Paine lampoons the whole Christian story of Satan. After first observing that the story of Satan's rebellion and exile from Heaven seems borrowed from pagan mythology, Paine makes the following analysis:

The Christian Mythologists, after having confined Satan in a pit, were obliged to let him out again to bring on the sequel of the fable. He is then introduced into the Garden of Eden, in the shape of a snake or a serpent, and in that shape he enters into familiar conversation with Eve, who is no way surprised to hear a snake talk; and the issue of this *tete-a-tete* is that he persuades her to eat an apple, and that eating of that apple damns all of mankind.

After giving Satan this triumph over the whole creation, one would have supposed that the Church Mythologists would have been kind enough to send him back again to the pit; or, if they had not done this, that they would have put a mountain upon him (for they say that their faith can remove a mountain), or have him put *under* a mountain, as the former mythologists had done, to prevent his getting again among the women and doing more mischief. But instead of this they leave him at large, without even obliging him to give his parole—the secret of which is, that they could not do without him; and after being at the trouble of making him, they bribed him to stay. They promised him ALL the Jews, ALL the Turks by anticipation, nine-tenths of the world beside, and Mahomet [Muhammed] into the bargain. After this, who can doubt the bountifulness of the Christian Mythology.(18)

The even more radical French revolutionists were not satisfied with the rationalistic Deism of the Anglo-Americans. Many among them wanted the official demise of the Church and its replacement with a neo-pagan religion or pure Reason. More and more, the image of Lucifer and the idea of Reason will become associated as the conflict between “faith” and “reason” becomes ever sharper in the Modern Age.

In the “mainstream” of divergent 18th century thought — whether Neo-Classicist or Romantic — the invocation of a new sacred formula “Nature” usually called to mind an orderly, benevolent (or at least neutral), even “rational,” system. Whether it was the Natural Law of the Neo-Classicist or the “back to nature” sentiment of the Romantics, Nature was the New God(-dess) defining the best aspirations of an enlightened mankind.

The Divine Marquis

At least one man stood against this all-pervasive sentiment: Dontien Alphonse François Marquis de Sade (1740-1814). Although for reasons that will soon become apparent, the “Divine Marquis”(19) was not what we might call a true Satanist, he has been widely thought to have been a paragon of evil and called “Satan’s Saint.”(This is the title of novel based on de Sade by Guy Endor.) But was his philosophy, which remained immature, one on the roots of the modern left-hand path?

Philosophically the Marquis de Sade was a radical materialist. In this idea he was following his countryman Julien Offray de la Mettrie (1709-1752). La Mettrie held that the soul — or any other previously thought to be “spiritual” part of man — was in fact entirely physical or chemical in its nature. In this idea he was, of course, following the philosophy of the ancient Epicureans. He acknowledged this philosophical debt in his book *The System of Epicurus*. These ideas were so radical for his time that he was exiled from France and his books burned. One of his most important books was *Man a Machine*. La Mettrie eventually found his way to the court of the Prussian king Frederick the Great, who became his patron. Among La Mettrie’s ideas which were to influence de Sade profoundly were that the imagination — the image-forming ability — is the chief function of the soul and that there is a close correspondence between a person’s appearance and his or her character.(20) These ideas also appear to have influenced Anton LaVey.

The works of the Marquis de Sade are hardly sexual or “pornographic” documents as is widely thought by those who have never read them. They are truly works of philosophy or “anti-theology.” Every page de Sade writes reeks of his deep rage in the face of the Roman Catholic God of 18th century France. This rage stems from the same idealism which moved Deists. All theological evidence of God, be it from the Bible of pious churchmen, objectively pointed to a cruel and despotic God whose agents hypocritically claimed omnibenevolence for him. The God of the Bible and Church is manifestly wicked and villainous. But in this Age of Reason, this conclusion did not necessarily lead to the idea that the enemy of God, Satan, must be a hero. The whole Judeo-Christian tradition tended to be rejected as superstitious nonsense.

On occasion the Devil is spoken well of in de Sade's works. One passage of *Philosophy in the Bedroom* (1795) sums up de Sade's attitude toward God and the Devil and is spoken by the character Dolmance:

Had man been formed wholly good, man should never have been able to do evil, and only then would the work be worthy of god. To allow man to choose was to tempt him; and God's infinite powers very well advised him what would be the result. Immediately the being was created, it was hence to pleasure that God doomed the creature he had himself formed. A horrible God, this God of yours a monster! Is there a criminal more worthy of our hatred and or implacable vengeance then here!...

More powerful than this villainous God, a being still in possession of his power, forever able to brave his author, the *Devil* by his seductions incessantly succeeds in leading astray the flock that the Eternal reserved unto himself. Nothing can vanquish the hold this demon's energy has upon us.(21)

At first de Sade sees Nature as a neutral force—the true creatrix of the world. She is the actual *first cause*, not “God.” But de Sade soon discovers what he determines the actual meaning of Nature is for Man: corruption and destruction. This is made explicit in a passage in *Juliette* (1794) which could be taken as de Sade's manifesto on Nature. With fitting irony he places the words in the mouth of the Bishop of Rome.(22)

The Pope says:

No earthly creature is expressly formed by Nature ... all are the result of her laws ... very different creatures probably inhabit other globes... But these creatures are neither good nor beautiful, precious nor created ... they are the result of Nature's unthinking operations.

Once cast man has nothing further to do with Nature; once nature has cast him, her control over man ends; he is under the control of his own laws that are inherent in him... [T]hese laws are those of his personal self-preservation, of his multiplication ... laws which are ... vital to him but in no way necessary to Nature, for he is no longer of Nature, no longer in her grip, he is separate from her. If man destroys himself, he does wrong— in his own eyes. But that is not the view Nature takes of the thing. As she sees it, if he multiplies he does wrong for he usurps from Nature the honor of a new phenomenon... [O]r multiplication ... is therefore decidedly detrimental to the phenomena whereof Nature is capable.

Thus those that we regard as virtues become crimes from her point of view... The most wicked individual on earth, the most abominable, the most ferocious, the most barbarous, and the most indefatigable murderer is therefore but the spokesman of her desires, the vehicle of her will, and the surest agent of her caprices.

De Sade sees Nature as a mechanical creatrix possessing only the will to propagate herself. But she is limited by her own laws so that this can not occur as long as the creatures already formed continue to live and multiply. Therefore she can not propagate herself anew until the present creatures have been eliminated. When a human therefore undertakes to destroy life, to degrade and defile it, he or she is doing Nature's will.

Humanity is now separated from Nature's will and control, but when humans act in accordance with the hidden “will” of Nature, they are rewarded with pleasure *and* success. When they act contrary to the will of Nature, they are visited with pain and failure.

The human faculty of imagination is the key to de Sade's psychology. "Imagination is pleasure's spur ... directs everything, is the motive for everything; is it not thence that our pleasure comes?"(23) In de Sade's grand scheme, of course, it is the imagination which spurs man to act in accordance with the destructive desires of Nature. However, even if one rejects de Sade's cosmology, his psychology remains of interest. It is here that his ideas concerning the erotic enter his philosophy most directly. Ultimately, de Sade holds that the pursuit of pleasure is the object of human life, and that physical satisfaction is more noble than the merely mental. Happiness depends on the greatest possible extension of pleasure. This is done by enlarging the scope of one's tastes and fantasies. It is only through willful imagination that the possibilities for pleasure are extended. Social or *religious* conditioning prevents this in most cases. Finally, happiness is not so much found in the enjoyment of pleasure as in the desire itself and in the destruction of obstacles in the way of its accomplishment.

De Sade posited that there were essentially three kinds of people erotically speaking: 1) those of weak or repressed imagination, courage and desires— and who live without remarkable incident; 2) "natural perverts" — who act out of obsession which is usually congenital in origin, and 3) libertines— who consciously develop their fantasies and who set about to realize them. It is this third category, the libertines, which de Sade saw as the apex of humanity. Libertines, through active use of the imagination, transform themselves through acts of will — in accordance with Nature. For de Sade the greatest pleasures were to be found in overcoming things which may have at one time inspired fear or disgust.(24)

Whether in the sexual or more abstract philosophical sphere, the truest definition of Sadism — or perhaps we should use the term Sadeanism to distinguish it from the pathological terminology of current psychiatry — is: "The pleasure felt from the observed modifications on the external world produced by the will of the observer."(25) That this definition could serve equally well when describing the pleasure artists feel when working in their media should not be overlooked.

The importance of the "Divine Marquis" to the modern left-hand path lies not so much in the most essential aspects of his philosophy as in its reception— especially its erotic component — by Anton LaVey in the 20th century. De Sade's philosophy is to a great extent underdeveloped. His philosophical writing career only lasted some 15 years; years spent in prisons and asylums hardly conducive to the development of a reflective system. There seems to be an inherent internal antagonism between de Sade's professed radical materialism and the assigned role of the *will* and *imagination* in the process of transforming human beings into his idealized libertines. While de Sade rightly rejected as pure expedient illusion the whole notion of the God of the Church, he also saw a dark side to the face of Nature so extolled by Neo-Classicalists and Romantics alike. For him there was a demonic side to nature which he only reluctantly and sparingly would ever identify with the Devil. He was right not to do so. For that *thing* which he glimpsed seems closely akin to the substance of Yahweh Elohim— the dark Demiurge of the Gnostics and "Sadistic" creator of the material universe.

Enlightenment thought rejected both the traditional God of the Church and the Devil in favor of Nature and a perfect creator God— perfect in his Reason. These ideas are further refined in the Neo-Classical period which will again be more hospitable to images from the past— at least as literary motifs.

The Dawn of the Faustian Age

Although the Middle Ages had ended in a historical sense during the 1500s, elements inherent in medieval culture, such as political Absolutism, continued to be a part of the established cultures until the early 19th century. The legacy of the Middle Ages still continues to haunt us on the brink of the 21st century, but it is in the theme of Faust, inherited from medieval literature of the propagandistic intolerance, that we can see the cultural transformation from those times into a kind of universal "Faustian Age." Whether the pact our culture signed will have its desired effects waits to be determined.

Whenever I have the opportunity to teach *Faust* in a literature or humanities course, I like to point out a certain attitudinal fact to the students. First, I tell them of the origins of the Faustian literature. How it had been written to warn would-be dabblers in the “Black Arts” away from seeking three things forbidden by orthodox cultural authority in the Middle Ages: knowledge, power and pleasure. But, I ask of my bright cheeked students, are these not the three culturally legitimate reasons you are sitting in this class today? Perhaps for the idealistic reason of gaining *knowledge*, perhaps for the pragmatic reason of potential career advantages a degree will bring (*power*), or perhaps for the pure *fun* of learning— none of which would have been found short of sinful to the medieval mind-set. We live, for better or worse, in a Faustian, some might go so far as to say a “Satanic,” Age. By this I do not wish to imply that the times are in any intrinsic way *evil*. They are, however, times of transformation and change.

— Goethe and Faust —

The greatest single poetic monument describing the spiritual position of humanity in the Modern Age is *Faust: Eine Tragödie* by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832). Goethe was himself the paragon of the “Faustian Man” as he defined — or re-defined — it in his work. It could have been no less, because the poetic drama of *Faust* was actually a kind of “spiritual autobiography” of the poet himself. The work appeared in two parts. Part I was published in 1808 and part II, only finished just before his death, was published in 1832. But the poet actually began to work with the Faust material as early as 1770-1775. In his old age Goethe said that he worked on *Faust* “without plan and without a break.”

On one level Goethe follows much of the outline of the traditional Faust literature. But his work is on the surface more fragmentary, yet possessed of an inner level of the same coherence and archetypal unity as the author’s own soul.

Goethe was no mere poet. He was a philosopher and a talented scientist as well as a professional statesman. He may have been one of the last truly “Renaissance Men.” Beginning around 1768 he studied alchemical and magical texts intensively. But his spirituality was to remain always a highly individualistic one. A family friend, Susanna von Klettenberg, introduced the young Goethe to pietism and spiritism. Ultimately Goethe’s philosophy and spirituality was a unique synthesis of the ideas of his time coupled with his own inner vision. Throughout his life Goethe built an enormous reputation for himself through his writings. By the time of his death he had reached the level of a living culture hero of international stature.

Goethe’s *Faust* begins with a “Prolog in Heaven” in which the Lord wagers with Mephistopheles that he can not tempt Faust — the representative of all Mankind — to ruination. This exchange is, of course, based on the beginning of the biblical book of Job. Meanwhile, Faust is a highly dissatisfied man. He has attained all the knowledge available in the world— yet he thirsts for more. So he turns from scientific pursuits to *magic*. With the aid of magical grimoires he first conjures the Earth-Spirit and then attempts to conjure the Devil. At first he is apparently unsuccessful, and therefore concludes to end his life. However, just as he is about to drink poison he is startled to new life by the tolling of church bells on Easter morning. This demonstration of the depth of his commitment — to both life and death — coupled with the magical formulas is successful in bringing the Demon to him— at first in the form of a stray black poodle who follows him home.

Faust forms a pact with Mephisto unique in the Faustian literature. Because Faust believes himself incapable of satisfaction — and does not desire it — he concludes a pact:

Werd’ ich zum Augenblicke sagen:
 “Verweile doch, du bist so schön!”
 dann magst du mich in Fesseln schalgen
 dann will ich gern zugrunde gehn.

(If I ever say to any moment: / “Remain— you are so beautiful!” / then you may put me in fetters / then I will gladly go to my death.)

This pact is unlike others in the Faustian literature in that it is not based on a time limit. Each party to the pact believes this to be to his own advantage: Mephisto believes he can “satisfy” Faust quickly— so he will not have to wait years to obtain his soul, while Faust believes that nothing can satisfy him— and so he will have the Devil’s services forever.

After this Faust and Mephisto set out on many adventures. In Part I they will explore the mysteries of the microcosm— in Part II those of the macrocosm. These include the seduction and eventual moral and physical destruction of an innocent milkmaid named Margaret or “Gretchen.” (The name Margaret means “pearl” in Greek, and Goethe’s own first love was named Gretchen.) Part I ends with Margaret about to be executed for the murder of her illegitimate child by Faust.

Part II is so fantastic in its scope that it has only rarely been staged. Central to this half of the tragedy is Faust’s conjuration of, and union with, Helen of Troy— the eternal ideal of feminine beauty. In the end— after many years of Mephisto’s attempts to satisfy Faust’s hunger for power and knowledge— that moment does come when Faust says of it— *Verweile doch, du bist so schön!* This occurs while he is involved with claiming land from the sea in Holland— in imitation of God’s separation of the earth from the waters. In the end the Heavenly Host and the Infernal Legions fight over Faust’s soul. A member of the Heavenly Host, “a Penitent, once named Gretchen,” intercedes on behalf of Faust’s soul and saves it from damnation. The final lines of the poem (ll. 12104-12111) sung by the “Mystical Choir” read:

Alles Vergängliche
Ist nur ein Gleichnis;
Das Unzugängliche,
Hier wird’s Ereignis;
Das Unbeschreibliche
Hier ist’s getan;
Das ewig Weibliche
Zieht uns hinan.

(Everything that is transitory / is only an image; / the inaccessible here becomes actual [there]; / the indescribable [there] / is enacted here; / the Eternal-Feminine / draws us onward.)

Faust, an almost fluid document produced continuously throughout the poet’s life, is the most vivid representation of Goethe’s philosophy. To be sure he made this philosophy more explicit elsewhere in more prosaic forms. The key-word to Goethe’s philosophy is said to be *Werden* (Becoming) or *Wandelung* (Transformation).(26) True to the *Zeitgeist* of the Age of Reason Goethe saw “Nature” as an all-encompassing matrix of reality. For him Nature was “a reality of matter and mind, a synthesis of substance and energy, in which the *geprägte Form* [characteristic form] of any existing being was the necessary result of its intrinsic purpose.”(27) So for Goethe *Life* — or existence — was a synthesis of substance and energy “held together by an unbroken nexus of continuous change (‘*Werden*’).”(28) His primary interest was the discovery of hidden archetypes or first forms; secondary to this, but linked to it, was the observation of isolated “forms” in Nature. Man’s ability to discern the archetypes is dependent upon the intellectual or spiritual development (*Bildung*) of the individual. In this view Man can not become a fully objective observer of a continuously dynamic process of which he himself is a part.(29) This is essentially the *modern* synthesis of the ancient dichotomy of *psyche* and *physis*. It is clear that Goethe and his contemporaries struggled with some of the same questions Plato had over two millennia earlier. For Goethe the Form is revealed by its particulars, each contributing to understanding the Form.

There are, of course, many different kinds of interpretations of Goethe's *Faust*. The most convincing and eternally valid and useful, however, is one that sees the *whole* as the story of the transformations of the soul of Modern Man— it is after all the spiritual and poetic story of one exemplary model of one such man, Goethe himself. Such an interpretation would see each of the major “characters” as archetypes within a single evolving soul. Faust, Mephisto, Gretchen and Helen are all internal to the soul. The drama is the story of the complex interactions of these archetypes within the soul through time.

The figure of Faust represents the self or I-consciousness which is the complex psychological essence of Modern Man. Faust says of himself:

Zwei Seelen wohnen, ach, in meiner Brust,
 die eine will sich von der anderen trennen:
 die eine hält in derber Liebeslust
 sich an die Welt mit klammernden Organen;
 die andere hebt gewaltsam sich vom Dust
 zu den Gefilden hoher Ahnen.

(ll. 1112-1117)

(Two souls dwell, alas, in my breast, / one desires to separate itself from the other: / the one clings to the world with clutching organs / in a dogged lust of love / the other lifts itself forcibly from the gloom / toward the fields of sublime ancestors.)

This is indicative of the dichotomy of the strivings of modern man— one toward material life and accomplishment and one toward intellectual advancement. This echoes the dual nature of the “sin” of mankind reflected in Judaic lore— one fleshly one intellectual. Also, it foreshadows the two schools of the postmodern left-hand path.

Faust is a *positive* figure. He is a “yea-sayer” to life and all things in it. Yet there is — as there *must* be — a void, an unrealized *negative* space in the soul, a shadow or darkness, into which the soul may grow and evolve. This is the function of Mephisto. The demon is the contrary, the adversary, to whatever is posited— the antithesis to Faust’s thesis. The drama unfolds in the ongoing dynamic (*werdende*) synthesis of the two. Mephistopheles says of himself:

[Ich bin] ein Teil von jener Kraft
 die stets das Böse will und stets das Gute schafft.

(l. 1336)

and

Ich bin der Geist, der stets verneint!

(l. 1338)

([I am] a portion of that power / that always wants evil, and always effects the good. I am the spirit, which always negates.)

The negation, or counterforce, of Mephisto is necessary to the dynamic process of becoming. From within Faust is driven by a mysterious force — manifesting itself in his sense of dissatisfaction — and is drawn onward by an equally mysterious force dwelling outside his normal field of consciousness— “the Eternal-Feminine.”

This Eternal-Feminine is embodied in the figures of Margaret (Gretchen) in Part I (the microcosm) and of Helen of Troy in Part II (the macrocosm). These are the two aspects of the mysterious archetype that is the object of the seeker’s eternal longing. Gretchen is the earthly reflection of the ideal Helen. But through suffering Gretchen too is lifted into the realm of the archetypal— and becomes the agent of Faust’s salvation. The left-hand path connotations of this philosophy should be obvious from the discussion of the role of the feminine in the left-hand path systems of Hinduism and Buddhism.

Faust is the modern exemplary model of spiritual heroism— complex and doomed to freedom and to the quest for knowledge and power. Although some aspects of Goethe's *Faust* seem to be "Christian" in nature, neither the religion of Goethe nor the character he created out of himself could be called "orthodox." When Gretchen poses her famous "Gretchen Question"— *wie hast du's mit der Religion?* (what's your position on religion?), Faust answers in part:

Schau' ich nicht Aug' in Auge dir,
 Und drängt nicht alles
 nach Haupt und Herzen dir,
 Und webt in ewigem Geheimnis
 Unsichtbar sichtbar neben dir?
 Erfüll davon dein Herz, so gross es ist,
 Und wenn du ganz in dem Gefühle selig bist,
 Nenn' es denn, wie du willst,
 Nenn's Glück! Herz! Liebe! Gott!
 Ich habe keinen Namen
 Dafür! Gefühl ist alles;
 Name ist Schall und Rauch,
 Umnebelnd Himmelsglut.

(Does my eye not gaze into your eye, / and doesn't everything / press itself into your head and heart / and weave in eternal mystery / the invisible made visible beside you? Fill your heart with it, as great as it is / and when you are completely happy in that feeling, / call it what you will, / call it happiness! heart! love! God! / I have no name / for it! Feeling is everything; / A name is sound and smoke, / obscuring the glow of heaven.

To this Gretchen rightly replies: "...*du hast kein Christentum*" ("...you have no Christianity"). In this, of course, she is right in so far as *orthodoxy* is concerned. Faust, and Goethe, have developed their own religion— a modern synthesis of all that has gone before them.

In many ways with the modern Faust we return to the ideal man of pagan antiquity. If, with the Socratic philosophies, we say that everything in the world has its special function, and to fulfill that function is the *Good* of that thing, then Faust as the steadfast *seeker of knowledge and power* may be seen as the exemplary model of human *Good* — not "evil" — since mankind's apparent *unique* function is to gain increasing consciousness and organize increasing potencies. As long as Faust is *true to his quest* he does Good— and it is this innate truth that "saves" him in the end. He is saved by the eternal object of his own subjective questing the mysterious Eternal-Feminine.

To some extent Goethe revolutionizes the left-hand path in the west. But was he himself a lord of the left-hand path? The answer, given our criteria, must be a reluctant no. On one side the overriding implications of his great work, *Faust*, would seem to indicate a left-hand path orientation. However, his unequivocal philosophical position on the role of man in nature and his decidedly ambiguous stance *vis-a-vis* the imagery of culturally traditional "evil," show him to be a manifestation of one of the "doubting angels" who took neither side in the battle between Lucifer and the Trinity.(30)

— The Classical Devil —

Although Goethe may be considered a proto-Romantic by cultural historians, he considered himself a Classicist, seems to sum up his general assessment.

Classicism was the final flowering of the ideologies spawned in the Enlightenment— or so-called Age of Reason. In cultural history it may be said to be characteristic of the time period from about 1700 to 1800. With Classicism, philosophy and aesthetics began to return to the established *forms* of Greco-Roman ideals— but this was synthesized with the

Enlightenment concept of questioning and/or rejecting all forms of received knowledge. The paradox here is obvious. The thoroughly *modern* split between the signifier and the signified, or between the symbol and the symbolized, was complete. Things could be regarded in a much more detached, "scientific" way.

In many respects Goethe fashioned the character of his Mephistopheles after the spirit of the Age of Reason—inspired perhaps in part by the character and temperament of the French philosopher Voltaire—rational, aloof, ironical.

Because at the time of the Enlightenment and Classicism popular and political culture were still thoroughly dominated by the spirit of Absolutism there was some room in rational circles for revalorizing the "spirit of contradiction" (the Devil) as the spirit of rationality. From our virtually postmodern perspective today it is clear that here we have the beginnings of the split between the image or "sign" of the Devil and that which he had signified in the pre-modern (medieval) world, i.e. "evil." From this time on through the remainder of the Modern Age serious attempts to deal with the Devil will come more and more from the artistic rather than theological world.

In reality the true Devil, the exemplary model of magician on the left-hand path, is fully liberated again from the theological dungeon of medievalism with the advent of Classicism. The gate was opened during the Renaissance, and his chains were broken by the Enlightenment, but only with Classicism does he begin to walk the earth freely again. The true essence of this Devil is, of course, the principle of isolate intelligence made aware of this material embodiment. The Classical Devil is the human spirit exercising its freedom and rationality, its fleshly existence and sense of beauty, its objectivity and sense of humor against the grain of cultural and political Absolutism which continued to wrap itself in the armor of divinely righteous justification.

The sense of humor displayed by the Classical and Enlightenment Devil is a powerful aspect. It at once tells us that the dungeon of medievalism had not dampened Old Nick's wit, and that he remained clever enough to use his most devastating of weapons. It also points to a certain disidentification between the image of the Devil and the world he begins to find so ironically humorous.

From the point of view of the left-hand path today it is important to note that during this dawn of the Modern Age the eternal values or principles which characterize the left-hand path in any age or in any culture were in reality only liberated (and then only partially) to be able to effect some of the work they had done in previous ages of western culture.

— Satan in the 19th Century — The Devil and the Romantics

In most things the Romantics sought for the same ends and goals or held many of the same ideals as the Classicists. But they went about it all in a precisely contrary fashion. The Romantics reacted to the perceived sterility and rigidity of Classicism and wanted to infuse human life with more emotion and vitalism. The essential hallmark of Romantic thought is an inwardness (G. *Innerlichkeit*) or subjectivity. This is in contrast to the objectivistic trait of Classicism. The Romantics would extol feeling over thought. Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), the French father of Romanticism, said in his *Confessions*: "I felt before I thought." (31) Where the Classical aesthetic had praised the simple, clear, exact and complete, the Romantic aesthetic acclaimed the complex, obscure, approximate and fragmentary.

In many ways Romanticism represents the final vital synthesis of western culture. Although aesthetically and emotionally it extols the virtues of a return to bygone nights, to "medievalism," to the inner world of dreams (and nightmares)—the scientific methodology and Classical modes of intellectual analysis are not rejected totally. But instead of the physical universe being the favored object of inquiry, as with the Classicists, now the history of human culture in all its aspects, life and the mysteries of the mind and soul retake center stage.

The Classicist had celebrated the bright and clear virtues of southern European culture — that of ancient Hellas and Rome — the Romantic would celebrate the dark and misty inner landscapes of the North— both ancient and medieval. “Romanticism” is in fact such a product of the Northern mind that it has been revalued as “Germanicism” on occasion. Perhaps a better term would be “Gothicism” which the Romantics *themselves* favored at the time. With the inward turning of Romanticism came nationalism as that subjectivity was expressed throughout the organic collective of individual *nations*. But on the level of the individual person this inward turn was often manifested as an interest in the “demonic.”

For our subject the greatest effect of the Enlightenment, of “modernism,” had been the permanent separation of the *idea* of evil from the *image* of the Devil. Once this modernist separation was complete, the image of the Devil, or Satan, was liberated to undergo revalorization in the hands of essentially Romantic artists and thinkers— who in many instances proved to be powerful magicians on the stage of the history of ideas.

The Romantic revalorization of Satan, or the Devil, was primarily the work of the English Romantic poets William Blake (1757-1827), George Gordon, Lord Byron (1788-1824) and Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792-1822). Every Romantic seems to have had a slightly different feeling about the mythopoetic place of Satan, or Lucifer, in the scheme of things.(32) But there are some important themes that hold most of them together as well.

To begin with, “God” and “Satan,” or other medieval theological terms, had become essentially literary symbols for the modernist Romantics. This is not to say they were not real. At first this may seem to trivialize the entities referred to by the terms— this especially would seem so to medievalistic apologists such as J. B. Russell. In fact, Satan is not “trivialized” by the poets— the symbol is revaluated and redeemed by making it again relevant to human experience. They recognize that the essence of the meaning of human existence is to be found not in a system of supposedly supernatural laws presided over by institutionalized authority but rather in the experience of the individual heart and soul. Because the medieval mind holds mankind to be in a sense “trivial,” all things which symbolize and embody mankind and its faculties are also so valued.

The Romantics see the Devil as a complex being or symbol. He is neither all-evil, or all-good. He is a mixture of complex and ambiguous characteristics— as is the human soul of which he is perhaps a projection. Mythically the Judeo-Christian figure of Satan was combined with the Hellenic figure of Prometheus. This combination is a natural, as Prometheus is in many ways the prototype of the Christian Devil. (See chapter 3.)

None of the Romantics could as yet call themselves “Satanists,” though they were often called this by an outraged middle class populace. Essentially based on Milton’s portrayal of him in *Paradise Lost*, Romantics did make him a heroic figure worthy of human emulation. They admired Satan for his act of rebellion against legalistic and organized authority (= God) and for his sublime existence, majesty and stubborn courage against all odds. They could empathize with Old Nick.

Romantics are, however, obsessed with the concept of love. Although they could see Prometheus as a lover of mankind they still preferred to use the symbol of Jesus as the paragon of love in their mythopoetic systems. This is not, however, the Jesus of historical Christian tradition but one they claimed as the *true* Jesus. They may or may not have a basis in the evidence, as we saw in chapter 4.

While the northern Romantics were engaged in creating new syntheses and in some cases harkening back to pre-medieval mythology to explore the demonic, the French tended to delve into more traditional diabolical imagery and feelings. Early French literary Romanticism — founded by François-René Chateaubriand (1768-1848) — was highly sympathetic to the spirit of the Middle Ages, and against revolutionary thought. (It was quite the opposite in the north.) Most French Romantics remained firmly in the grip of Catholic mythology, medieval aesthetics and anti-revolutionary sentiments. Demonic imagery was principally used for its ironic impact or horrific effect. Victor Hugo (1802-1885) eventually developed a pro-revolutionary, anti-medieval position within French

Romanticism. His ideas are imaginatively explored in his historical novel *Notre-Dame de Paris* (1831)— better known perhaps under the popular title "*Hunchback of Notre-Dame.*" The Devil becomes a symbol for rebellion as well as alienation or separation from God— God being seen Platonically as the Good, or Being. Thus God of the traditional churches is rejected and replaced by the idea of infinite love. Satan is seen as an exemplary model of the human condition— mixed with good and evil.

The Romantic with the fondest emotions for the Devil seems to have been William Blake. In his *Marriage of Heaven and Hell* (1790) Blake depicted Satan as a symbol of vital creativity who struggles to be free of a coercively passive God.(33) Blake — who said of Milton that he was of the "Devil's party without knowing it" because he wrote of freedom when he wrote of the Devil and of limitations when he wrote of God — took Miltonian subjectivism one step further. Blake invented his own religion and his own mythology— and presaged schools of thought in the 20th century. In Milton and Blake we see the roots of the 20th century movement called "The Process, Church of the Final Judgement." (See Volume II.)

In the midst of all this Romanticism one of the major roots of the coming occult revival was being laid by Alphonse Louis Constant (1810-1875) who wrote seriously about the idea of true Satanism. Constant is better known under his pseudonym Eliphas Levi. He tended to portray the Devil in a positive light— when Levi supported revolutionary change (mainly in the 1840s) Satan was the rebel, but later when Levi came to advocate the establishment of law and order Satan was portrayed as the model ruler. In any event Levi's positive valuation of an occult Satan must be viewed as the forerunner to current philosophical left-hand path thought in the west.

In France the dark side of the Romantic movement developed into a variety of sometimes bizarre pseudo-catholic sects on the one side, and the artistic-literary traditions of Symbolism and Decadence on the other.

The father of the French Symbolist movement was the Romantic poet Charles Baudelaire (1821-1867). Baudelaire, himself, drew on the early American tradition of darkness found in Hawthorne, Poe and Charles Brockden Brown. His words were themselves a gateway to darkness for such diverse figures as Kurt Seligmann, Clark Ashton Smith and Diamanda Galas. Although he wrote such poems as "Litanies to Satan" in his *Flowers of Evil* collection (1857), Baudelaire could in no meaningful way be described as a Satanist. The poet was one of those unfortunate souls who believed in the traditional ideas of God and sin— and who was unable to prevent himself from committing sin.

Among the Decadents, Isidore Ducasse (1846-1870), who used the literary pseudonym Lautreamont, is perhaps most interesting from the Satanic viewpoint. His *Les chants de Maldoror* (1868) is a neo-Sadean celebration of cruelty. Both Baudelaire and Lautreamont were moved by a deep sense of outrage against hypocrisy both within themselves and in the world around them. This opposition to hypocrisy and courage to face even the darkest aspects of the human soul make the Decadents interesting from a left-hand path perspective. Lautreamont is interesting in his connection of alienage with evil, foreshadowing such modern writers as H. P. Lovecraft or Don Webb. However, their essentially aesthetic or artistic context make them difficult to study from a philosophical viewpoint.

James Webb puts the Symbolist/Decadent movement in the arts into an occult context when he writes:

[Symbolists] set out ... with assumptions which were anti-rationalist and anti-materialist, to produce anti-naturalist art. Because this approach was based on a total rejection of the world it may be legitimate to call it "spiritual." Whether it led to "Satanism," or the cult of the Beautiful, the face this reaction presented to the public was uniformly rebellious.(34)

Whereas the aesthetics present us with obscure ideas beautifully wrought, the pseudo-Satanic sect leaders demonstrate their doctrines quite clearly— or at least as clearly as they are able. Of these sects there were essentially two types, one which clung to medieval metaphysics and considered itself generally Christian and the other more in line with the Decadence of the literati.

In August of 1839 Eugene Vintras, a manager of a cardboard-box factory in Tilly-sur-Seule in Normandy, France, had a vision of the Arch-Angel Michael, later the Virgin Mary and St. Joseph appeared to him. From these experiences he founded his own sect, the "Work of Mercy" (*Oeuvre de la Misericorde*). This sect was soon linked with the political interests of the "Royalist Party" which wanted to restore a king to France— a shady operation spearheaded by one Ferdinand Geoffroi, an acquaintance of Vintras in Tilly. The sect grew rapidly, but ran afoul of establishment government officials and the highest levels of the Catholic church— despite the fact that it was supported by some local priests. The sect was declared heretical by the Pope in 1848— which only spurred its development. Vintras now became the Pope of his own movement with his own priests. Women were also admitted to the priesthood. The sect spread to England, Italy and Spain.(35)

The visions of Vintras have been compared to those of William Blake or Emmanuel Swedenborg(36) in that they involve the perception of the dichotomy between extremes of Heaven and Hell. But the rather unsophisticated Vintras could conceive of this only in terms of what he had absorbed from Catholicism. So he cannot see the necessity of reconciling the two extremes— instead he sets out to destroy what he identifies as the "church of Satan." There is every reason to believe that by this Vintras meant the official orthodox Roman Catholic Church.

At the same time, it is curious to note Pope Pius IX issued the *Syllabus of Errors* in 1864 in a theological attempt to cast all efforts toward radical social or cultural change in the mold of a Satanic force in the world. Freemasonry was especially targeted, but so too were other occult movements.(37)

Vintras died in December of 1875 and one of his controversial priests, Abbe Boullan, who had earlier that year been defrocked by the orthodox church, declared himself his successor.(38) Boullan is perhaps most famous for the supposed magical cause of his death in 1893. The "Work of Mercy" had been fighting the forces of evil marshalled all around it for decades. These forces had come to include the Roman Catholic Church, but also other occultists now engaged in what "the Work" held to be "black magic." Then, as now, these sinister forces tend to reside not in the objective universe, but in the paranoid fantasies of the accusers.

In any event there was a cadre of occultists of darker aspect active in France in the late 19th century. This group became the target of the accusations of the self-proclaimed "white magicians" of the "Work of Mercy."

The principal two occultists of this kind active in France at that time were Josephin Péladan (1858-1918) and Stanislas de Guaita (1860-1898). It will become clear that neither of these is a true left-hand path magician, nor a Satanist— merely eccentric and decadent.

Péladan was the son of a school-master who edited a fanatically pro-royalist and Catholic paper (*Le Chatiment*). The father also made somewhat of a business of his mystical speculations about the "sixth wound of Christ" (made on his shoulder by the cross when he fell on the way to Golgotha)— there was a trade built up selling religious trinkets commemorating this new found wound. His brother was a homeopathic healer and cabalist. Péladan ran afoul of the law as a protester against decrees banning unauthorized religious congregations in 1880. In 1883 he went to Paris and entered artistic circles. He held himself to be ultra-orthodox and at the same time a "magician"— by which he meant "someone who is totally in control of himself."(39) In 1884 he published his major work *La vice supreme*.

De Guaita had also come to Paris in 1880 and made his reputation as a poet and writer. He published *La muse noire* in 1882. As a result of Péladan's book, de Guaita met him in

1884 and the two formed an alliance that would last until 1890. In 1888 the two in partnership founded the *Ordre Kabbalistique de la Rose-Croix*. De Guaita was greatly inspired by Baudelaire, whom he identified as the “Satanist” poet. It seems to be Baudelaire’s use of drugs which most influenced de Guaita, who used morphine, cocaine, as well as hashish in his “occult” experiments. De Guaita also cultivated eccentric habits which drew attention to himself— he slept by day, only went out at night, his apartment was draped in red and he usually dressed in robes of that color as well.(40) Certainly de Guaita is most famous for having been accused of causing the death of Abbe Boullan by magical assassination in 1893. This accusation was probably nothing more than paranoid rumors. De Guaita himself denied it and on the contrary was on record in his book *Serpent of Genesis* as condemning the Vintras sect and the Abbe Boullan as being “Satanic.”(41) In the final analysis it seems we have nothing more than a paranoid fanatic and a drug deluded aesthete playing a game of “you’re one too!”

In 1890 Péladan broke with de Guaita and subsequently founded his own independent *Rose-Croix Catholique*— a break referred to as “the War of the Two Roses.” Péladan adopted the Assyrian title and name “Sar Merodack”— King Marduk. He began to issue mandates to the world — especially to the artistic and occult worlds — which was only fitting his new-found stature as king. The Sar conjured a highly original and creative synthesis of occultism and Catholic tradition. No matter how outre the Sar’s behaviors or theories became he was unable and unwilling to put his fanatical Catholicism behind him. It was his purpose “to restore the cult of the IDEAL’ through the depiction of Beauty and on the basis of tradition.” Péladan’s *Rose-Croix* organization had widespread influence among artists in Paris.

The Sar’s order did not survive his death in 1918. De Guaita died in 1898— blind and shattered in body and mind— no doubt an end hastened by his brand of “pharmaceutical occultism.” However, his order was continued by Gerard Encause (who wrote under the name “Papus”) until his own death in 1917.

The Bohemian or Decadent artistic movement runs parallel to the occult revival taking place in Europe during the same time period. As much as these aesthetes loathed the modern age they were utterly the product of it and their “magic” was essentially a modern— albeit a “Romantic” one. The Decadents, by using every artistic medium of communication available to them, sought to undermine the positivistic, rational-materialism which had come to dominate the upper levels of western civilization by the latter half of the 19th century. They, however, fought this battle on a field defined by the positivists— in the world of the senses.

Le Diable au XIXe Siecle:

Leo Taxil and the Anarchistic Art of Hoaxing

In the latter half of the 19th century, especially in France, the Devil had become a figure of enormous entertainment value, and a symbol of spiritual and political rebellion (especially among fanatic or conservative Catholics). “Black Masses” were performed in Paris as dramatic tourist attractions and the figure of the Devil — then as now — was always good for the raising of sensationalistic expectations. But since the issuance of the *Syllabus of Errors* in 1864 conservative Catholics also had a new impetus for considering all forms of progressivism and change as essentially diabolical in origin.

Freemasonry had been especially identified by the church as a Satanic force. Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical *Humanum genus* (1879) claimed Freemasonry intended to overthrow Christianity and re-establish paganism. A Jesuit Archbishop wrote *La franc-maçonnerie, synagoge de Satan* in which it was claimed that the Grand Master of the lodge in Charleston, South Carolina was the Vicar of Satan and that it was the intention of Masonry to destroy Christianity and establish a Satanic Empire.(42)

The two tendencies to see “Satanism” as both high entertainment and a serious threat to the establishment were woven together in one of the most elaborate hoaxes in history— the

apparent purpose of which was the exposure and weakening of the conservative cause. The means used for this operation were the popular press and popular literature on the subject of Satanism. The ironic thing is that much of the literature created for this hoax — or campaign of disinformation — or derivations from it, is still being used today in lurid descriptions of supposed Satanic goings-on.

The master mind of the hoax was Gabriel Jogand-Pages, who wrote under the name Leo Taxil (as well as Dr. Bataille). Jogand was born in 1854 and began his education under the Jesuits— but began to call himself a “freethinker” by the age of 14. He was exposed to the ideas of Masonry through a book he obtained from a friend at school. His rebelliousness eventually led him to try to run away to Italy— but as punishment of this he was sent to a juvenile prison for eight months by his father. This incident was apparently further fuel for his sense of rebellion against authority throughout his life.(43)

In 1870 he joined the military and served in Algeria. After this he began to publish anti-clerical and Republican journals in his native Marseille— for this he was convicted of, and fined for, “blasphemy and outrages against religion.” But his journalistic subversion continued nevertheless.

1878 saw his move to Paris where he founded radical journals of tremendous popularity. By 1881 he actually joined a Freemasonic lodge. He spent a total of 12 months in the brotherhood and must not have been very highly initiated— but by this time most Masonic “secrets” were available to the learned public anyway. But after his departure he “mysteriously” began to write exposes of the sinister secrets of Masonry and began to make alliances with clerical forces. In 1887 he published *The Confessions of a Freethinker* which won him an audience with Pope Leo XIII.

“Taxil” then proceeded to *create* and publish anti-clerical and anti-Catholic literature— including periodicals ostensibly emanating from the Satanic “Palladium.” First he set about fabricating the personality of Diana Vaughn— supposedly the descendant of a line going back to a union between the English alchemist Thomas Vaughn and the goddess Astarte! Diana Vaughn finished up her career as a fictional character when Arthur Machen borrowed the name for a character in “The Great God Pan.”

While creating the artificial reality of the “Palladians” and their head “Diana Vaughn” Taxil was also busy publishing exposes of the Satanic cult. In 1887 he claimed that Diana Vaughn was now in hiding from the Palladists— but could not show herself for fear of reprisals. He exhorted good Catholics to pray and have masses said for her conversion from her religion of evil to the true Church. For *ten more years* Jogand/Taxil would exploit this hoax. He had Diana finally “convert” to Roman Catholicism— and even had her writing devotional literature which was praised by the Pope himself! In 1892 Jogand issued his *magnum opus* under the name Dr. Bataille called *Le Diable au XIXe Siecle*. “Dr. Bataille” was another alternate persona used by Jogand— sometimes to whip up the Satanic scare, sometimes to decry it as a fraud. Jogand was, by the way, aided in his work by his female secretary who in fact was the actual writer of some of the “Diana Vaughn” material.(44)

Jogand/Taxil was indeed a magnificent sorcerer. He spun a web of mass illusion at the highest ranks of society for well over a decade. But right after Easter 1897 he called down the final curtain. Diana Vaughn was set to appear for the first time in person before an audience gathered at the Geographic Society in Paris— but only Jogand appeared. He read a statement to the crowd in which the whole hoax was laid out.(45) He had made fools of the masses in demonstrating that they were ready to believe the most outrageous neo-medieval nonsense imaginable!

Although apologists would try to claim that all the revelations about the Satanic Palladium, Masonry and all the rest were really true— and that Jogand had been “bought off” by the evil conspirators to “confess” that he had made it all up— an “explanation” that even further stretches credibility — a more likely interpretation is that Jogand was practicing a form of journalistic sorcery— and anarchy — at the expense of the Church and

the Masons both. He was just continuing his life-long rebellion against authority of all kinds.

The story of 19th century French "satanism" is important to us because it sets the stage for subsequent developments in the left-hand path in America in the late 20th century. The interweaving of religion and philosophy with art and entertainment would be a hallmark of the LaVeyan Satanism of the 1960s and 1970s. In the final analysis, however, there is little in the world of French Decadence of the late 19th century which can be seen as furthering the philosophical aims of left-hand path philosophies. Because they tended to hang onto medieval imagery — conditioned by their thoroughly Catholic cultural milieu — the French Satanists (of fact and fiction) actually seem to have retarded the renewal of the philosophy of the Transcendental Branch of the Left-Hand Path in the west. But at the same time they provided the heart and soul of the *imagery* upon which the redevelopment of the Immanent Branch of the path would rest.

The Red Devil

While the Satan of the Decadents and the Neo-Romantics was being manifested in the world of the arts, another image of Satan was being revalued in the political sphere. The Satan of Judeo-Christian tradition— as developed by Milton and the Romantics — was a highly suitable symbol or embodiment of rebellion in the revolutionary period of the mid-19th century. Even the materialist/positivist revolutionaries saw Satan as a hero of sorts.

Almost in a revival of the ancient debate between Epicureans and Stoics, the mid-19th century saw the growth of a new form of materialism (which had been theoretically pioneered by La Mettrie and de Sade) but which was now projected into the world of economic and political action. In essence, however, the assertion that the material universe is all that exists and any notion of a metaphysical realm is purely an aberration or delusion is in and of itself a matter of faith in something unseen or unapparent. Radical materialism is in practice just as "mystical" as spiritualism, and history has shown that it is no more "scientific" than theology and not nearly as effective.

The materialists of the 19th century were uniformly revolutionaries— intellectual as well as political — rebels. They revolted against an establishment universally wrapped up in the mantle of religious authority. God Almighty, King of Heaven, ruled there as the Czar, Kaiser, or King ruled in Russia, Prussia, or England. It is therefore not surprising that when and if their thoughts were couched in Biblical metaphors they might tend to show an overwhelming amount of sympathy for the Devil.

Whether it was the communism of Marx, the anarchism of Bakunin, or the Bolshevism of Lenin each had their special relationships with the Devil and each saw him as they saw themselves— cast in the glow of a red light. In their minds the battle lines were drawn between the spiritual and material, the bourgeois and proletariat, the "haves" and the "have-nots."

The Devil and Karl Marx

For conservatives over the past century and a half or more the ideas of revolutionary communism have been virtually synonymous with a cosmic Satanic conspiracy— from Pope Pius IX to John Birch and beyond. Before these apparent ravings are dismissed out of hand, we might find it interesting to explore the philosophies of Marx and other socialist/materialist thinkers from a left-hand path viewpoint.

Karl Marx (1818-1883) did not invent communism or historical materialism, but he was an original synthesizer and codifier of a range of philosophical, economic and socio-political ideas into a theoretically coherent whole. This ideology could then be more forcefully disseminated than had been the case with the loose association of concepts that marked related pre-Marxist movements.

Marx was born in Trier, Germany on 5 May 1818 to an ethnically Jewish family.(46) His father, Heinrich, had converted to Lutheranism just the year before. Karl was brought up entirely in the Lutheran faith. In 1835 he went to study law at the university of Bonn, but transferred to Berlin the following year where he was quickly "converted" to

philosophy under the influence of the “Young Hegelians,” a group of intellectuals engaged in the transformation of Hegel’s historical idealism into historical materialism.

Marx had planned to become a university lecturer. He wrote his doctoral dissertation on the philosophy of Epicureanism. But by 1841 the Prussian government clamped down on the Hegelian left, which caused all job prospects for Marx to evaporate. Back in the western part of Germany, in Saarbrücken, Marx met a communistic Zionist publicist named Moses Hess who was able to “convert” him to a communist philosophy. Hess was also responsible for converting Friedrich Engels, Marx’ future collaborator. Marx soon became the editor of a liberal newspaper, the *Rheinische Zeitung*, which he quickly radicalized. In April 1843, the paper was suppressed by the government and Marx emigrated to Paris. He was expelled from France in 1845, eventually settling in England in 1849. The year before, in 1848, he wrote one of his two major works — in collaboration with Engels — *The Manifesto of the Communist Party*. He was to live the rest of his life in relatively obscure circumstances in London.

In 1864 the “First International” — or more precisely the International Workingman’s Association — was organized in London. This was a federation of unions and radical organizations. Marx was able to exert his influence on this group. In place of nationally organized and loosely affiliated, vaguely liberal unions, Marx imposed his vision of an international, disciplined and federated, radical organization bent on the utter destruction of capitalist society. Because of his authoritarian principles Marx was opposed in the International by the almost equally prestigious Mikail Bakunin.

1867 saw the publication of the first volume of Marx’ *magnum opus*: *Capital (Das Kapital)*. By this time his thought had reached its full maturity and he could only defend the doctrines he had already developed. His support for the short-lived violently insurgent government in France in 1871, known as “the Commune,” earned for Marx the popular title of “the Red Terrorist Doctor.”

Due largely to the chaotic influence of Bakunin in the organization, the International died in obscurity in Philadelphia in 1876. In his latter years Marx developed closer ties with Russian communists. But before these ties could be exploited, he died in London on 14 March 1883. He is buried in Highgate Cemetery. It would be over three decades before his theories would begin to be put into practical use after the Russian revolution of 1917.

Marx’ attitude toward traditional religion was that it is “the opiate of the masses.” However, it is equally clear that he intended his philosophy to be a total replacement for religion. His antipathy toward religion began shortly after he began his university studies. He and his associates at the *Doktorklub* — the Young Hegelians of Berlin — set out on an atheistic program to destroy the superstructure of conservative authority, which they saw in religion. Although he later concentrated on certain economic theories coupled with historical materialism, the young Marx had a vision of the “total redemption of humanity,”(47) as he wrote in the introduction to his *Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right* (1844). The whole of Marx’ philosophy has been seen as a sort of “prophetic politics”(48) in which a total transformation of the world is envisioned — and then promoted.

The early ideas of Marx — in which the roots of his motivations may be found — have been analyzed as being Faustian/Promethean by at least one scholar.(49) Even the casual observer will have noticed the quasi-religious features of Marxism both as a theory and as it has been practiced in various countries in the 20th century. This perhaps has its origins in the nature of Marx’ own initial impetus during his Berlin period. All this is best revealed in his own early, pre-communist, writings, e.g. the epic drama *Oulanem* (1837) and his poetry. In one of these poems, “The Fiddler” [“*Der Spielmann*”] (1841), he writes:

Was, was! Ich stech', stech' ohne fehle
 Blutschwarz den Sabel in Deine Seele,
 Gott kennt sie nicht, Gott acht' nicht der Kunst
 Die stieg in den Kopf aus Höllendunst,
 Bis das Hirn vernarrt, bis das Herz verwandelt:
 Die hab' ich lebendig vom Schwarzen erhandelt.
 Der schlägt mir den Takt, der kreidet die Zeichen;
 muss voller, toller den Todtenmarsch streichen...
 (ll. 17-24)

Behold, my blood-blackened saber shall stab
 Without fail into your heart.
 God neither knows nor does he honor art.
 It rises into the brain as vapors from Hell.
 Until I brain is deluded and my heart transformed:
 I bought it while still alive from the Dark-One.
 He beats the time for me, he gives the signs;
 must more boldly, madly rush in the March of Death...

It is curious that even toward the end of his life overtly Satanic images were used to describe him, even by his close associates. His son-in-law Paul Lafargue said of him: "... he himself was known as the Moor or Old Nick on account of his dark complexion and sinister appearance." (50)

In the final analysis Marxism is a system of mystical materialism. He posits that history has an organic structure and that its evolution is driven not by the mind of God, as Hegel would have had it, but by exclusively material considerations, e.g. purely economic determination or human behavior and the change caused by struggles between economically determined classes in society. Throughout all of history classes of people — as determined essentially by economic status — who were without power would, by the inevitable force of the historical dialectic, wrest power away from those who have it at present. Thus the proletariat would, by the sheer force of history, overcome the over-ripe capitalist establishment.

Marx claimed that his theories were purely "scientific" or rationally based, that he merely had the clearest view of historical change and its causes. But as it turns out his work had an effect less like a prophesy and more like a sorcerous incantation. Essentially Marx' view of history appears uncannily like that of Judeo-Christian tradition— only its causal agent has been reevaluated from "God's Plan" to "historical dialectic." In the former there is an initial Edenic period, broken by man's transgression against God's law. This is followed by a long period of tribulation ended first by the incarnation of the Messiah who brings the program for salvation — the Evangelium — which is to be enacted by his earthly followers (the Church). Once this program has been spread world-wide, evil will be vanquished and a new paradise will be established on earth. The Christian version of this is, of course, highly spiritualized, while the Judaic remains largely materialistic. The Marxist view similarly posits an early period of primitive communism, broken by the institution of private property (= Original Sin) and slave labor. This is followed by successive economic stages of feudalism and capitalism. The beginning of the end of the capitalistic phase is heralded by Marxist theory as a program for "redemption" — historical dialectic — which is to be enacted by socialist revolutionaries (the International). Once revolution is spread world-wide, capitalism will be vanquished and the classless, perfected Communist society will be established on earth. Such parallels between Marxist and Christian and/or Judaic views of history have also been posited by several scholars in the past. (51)

Although Marxist theory may be increasingly discredited as political systems based upon it fail and prove to be programs for ever more inefficient and intolerant systems than those the theory was designed to overthrow, elements of Marxist thinking have definitely

permeated into popular political culture in the form of such things as notions of “political correctness.” The concept of “political correctness” (even the connotations of the phrase) stems from Marxist orthodoxy and is based on the premise that there is an ongoing struggle by a variety of suppressed groups who are at present viewed as being relatively powerless, e.g. women, African Americans, Hispanics, the physically challenged. It is their collective aim (each group individually) to wrest socioeconomic power from those who have it at present. This is Marx’ “class struggle.” Furthermore, those groups are assured by Marxist theory of fighting the good fight, the moral fight, because the historical dialectic (or the Marxist “God”) is on their side. Their morality and their future victory is assured by the very fact that they are *currently* powerless. This is why, for example, blacks cannot be considered “racists,” or women “sexists,” at least according to this theory based in the Marxist historical dialectic.

— The Anarchistic Devil —

“If God really existed it would be necessary to abolish him.”

- Mikail Bakunin

In his fragmentary work, *God and the State*, the Russian anarchist Michael Bakunin (1814-1876) at one point assesses humanity in terms of the Edenic myth and says: “[Satan] makes man ashamed of his bestial ignorance and obedience; he emancipates him, stamps upon his brow the seal of liberty and humanity, in urging him to disobey and eat of the fruit of knowledge.”(52) As Bakunin saw it, humanity — as an essentially bestial creature — was “endowed in a higher degree than the animals of any other species with two precious faculties— *the power to think and the desire to rebel.*” His understanding of humanity— his *anthropology* — held that collectively and individually the development of man was characterized by three principles: human *animality, thought and rebellion.*

For Bakunin Satan is “the eternal rebel, the first freethinker and emancipator of worlds.”(53) Like most anarchists who derive much of their theory from Rousseau’s idea of the “noble savage,” civilization and its institutions are the chief evils in the world. They must be struck down so that the innate nobility of humanity may emerge as a matter of natural course once freed of all socially determined conventions.

Bakunin was himself more an activist revolutionary than a writer or philosopher— he said “I have no system, I am a seeker.” He is said to have had a love for the mysterious and the irrational. This put him at odds with those he called “doctrinaire communists” who followed the more systematic philosophy of Marx. Both of these philosophies are, however, based on a positivistic materialism. “God” was firmly identified with the idea of “spirit,” so the Devil, God’s opposite, must be — if we choose to use this language — tantamount to the idea of matter. The property of “intelligence” can be ascribed to matter due to its “dynamic nature and evolutionary quality,” according to Bakunin.(54)

This dichotomizing of “matter” and “spirit” (or “intelligence”) is, of course, typical of the modern era. Where such dichotomies can be generated one must be accepted, the other rejected, or so goes conventional thought. All this is modern, all-too-modern. From a left-hand path perspective it is perhaps interesting to remember that ancient Hebrew mythology identified as “Satanic” *both* the existence of the flesh (nature/matter) and the presence of intelligence (as a result of rebellion).

While the ideas of Bakunin lived on in a vague obscurity — and continue to do so today among all those who oppose authority in all its forms — the ideas of Marx have had a much more doctrinaire and institutionalized history. This history was to be played out not in the industrialized capitalist strongholds of western Europe but in the still largely feudalistic, pre-industrial Russia.

The Bolsheviks and the “Empire of Evil”

The Slavs in general, and the Russians in particular, have a special place in their national traditions for the Devil or devils. Russian popular religion on the very eve of the 1917 Revolution was still a mixture of orthodoxy and rural demonology(55) — there was indeed still a true “dual faith” (Rus. *dvoeverie*). This only goes to show how

extraordinarily conservative (in the sense of holding onto archaic cultural traditions) the Russian peasant was. The structure of this faith remained virtually unchanged from the period of the conversion of the Russians to Orthodoxy nine centuries before.

But beside the “normal” culturally conservative peasants who believed in the magical power of saints (who embodied their old Slavic gods) and the powers of devils great and small, there was a variety of extraordinary sects or cults in late 19th and early 20th century Russia which must be understood in order to comprehend the spiritual dimension of the phenomenon of Bolshevism.

Most of these sects rejected orthodox spirituality in favor of their own teachings many of which were heavily tinged with Gnosticism and most of which held out the promise of the advent of an earthly paradise— as opposed to the more orthodox promise of a heavenly one. Many of these sects were rationalistic and materialistic in their ideas and prophesied a time when mankind — as a collective entity — would become god-like. Sects such as the Raskolnik, the Molokans, Duchohorzis, Stundists, Neo-Stundists, the Nyemolyaki (non-prayers), Medalyshchiki and Nyeplatelshchiki (non-tax-payers) and several others all taught of the evils of private property and the Russian Orthodox Church. They were for the universal brotherhood of humanity, the advent of an earthly paradise in the name of true Christianity. They were against the privilege of private property, the Orthodox Church— and Satan.(56)

Other, perhaps better known, sects in Russia at this time include the Khlysti (“whippers”) and the Skoptsi (“mutilated”) who grew out of them. The Khlysti practiced a libertine form of mysticism which involved flagellation and sexual orgies. The Skoptsi, however, believed in extreme asceticism and practices of corporeal mortification—including mutilation of the sexual organs and amputation of limbs. Their leader was typically believed to be the reincarnation of Christ— and sometimes the Czar would “humor” them by crucifying them on the Kremlin wall!(57) These sects compare very favorably with tendencies present in Gnostic cults from the first few centuries of the Common Era.(58)

It seems likely that the famous rogue holy-man, Grigori Y. Rasputin, was closely allied with the teachings of the Khlysti— at least in spirit. However, most hard evidence — such as his own writings — points to him being a rather naive, simple peasant in most of his outlook on life. Surely he was no follower of the left-hand path.(59) This despite the fact that he is listed as one of the major influences on Anton LaVey on the dedication page of the *Satanic Bible* and despite the popular image of him as a “devil worshipper.” Often the myth, or *image*, of a man in history far outweighs any factual data on him.

It is into this mixture of widespread popular demonology, sects preaching the advent of “heaven on earth” and cults practicing extreme forms of libertinage and asceticism that the Bolsheviks of V. I. Lenin step upon the stage of Russian history.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin (1870-1924) founded the Bolshevik (majority members) faction of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers’ party in London in 1903. This wing opposed the Menshevik (minority members) faction. Lenin, born Ulyanov, became a Marxist revolutionary after the execution of his brother who was implicated in a plot to assassinate the Czar. Lenin was later arrested and sent to Siberia in 1895. In 1900 he fled to western Europe to organize socialism internationally. In 1905 he returned to Russia to participate in the abortive revolution of that year, but fled again in 1907. Lenin returned to Russia after the outbreak of the 1917 revolution in March of that year— and led the Bolshevik overthrow of the provisional government in November (October in the old style Russian calendar). As chairman of the Council of People’s Commissars he became the virtual dictator of Russia. From then to his death in 1924 Lenin worked to establish the professional revolutionaries of the Bolshevik party as the ruling elite of the country, while suppressing all internal opposition to himself and working to spread communist revolution world-wide. One of his closest associates was Joseph Stalin.

Lenin's opponents often saw in him the Antichrist.(60) Certainly he was an "apocalyptic" figure who attempted to transform a whole culture in a very short period of time. He was as successful as he was because of his mystical vision of a primitive culture transformed into an ultra-modern, electrified, totally efficient machine. *The Machine* was Lenin's god.

Each individual worker or peasant — each individual human being — was essentially a machine, and so too was the collective entity of all workers and peasants. Lenin's inner task was to make the whole work as an efficient, perfected machine. This is why science and technology were virtually sanctified in Soviet Russia. The New Man, the New Machine — the *Homo Sovieticus* — would be created from the scientific communist programs of the Bolsheviks. These programs were indeed set into motion by the party. These activities amounted to the dismantlement of orthodox religion replaced by the new faith of Communism.

The Rites and Rituals of Bolshevism

No source informs us more about the early cultural history of Soviet Russia than Fülöp-Miller's *Face and Mind of Bolshevism* (1926). We can expect more internal evidence to surface in the coming years about the quasi-religious and even "magical" aspects of Soviet culture. It is clear that the early Bolsheviks had an extremely radical "plan," implicit in the Marxist-Leninist philosophy, for the transformation of the human species into a collective god-like machine. But *how* was this to be done in practical terms? First, the vestiges of the old system, the bourgeois society and culture, had to be destroyed utterly. As institutions the church and state could be eradicated or controlled in a relatively easy manner— through brute force. But the psychological and cultural (collective psychological) hold of the old ways would require a second phase: the institution of new cultural and quasi-religious forms to replace the old ones.




Plate 6.1: Comic Icon from *Bezbozhnik*

In the efforts of the first phase the communist youth organizations, especially the *Komsomol-League*, were instrumental. There were massive campaigns to debunk the Russian Orthodox religion and every cultural aspect of that church. The public was rationally “educated” against belief in icons or the miraculous powers of relics of the saints. In the former effort, for example, comic versions of icons were produced in magazines such as *Bezbozhnik* (“*The Atheist*”), an example of which is reproduced on plate 6.1. “Red Masses” were held in the old churches. These lampooned the orthodox faith with comic mockeries of their ceremonies. Churches were turned into museums of atheism and the hammer and sickle replaced the saltire cross atop the spires. Belief in the curative powers of the miraculously preserved bodies of saints was debunked with rational and scientific explanations of how the bodies were preserved by artificial means. It is rather ironic, but consistent with the nature of cultural continuity, that Lenin’s body was preserved the way it was— as a miraculous example of “Soviet Sainthood.”

Soon after the revolutions of 1917 the Soviets set out to create a replacement for the “opiate of the masses.” The negative campaign against religion in general could only take them so far in transforming the society. Certain rites and customs were created in the time of Lenin to act as positive answers to the human need for such things. There were rites for “baptism,” marriage and funeral.

The most interesting of these is that of the baptism, or naming of a new “comrade.” The names given to children were sometimes selected by collective action in the factory or party offices. A whole new type of names began being given in Russia— ones that reflected Revolutionary values, e.g. *Revolutia* or *Oktyabrina* (in honor of the “October” revolution) for girls and things such as *Rem* (an acronym for the Russian phrase for “Revolutionary Electrification Program”) for boys. The naming was done in a “Red Baptism” presided over by local party secretaries in party facilities. Usually children were named in group ceremonies. The meeting hall was draped in red, the gathered workers sang “The International,” hymn of international communism, and the parents swore to bring up the child as a good communist. The official naming was done ceremonially with the words:

We the undersigned herewith confirm that into the union of the Socialist Soviet Republic a new citizen _____ (here the first and last names are inserted) has been received. As it is that we give to you your name in honor of _____ (here an explanation of the socialist significance of the first name is given), we greet you as a future worker and founder of Communist society. May the ideals of Communism henceforth form the content of your long-lasting life! May you become one of those who will lead the great task of the proletariat to its conclusion! You shall step beneath the red flag! Long live the new revolutionary citizen!(61)

The Soviets thought that the new, younger generation would be the true transformers of humanity. Instrumental in this transformation of the species would be a new sexual morality. Until the advent of Stalinism there was a red sexual revolution following in the wake of the political revolution. Both marriage and divorce were made easier— with no involvement with ecclesiastical sacraments. Abortions were also easily available, but not encouraged. Certain aspects of the new red sexuality suggest possible links with the Khlysti sect— at least in spirit.

In *Pravda* a female ideologue, Smidovich, published an article on this new morality pertaining especially to the young members of the *Komsomol*. She wrote that the more primitive (“animalistic”) the rules of conduct for sexual life are, the more Communistic they are. The youth must not place restrictions on their sexuality. No female should refuse the sexual advances of a male member of the *Komsomol*. In the *Komsomol* itself orgies, called “African Nights” were organized in which there were approximately 70 percent men and 30 percent women.(62)

These institutions did not survive the development of Stalinism.

Lenin only lived to 1924— at which time Joseph Stalin (179-1953) began to consolidate his power from his position as General Secretary of the Communist Party. By 1929, with the exile of Leon Trotsky, Stalin’s hold on ideological power was complete. Stalin reinstated a high level of cultural conservatism and virtually every shred of the *avant garde* characteristics of the Revolution was suppressed. To his citizens Stalin became a devil incarnate perhaps liquidating as many of his countrymen as were killed in the “Great Patriotic War” with the Germans. Any and all popular deviations from the strict, atheistically puritanical code of Stalinist authoritarianism became impossible.

The demise of the Soviet system in the early 1990s indicates nothing more than the failure of one more totalitarian regime to sustain the common welfare. The theoretically Marxist-Leninist line of thought was utterly (if covertly) rejected by Stalin during his tenure as Soviet dictator. For all intents and purposes the Marxist-Leninist experiment died in the Stalinist purges. What replaced it was the ever-popular form of simple tyranny.

From a left-hand path perspective there are essentially two kinds of political structures. One is the tyrannical structure in which the leader is virtually deified (or demonized) and worshipped. In such a structure the only possible practitioner of the left-hand path would be the leader him- or herself— all others would have to practice the right-hand path value system of self-annihilation before the will of the leader. The second left-hand path political structure involves the relative deification of a variety of individuals in various spheres of influence. With each individual epicenter of consciousness on the perimeter of other surrounding spheres.

Both structures have their representatives. The latter structure is more complex and subtle, of course. It is seen in the models of pagan antiquity (whether that of the national traditions, Indian tantrism, or Platonic systems) and in modern organizations such as the Temple of Set. The former mode is more evident in modern movements of ideological or political totalitarianism where the leader understands himself to be the universal “god” — or standard — of the “world” in which he reigns. This is usual in many occult organizations. This is often the case among modern Satanic groups such as the Church of Satan in which the personality of Anton LaVey defined its essence *in toto*.

The question as to the true left-hand path significance of Marxist theory and practice is fairly clear. Theoretically, Marxism assumes a possible perfection (deification) of humanity *as a species*. But this perfection is only possible on a collective, not individualized, basis. The nature of this collective is determined by materialistic/economic criteria and the process of perfection is governed by a transpersonal force in history. That the human can become (a) god is essentially a left-hand path premise, but that the process by which this occurs is *collective* and *not willed* (but inevitable) takes the ideology out of any ultimate consideration as a left-hand path system. Plato or Pythagoras would have told Marx that any deification must be based on *individuality*. It is perhaps this truth that Lenin and Stalin realized in their final stages of personal development.

“Collective perfection” is a notion inherited from Judaic and perhaps Iranian ideology. The idea that a selected *group* of humans will gain knowledge, power and immortality passes into institutionalized Christianity and can be found in “political” ideologies such as Marxism or National Socialism. Such ideologies are always dependent on *linear* models of history— the group as a whole must progress through time until the advent of collective perfection (or “salvation”). For the National Socialist (Nazi) or Jew (from whom the Nazi

derived the idea) the collective is deified in terms of an ethnic group. For the Marxist or Christian the collective is determined on a more voluntary, ethical, basis. But it is also somehow "predestined" (by historical dialectic here, by "God's Plan" there). A comprehensive analysis of "Satanic politics" still awaits some future investigator.

— The Will to Power —
Nietzsche: the Antichrist

Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) is a philosopher with a sinister reputation. For the most part this is because Hitler is supposed to have liked him. This is also why Richard Wagner is an "evil composer." If they were capable of perceiving the truth, the popular pundits responsible for such ludicrous reasoning would have much more to fear from both of these men than even they can imagine.

Nietzsche's objectively productive period spanned from 1872, when *Birth of Tragedy* was published, to 1889 when he becomes either insane or divine. (After this time he referred to himself with a variety of "divine epithets" including Dionysius, "the Crucified and Apollo.) Among his last works was *The Antichrist*(63) which was a full-force frontal attack on Christianity. In an early section of that book, he writes:

What is good? Everything that heightens the feeling of power in man, the will to power, power itself.

What is bad? Everything that is born of weakness.

What is happiness? The feeling that power is *growing*, that resistance is overcome. Not contentedness but more power, not peace but war, not but fitness (Renaissance virtue, *virtu*, virtue that is moraline-free).

The weak and the failures will perish: first principle of *our* love of man. And they shall be given every possible assistance.

What is more harmful than any vice? Active pity for all the failures and all the weak: Christianity.

The comprehensive philosophy of Nietzsche is too complex to discuss extensively in this forum. His cosmology was an entirely materialistic one, and his view of man one that would be closely imitated by Anton LaVey. Man's only distinction from "other animals" is his ability to build "horizons"— to overcome limitations imposed upon him and which he imposes on himself.

Most mysterious of Nietzsche's ideas is his doctrine of Eternal Recurrence— *ewige Wiederkehr*.(64) It was *this* idea which he himself thought was the essence of his teaching. Three ideas — the Will to Power, the Overman and Eternal Recurrence — are bound together in a Mysterious triad. Recurrence is the law, Will is the method and the Overman the aim.

Nietzsche saw himself, and those who would *understand* him, as "Hyperboreans" — those of the ultimate north — ones separated from the rest of humanity by their characters. They are to be *Übermenschen*— "over-men," those who have "overcome by going-under" (See *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* Prologue 1.) Nietzsche's philosophy is based on the force of the empowerment of the individual Will, or consciousness. It is a philosophy of *Diessseitigkeit*— "this-sided-ness." It is the individual, carnal ego which is to empower its will in order to become the *Übermensch*. This evolution into the Overman — this "self-deification" — takes place under the direction of the Will. Essential to the *technique* of Nietzsche's active philosophy is the *Umwertung aller Werte*: "the Revaluation of all Values." This virtually defines a modern school of secular antinomianism instituted for the sake of the evolution of the Will into a unique and potent entity.

Obviously many of Nietzsche's ideas correspond to the philosophy of the left-hand path. That which seems to be lacking is a theory of "magic" and a system of "initiation." But his ideas were to be developed in this direction by such magical philosophers as

Aleister Crowley (who seems to have based his philosophy on Nietzsche's Will to Power), P. D. Ouspensky, Gregor A. Gregorius and Anton LaVey.

From the time of the Renaissance, the dawn of the Modern Age, there has been a steady development toward secularization, rationalism, and even materialism within the establishment of western culture. This has manifested itself in everything from the growth of free-trade capitalism, to representational democracy, to "secular humanism," to Marxist political theory. But at the same time during the course of the most recent and accelerated phase of modernism (from about 1880 to the present) there has been a growing "occult revival" running below the surface of established norms. In this counter-cultural phenomenon the keys to the current manifestations of the left-hand path can be found. It will be found too that these keys help unlock many mysteries housed in the establishment culture which were in many cases spawned from intersections of modernist rationalism and occultist magic and mysticism.

Notes for Chapter 6

(1) The so-called Children's Crusade occurred in 1212 CE and involved the rounding up of thousands of children to be sent to "fight" in the Holy Land (they would be invulnerable in battle because of their innocence). Merchants hired to transport the boys and girls took them from Marseille to Alexandria, where they were sold into slavery.

(2) On the revival of paganism in the Renaissance, see Jean Seznec, *The Survival of the Pagan Gods* (New York: Harper and Row, 1953).

(3) William Fleming, *Arts and Ideas* (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1986, 7th ed.), pp. 221-223.

(4) Printed by Ernst Cassirer, et al. eds. *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), pp. 193-212.

(5) See Cassirer, *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man*, pp. 223-254.

(6) Cassirer, *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man*, p. 225.

(7) Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince*. trans. T. G. Bergin. (Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson, 1947), p. 50.

(8) Eric Towers, *Dashwood: The Man and the Myth* (Wellingborough, UK: Crucible, 1986), pp. 13-21; 231-246.

(9) Mark Blackett-Ord, *Hell-Fire Duke: The Life of the Duke of Wharton* (Windsor Forest, UK: Kensal Press, 1982), p. 46.

(10) Blackett-Ord, *Hell-Fire Duke*, pp. 44ff.

(11) Towers, pp. 130-131)

(12) Towers, *Dashwood*, p. 148.

(13) Towers, *Dashwood*, pp. 219-220.

(14) Towers *Dashwood*, pp. 160ff.

(15) Towers, *Dashwood*, p. 146.

(16) Thomas Jefferson, *The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth [= The Jefferson Bible]* (St. Louis: N. D. Thompson, 1902).

(17) Thomas Paine, *The Age of Reason* (Buffalo, NY: Prometheus, 1984. [1794-1795]).

(18) Paine, *Age of Reason*, p. 15.

(19) See Jean Paulhan's introduction to *The Marquis de Sade: The Complete Justine, Philosophy in the Bedroom* (New York: Grove, 1966), pp. 8-11.

(20) Geoffrey Gorer, *The Life and Ideas of the Marquis de Sade* (London: Peter Owen, 1953, 2nd ed.), pp. 89-96.

(21) De Sade, *Philosophy in the Bedroom*, pp. 211-212.

(22) Marquis de Sade, *Juliette* (New York: Grove, 1968), pp. 765-798.

(23) For a discussion of this passage see Gorer, *Life and Ideas of the Marquis de Sade*, p. 180.

(24) See Gorer, *Life and Ideas of the Marquis de Sade*, p. 171-185.

(25) Gorer, *Life and Ideas of the Marquis de Sade*, p. 187.

(26) R-M. S. Heffner, et al. eds, *Goethe's Faust* (Lexington, MA: Heath, 1954), p. 31.

(27) Heffner, *Goethe's Faust*, p. 30.

(28) Heffner, *Goethe's Faust*, p. 31.

(29) Heffner, *Goethe's Faust*, p. 31.

(30) See Emma Jung, *The Grail Legend* (Boston: Sigo, 1986), pp. 150-151.

(31) Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Confessions* (New York: Colonial, 1935).

(32) Jeffery B. Russell, *Mephistopheles* (Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986), pp. 168-213.

(33) June Singer, *The Unholy Bible* (New York: Putnam, 1970).

(34) James Webb, *The Occult Underground* (La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1974), p. 163.

(35) Henry T.F. Rhodes, *The Satanic Mass* (Secaucus, NJ: Citadel, [1954]), pp. 156-162.

(36) Rhodes, *Satanic Mass*, p. 164.

(37) Webb, *Underground*, p. 141-144.

(38) Webb, *Underground*, p. 156.

(39) Webb, *Underground*, p. 169.

- (40) Webb, *Underground*, pp. 173-174.
- (41) Rhodes, *Satanic Mass*, p. 169.
- (42) Webb, *Underground*, p. 144.
- (43) Rhodes, *Satanic Mass*, pp. 194 ff.
- (44) Rhodes, *Satanic Mass*, p. 212.
- (45) Rhodes, *Satanic Mass*, pp. 209-213.
- (46) Isiah, Berlin, *Karl Marx* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 21-22.
- (47) Neal Riemer, *Karl Marx and Prophetic Politics* (New York: Praeger, 1987), p. 64.
- (48) See Riemer, *Karl Marx and Prophetic Politics*, 1-20.
- (49) Leszek Kolakowski, *Main Currents of Marxism: I: The Founders*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), pp. 409; 412; 414.
- (50) Berlin, *Karl Marx*, p. 229.
- (51) Riemer, *Karl Marx and Prophetic Politics*, p. 11-12.
- (52) Michael Bakunin, *God and the State* (New York: Dover, 1970), p. 10.
- (53) Bakunin, *God and the State*, p. 10.
- (54) Bakunin, *God and the State*, pp. 12-13.
- (55) Sergei M. Kravchinsky, *The Russian Peasantry: Their Agrarian Condition, Social Life, and Religion*. Westport, CT: Hyperion, 1977 [1888], pp. 57-71.)
- (56) René Fülöp-Miller, *The Mind and Face of Bolshevism* (London: Putnam, 1927), pp. 100-121.
- (57) These are reviewed by Fülöp-Miller, *The Mind and Face of Bolshevism* in a chapter on sectarianism. See also the lurid account by Charles Lefebure, *The Blood Cults* (New York: Ace, 1969), pp. 100-105.
- (58) Benjamin Walker, *Gnosticism* (Wellingborough, UK: Aquarian, 1983), p. 183-184.
- (59) See Colin Wilson, *Rasputin* (Secaucus, NJ: Citadel, 1964).
- (60) Fülöp-Miller, *Mind and Face of Bolshevism*, p. 29.
- (61) Fülöp-Miller, *Mind and Face of Bolshevism* pp. 258-259.
- (62) Fülöp-Miller, *Mind and Face of Bolshevism*, pp. 265-266.
- (63) Walter Kaufman, *The Portable Nietzsche* (New York: Viking, 1954), pp. 565-656.
- (64) Walter Kaufman, *Nietzsche* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), pp. 307-333.

Chapter 7

An Interlude in the Absolute Elsewhere: Adolf Hitler and the Modern Mythologizing of Evil

In western culture during this latter part of the 20th century no other man is personally more identified with the idea of *evil* than Adolf Hitler, no symbol more emblematic of evil than the swastika, and no organized body of men more vilified than the "Nazis." In fact it often seems as if Hitler has replaced Satan as the very image of evil in our popular culture. This, to be sure, is in the great historical sweep of things nothing but a passing fad, but it is a present collectively subjective reality.

The origin of this image lies in war-time propaganda produced during and just at the close of the Second World War. Books such as Lewis Spence's *The Occult Causes of the Present War* make claims such as: "From the first Germany has been a region favorable to the suggestions of the powers of evil." (p. 20) Spence goes on to write chapters with titles such as "The Satanic Element in Nazism," "The Satanic Power in Old Germany," "The Satanic Power in Modern Germany," and "Nazism and Satanism." Each chapter contains assertions whose shrillness is exceeded only by their vagueness and obscurity— few written or verifiable sources are ever cited for Spence's information about the Satanic Church that has supposed to have been in control of Germany since time immemorial. But after all none is needed because the work is a work of pure war-time propaganda.

A whole modern mythology of "Nazi Occultism" grew up in the years after the war. This mythology had as its common denominator that the National Socialists were somehow really and truly in cahoots with the Devil in one guise or another and involved in all manner of occult goings on.

The "occult classic" of the 1960s *Le matin du magiciens* (translated into English as *The Morning of the Magicians*) by Louis Pauwels and Jacques Bergier set things in motion with a chapter entitled "A Few years in the Absolute Elsewhere." The contents of this chapter can best, and most charitably be described as an effort in modern mythologizing. Few objective facts are present.

Then in the early 1970s a writer named Trevor Ravenscroft wrote a book entitled *The Spear of Destiny*, which was largely based on the ideas of his teacher Walter Johannes Stein. In an apparently learned style Ravenscroft weaves a tale of reincarnation and evil in which Adolf Hitler is the reincarnation of a historical personage, Landulf II, who was in turn the figure upon whom the character of Clinschor/Klingsor was based in the Parzival/Parsifal legend. The Spear of Destiny, it seems is supposedly the spear used by Longinus to pierce the side of Jesus as he hung on the cross. Because this spear thrust was necessary to fulfill biblical prophecies concerning the divinity of Jesus, it is said that Longinus held the fate of the world in his hands with that spear. So too will any man who holds the spear. It is a talisman of world power. Hitler saw it in its home in the Hofburg in Vienna, and had it brought to Germany after the annexation of Austria by Germany in 1936. Indeed, this spear has many legends attached to it. Including perhaps that of Longinus. However, it can not have been that spear in fact. The spear in question is not of

Roman origin, in fact it was not made until around 700 AD, and is certainly of Longobardic manufacture. (The spear was the royal scepter of the Germanic kings, and the symbolic magical weapon of their high god, Woden.)

Ravenscroft, and perhaps Stein, are shown to have created "facts" out of thin air on many occasions.(1) *The Spear of Destiny*, to put it as charitably as possible, is a work of "poetic" history and/or cosmic propaganda. But its story seemed so compelling that it spawned a whole new wave of "occult Nazi" books, such as *The Occult Reich* (1974), *The Occult and the Third Reich* (1974) and *Satan and Swastika* (1976).

Each of these works has some pet theory to espouse as to just why and how the Nazis were mixed up with "dark forces." The only work to make any sense of this period is Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke's study *The Occult Roots of Nazism*. Its only somewhat occult concept is a thinly disguised Marxist theoretical base, but that does not obstruct the facts nearly so markedly as the theories abounding in the other works.

The Facts Behind the Mythos

But why, if the Nazis were not actually involved in the Satanic affairs the propagandists and popularizing occult writers would have you believe, is such mythologizing so appealing and why does it continue to "sell" so well? One of the reasons is that the Nazis did play the role of villains so well— at least as villains were supposed to appear to the Anglo-American world. They wore austere uniforms and had great rituals and indulged in celebrations of vital existence— and were just all very intense. To argue that their practice of exterminating whole populations somehow made them "diabolical" in any traditional sense is absurd. Otherwise we would also have to classify the Roman Catholic Church as being equally "diabolical." That the acts of the Nazis were somehow historically unique is equally absurd— the Stalinists, the Ethiopian Communists, the Khemer Rouge and dozens of other parties, factions and states have carried out similar programs in this century alone.

No, there is something archetypal about the *style* of the Nazis that makes them so singular. This is then combined with a philosophy which is a curious mixture of the barbaric, the medieval Christian and the futuristic scientific to give rise to an image which is singularly out of step with the norms of the 20th century.

Nazi Irrationalism and Paganism

Although among the top Nazi leaders only Himmler and Rudolf Hess ever resigned from their Christian Church affiliations, it is widely believed that the Nazis were heavily involved in neo-Germanic religion (tantamount to diabolism in orthodox Christian circles). This was not really the case.

For many decades Germany had been swept up in a neo-Romantic fever for things *Germanic*. Wagner's operas, especially the *Ring of the Nibelung* tetralogy and *Parsifal*, were the rage, Guido von List and others had instituted a new runic mysticism,(2) neo-Germanic religious and cultural groups were springing up all over Germany and Austria from the late 19th through the early 20th century.(3)

The fact is the God of Hitler was *not* Satan or Wotan. When Hitler spoke of his own religious conceptions he spoke entirely in terms of a Christian God (as he understood it). All of Hitler's expressions concerning religion have been collected by Manfred Ach and Clemens Pentrop in their book *Hitlers Religion* (1977). He tolerated — and used — the widespread neo-heathenism in Germany because he thought it provided "unrest" in the populace— unrest which he could use to his own ends. "... These professors and obscure men who found their Nordic religions corrupt the whole thing for me." (4) This is the *documented* reality of the personal attitude of Hitler toward neo-heathen religion. He could hardly be called a Satanist or Wotanist!

As we will see later, the Nazis attempted to institutionalize a new religion based on Party doctrines and given shape by religious and magical pageantry with symbolism drawn from the established churches, but also from Imperial Rome and what they knew of ancient

Germanic cult. It appears that the deeper into the core of the Nazi hierarchy one went the more “pagan” or “magical” things became.

Nazi Medievalism and Science

But the motivating factors for the Nazis’ actions are not rooted in magical or pagan ideas— they are rooted in the hatreds and fears first conjured in the Christian Middle Ages. The obsession with the Jews and the belief that they were agents of evil in the midst of the good folk of Germany — and ultimately responsible for every social, political and economic ill suffered by the people — is a thoroughly medieval one. Such ideas were part and parcel of establishment thinking in the Christian Middle Ages. The only direct root for Nazi enmity toward the Jews is in the medieval Christian hatred of them as “Christ killers.” The only modern addition to this is that the Nazis now added to the theological argument for the Jews being an “evil race” (an idea Christian Church Fathers introduced) scientific and pseudo-scientific arguments stemming from Darwinist and even Theosophical doctrines.

A careful study of all the facts regarding the true nature of Nazi ideology reveals that the whole “Occult Nazi Mythos” is bogus in character, and misses the whole point of any real Black Magical, or left-hand path aspects that might have been occurring in the National Socialist movement. For the most part the Nazis thought of themselves as being on the on the side of Nature, and their mission was seen as being an entirely “hygienic” one— they would rid Nature and the world of its diseased and degenerate segments and cultivate and nurture the healthy and wholesome wherever they could find it.

Final answers on the actual character of any occult or magical practices undertaken by the Nazis are impossible to arrive at because the records of these, if they ever existed, would have been destroyed at or before the end of the war. In the absence of any hard evidence, we are reduced to inconclusive speculations. The records of Nazi investigations into occult, religious and magical matters that we have can be found in the archive in Koblenz, and in the Library of Congress where photographic copies of that material are stored. A review of that material shows no traces of Satanism or black magic in the usual sense.

The Life of Adolf Hitler — The Wolf Unbound —

Hitler — whose nick name, or code-name was “Wolf” — was born in Braunau am Inn, Austria on 20 April 1889. The given name “Adolf” means “the Noble Wolf.” Evidence indicates a troubled childhood in an authoritarian household. He left school when he was 16 dreaming of becoming a painter. In 1907 he made his way to Vienna where he led a bohemian life-style until 1913.

It was in this Viennese milieu that he received his education in politics and in the racial and perhaps mystical doctrines that would shape his future philosophy. Of course, the hatred of the Jews and the Marxists was an important part of this world view. It was at this time that he was exposed to the doctrines of Lanz von Liebenfels, and perhaps also Guido von List.

In 1913 Hitler moved to Munich, Germany. Shortly thereafter war broke out in Europe and he joined the German army and served courageously on the front. After the war he worked as a domestic spy for the German army. He ended up joining one of the groups he was supposed to investigate — the German Workers’ Party — which had about 40 members at the time. The party soon thereafter changed its name to the National Socialist German Workers Party, colloquially known at the “Nazis.” By 1921 Hitler had been elected chairman of the party and had personally chosen its symbol: the swastika or *Hakenkreuz*.

By November 1923 Hitler's party and other nationalist groups were ready to try to conduct a Putsch against the Bavarian government. In the resulting street battle 16 of the Nationalists were killed and the *Putsch* failed. Hitler was arrested and sentenced to prison. While in Landsberg prison he dictated his book *Mein Kampf* to his associate Rudolf Hess. There he also underwent a personal transformation from a rabblouser into a cunning politician.

After nine months in prison he was released. By 1926 he had rebuilt the disintegrated NSDAP. From that time to his final election as Chancellor of Germany in January of 1933 Hitler undertook a relentless campaign of political organization. Once in power he consolidated that power through various maneuvers until he was absolute dictator of Germany by the next year.

Subordinates Heinrich Himmler, Hermann Goering, Josef Goebbels and to a lesser extent Alfred Rosenberg were allowed to control certain aspects or segments of the new, or "Third Reich."

By 1935 Hitler had begun to build up German military power and in 1938 Austria was finally made a part of Greater Germany. He met with success after success in domestic and foreign affairs. The outside world, as well as the Germans seemed to both fear and admire him.

In September of 1939 the Germans invaded Poland using *Blitzkrieg* tactics— and the Second World War was underway. For the first three years of the war, from late 1939 to mid-1942, the Germans were virtually unstoppable. But from the middle of 1942, with the Americans now in the war, the Germans began to suffer defeat after defeat on both the eastern and western fronts. The final moments came for Hitler when he committed suicide in his bunker in Berlin on *Walpurgisnacht*, 1945, with the Red Army entering the now all but flattened city above.

The Life of Heinrich Himmler — Lord of the Black Knights —

Himmler was born 7 October 1900 in Munich. His father was a pious Roman Catholic school teacher. He served in the German army just at the end of the First World War and from 1918 to 1922 attended the Munich Technical University. During his less than successful business career after this time, he became involved with a nationalist organization and participated in the 1923 *Putsch* led by Hitler and the NSDAP. From 1925 to 1930 he was propaganda leader of the Party, and in 1929 was named leader of the *Schutzstaffel* (SS)— the at that time 200-man body guard of the *Führer*. By 1933 SS membership stood at 52,000.

Himmler envisioned the SS as an elite corps of modern knighthood— who would serve as the cutting edge in the generation of the long awaited superman, or master race. This SS superman would be leader, scholar, warrior and administrator all in one.

The *Reichsführer-SS* was given progressively greater powers during the National Socialist reign. He became the supreme commander of a private army, the *Waffen SS*, was given complete control of all the eastern territories occupied by the German *Reich* and eventually became the head of all political and state police forces both inside and outside Germany.

The center of Himmler's world-wide SS empire was to be Castle Wewelsburg in Westphalia. There the SS was to have its magical headquarters where the knights of his order would be educated and trained, and where they would hold their rites of chivalry. Other castles, called *Ordensburgen* ("order-castles") were also instituted.

The branch of the SS most responsible for its reputation as an "occult order" is the *Ahnenerbe* ("ancestral heritage") which was instituted to study ancient Germanic culture and religion, including runes, astronomy, architecture and other occult traditions with which Himmler was fascinated.

Himmler's SS became a "state within a state" in Nazi Germany. At the end of the war Himmler attempted to negotiate separately with the Allies in the west in hopes of stabilizing that region so he could carry on the fight in the east. In the final moments of the war when Hitler found out about Himmler's actions the *Führer* denounced him and removed him from his official positions. Shortly after Himmler was captured by the Allies in the west, he committed suicide by means of a poison capsule on 23 May 1945.

Sources for the Study of the Nazis and Magic

The major primary sources for the study of the magical or religious aspects of the National Socialist movement in Germany would be the Ahnenerbe archives, as well as the many official publications of the SS, the Rosenberg Office and other branches of the NSDAP. The most valuable secondary studies have been provided by Klaus Vondung (1971), Michael Kater (1974) and Ulrich Hunger (1984). The roots of what was to become, at least in part, the NS ideology can be studied in the works of Lanz von Liebenfels, Guido von List, and dozens of others. It must be stressed, however, that these neo-Romantic mystics were not "Nazis," nor were their ideologies identical to those of the later Nazis. Some of their ideas were simply used by the founders and developers of NS ideology. One of the most important studies of this aspect is Wilfried Daim's *Der Mann, der Hitler die Ideen gab*. (1958). This is an exhaustive treatment of Lanz von Liebenfels and his possible influences on Nazi ideology.


— Nazi Cosmology —

The cosmology underlying Nazi ideology is reminiscent of Manichaen dualism. The important factor is that there is an ongoing *conflict* in the world— a conflict between the forces of darkness and evil (embodied in the subhuman species of mankind) and the forces of light and good (embodied in the embattled Aryan). The Aryan is good, not by virtue of his actions or beliefs but by his very nature and organic essence. By the same token the subhumans are evil by reason of their organic inferiority. The cosmic struggle is an organic one between subhumans whose agenda it is to destroy the human Aryan race before it has a chance to evolve into the superhuman race of the future.

The idea of *conflict* is essential to Nazi cosmology. This is why the apparently pseudo-scientific theories of Hans Hörbiger concerning cosmic fire and ice were so attractive.

Many believed that the Aryan man had a "divine spark" which was more evident in ancient times, but that this spark had become clouded, and under the influence of Judaized Christian culture backward steps were taken in the evolution of the superman. On the most magical level the National Socialist agenda was to aid this further evolution of the *Volk* (the most advanced of the Aryan race, the Germanics). Instead of the economically driven historical dialectic of the Marxists the Nazis had an organically (nationally) determined evolutionary dialectic. The end result would, however, be similar in both cases. There would be on earth a paradise ruled by a perfected species of man. For the Marxist this would be achieved through revolution, "education" and strict planning of the economy— providing for all the material wants of the people. For the Nazi this paradise would be brought about through conquest, hygiene, and eugenics— selective breeding leading to the evolution of the superman. In both the case of Marxism and National Socialism, the cosmological model is probably evolved from the Judeo-Christian model. Table 7:1 comparatively shows the cosmological relationships among these ideologies.

Table 7:1 The Judeo-Christian, National Socialist and Marxist Cosmologies(5)



Nazi Methodology

We can speak of a form of Nazi magic with a definite aim—the divination of the *Volk*. Its methodology is, however, something other than what many books on “occult Nazism” might lead one to believe. Attempts to attach Nazi magical methods with those of mainstream western occultism—Crowley, Gurdjieff, and so on, completely miss the mark. Nazi magic is rooted entirely in an organic model. There is a mysterious element, a hidden or occult component, that goes beyond established genetic sciences. Poetically or mystically this might be referred to as “the blood,” but more analytical minds might want to designate it as some particular DNA pattern.

The methods described here must be interpreted as “magical” because they are intended to cause changes in conformity with will and they are making use of theories that exceed, or stand outside of, the established science of their day or ours.

Four main magical methods are used: hygiene, eugenics, war and ritual. Each supports the other, makes the other possible and each is necessary until the final perfection of the superman has been achieved.

Hygiene is the maintenance of health and the prevention of disease. In the magico-racialist sense used here it is the maintenance of purity and the prevention of further mixed breeding between “Aryans” and “non-Aryans.” This became the object of laws established

in Germany in 1935, the so-called Nuremberg Laws. This hygienic stage — which is essentially an operation to separate the “good” from “evil” — is somewhat passive. It only “restores health and prevents disease.”

Beyond the hygienic stage is the more active eugenic stage. With eugenics the work becomes one of actually improving, or evolving the *Volk* (now *elected* through hygienic measures) into the willed object of the operation. This more complex and delicate phase of the method was only partially undertaken in the Nazi regime. Eugenics attempts to select specimens for reproduction which display elements most similar to the aimed for resultant form.

Himmler indeed envisioned establishments which would correspond to the much invoked horror of “breeding camps.” Although his version would have sounded much more “romantic.” Programs such as the *Lebensborn* (“Well of Life”) were designed to ensure that Aryan women had Aryan children, and that Aryan orphans would have shelter and safe haven from the war. SS men were chosen for their racial characteristics, and German women were encouraged to have children by them (as many as possible) before they were sent off to war (probably to die). In this way the racial stock was not only maintained but improved since the offspring would be those of brave warriors.

War and conflict is important to the whole process for a number of reasons. War is necessary to protect and defend the Aryan racial stock and to help destroy subhuman genetic elements which threaten it now, or may threaten it in the future. War and conflict of all kinds helps to harden the basic Aryan stock and select out of that stock the fittest and most powerful. War can be the final proving ground — in an objective way — for the superiority of the superman. Also war is in and of itself a kind of meta-ritual— which organizes and focuses the attention of a whole culture on an enormous undertaking. This is obviously necessary when one is trying to revolutionize a culture at the root level— this was true for Marxist revolutionary societies as well. If there is no war really going on, one needs to be created in fact or in propagandistic fiction.

The importance of ritual and spectacle, public and private, is obvious to anyone who has seen films of Nazi rallies, parades, and so on. The National Socialists were modern masters of symbolism and ritual— what would be called Lesser (Black) Magic in left-hand path circles today. (Nowadays only rock concerts and sports events remain as pathetic attempts at this kind of spectacle.)

The ritual was necessary to focus attention on the cause and shape and nature of the cause on a day in, day out basis. As individuals can be transformed by rituals, whole cultures can also be metamorphosed through collective participation in such rituals. Even marginally effective ones, if repeated often and long enough, will have some result. But it may take only one good jolt from a highly potent rite to have a profound and lasting effect. The Nazis used both kinds.

The Rituals of Nazism

Although the NSDAP and all its various groupings, such as the SS and the Hitler-Youth, had many kinds of rituals and festivals, we will concentrate here on the more public ones. There is some public record of these, which has been recorded. Of the more secret rites, little to nothing remains for us to record. A lengthy discussion of National Socialist liturgy can be found in Klaus Vondung’s *Magie und Manipulation* (1971).

From the calendrical rites we can form a well-rounded picture of the kind of rituals the Nazis were developing. Besides the “Ceremonies of the Reich and the Course of the Year,” other liturgical formats used by them were: “Morning Ceremonies” (*Morgenfeiern*) also called “philosophical hours of celebration,” “Ceremonies of Life” (rites of passage), and the dramatic celebratory plays and so-called *Thing*-plays. This latter type of ritual was an effort to create a mass drama in which the audience, or congregation, participated in poetic chants with actors or choral groups. Special open-air theaters, called *Thingstätten* (“Thing-Steads”) were built for this purpose in the early years of the Reich.

From the beginning we want to avoid the mistake of assuming this liturgy was a standardized one, or that it was ever fully developed during the short history of Nazism. Some features were developed only late (after the war had begun) and others fell away in the early years. Some ceremonial forms were practiced only in certain segments of the Party— which, despite the *Führerprinzip*, was far from a monolithic entity. There was a deep æsthetic-ceremonial rift between proponents of a Romantic-Germanic style (favored by Himmler and Rosenberg) within the SS and the Hitler-Youth, and a Neo-Classical style favored by Hitler (and hence the “mainstream” of the Party).

Ceremonies of the Reich and Course of the Year

It was clear from the beginning of the Third Reich that the Party was actively trying to displace orthodox Christianity. One of the most significant ways it set about doing this was through the institution of its own “sacred calendar.” The main days celebrated were:

30 January: Day of Coming to Power

The main liturgical act was a night-time torchlight parade as a re-enactment of the one held on that night in 1933. Its significance was the final victory of the Party.

24 February: Proclamation of the Party Program

This was, in the early years, celebrated by Hitler and the “old guard” in the Hofbräuhaus in Munich in private ceremonies. It was in the beer hall that Hitler had first proclaimed the program of the party on this date in 1920. This was only briefly a special day of public celebration (1934-1935). Its significance was the mythic foundations of victory— which would come to fruition on 30 January 1933.

16 March: Heroes’ Memorial Day

This holiday was taken over from the Weimar Republic and was originally called “Day of Popular Mourning” (*Volkstrauertag*)— and was a day for mourning the dead of the (First) World War. But it was Nazified into a day of heroic celebration of those who fell in battle.

Last Sunday in March: Pledging of the Youth

This was analogous to confirmation in the Christian churches. It was the day on which the 14 year old boys and girls could transfer to the Hitler-Youth (*Hitler-Jugend*) or League of German Girls (*Bund deutscher Mädel*) from the corresponding “junior leagues” of these organizations. Although this was an individual rite of passage, it had national significance as a time of celebrating the commitment of youth to the movement.

20 April: Hitler’s Birthday

Only once was this a legal holiday, but three important liturgical events took place on this day: the acceptance of 10 year olds into the German Youth-Folk, and League of Young Girls, military parades, and the swearing in of Political Leaders of the Party. This latter event was staged in full liturgical splendor at night in the Königsplatz in Munich illuminated with torches and vessels of fire.

1 May: National Day of Celebration of the German Folk

This was an ancient festival, which through Marxist influence had acquired the connotation of a “labor day.” The Nazis combined these ideas to celebrate the worker as well as “joy over the victory of eternally new life.” Goebbels declared it the highest holiday of the German people.

German Easter and High May

Two days that had taken on Christian importance, Easter and Pentecost (fifty days after Easter)— called “High may” in the folk tradition — were repaganized by the National Socialists. These were celebrated with neo-Germanic festivities and had the function of focusing the attention of the folk on their national heritage as distinct from the internationalist form of Christianity.

Second Sunday in May: Mothers’ Day

After the war had begun in 1939, the Nazis instituted ceremonies in which mothers who had borne a certain number of children would be invested with a Cross of Honor, and those mothers who had lost children in the fighting were escorted by flower-bearing Hitler-Youth to ceremonies where they received places of honor.

21 June: Summer Solstice

This was especially celebrated by the Hitler-Youth and the SS, the groups most interested in Germanic traditions. In the SS it was the time when good Aryan marriages were made, and other neo-Germanic festivals were held. After 1937 Goebbels arranged a more Neo-Classical ceremony in Olympia Stadium in which the solstice fire was ignited—to symbolize the victory of the Aryan race. As usual, this ceremony was held at night.

First Half of September: Party Day of the Reich

This was the most important celebration of the full power of the Party—the triumph of its will, as it were. Actually this consisted of an entire week of political and ritual events. In 1934 these were recorded by Leni Riefenstahl in her famous film *Triumph des Willens*.

Beginning of October: Harvest Thanksgiving Day

As 1 May was the workers' day, this was the day to honor the farmer—held in high regard in the "Green" Nazi *Blut und Boden* ideology. The Harvest Festival Rally was held in the 1930s in the town of Bückeberg near Hameln. Hundreds of thousands of farmers were brought to this festival which also had a set liturgy, the high point of which was the presentation of the harvest-crown to the *Führer*. This symbolized the presentation of the harvest to the entire *Volk*.

9 November: Memorial Day

for the Fallen of the Movement

This is the anniversary of the failed *Putsch* of 1923. by all accounts this was the most religiously loaded cultic affair of the Party. In the ritual the "Old Guard," those who had been there on that day in 1923, and who had been invested by Hitler with a special medal—the *Blutorden*—gathered with the *Führer* in front of the *Bürgerbräukeller* beer-hall and marched toward the *Feldherrnhalle*, where 16 of their number had been felled by gunshot in 1923. This march was led by member of the *Blutorden* bearing before them the famed "Blood-Flag," the one carried on that day and which had been stained with the blood of the martyrs. As they marched they passed pylons upon which were written the names of 240 "fallen of the movement." As the "Blood-Flag" passed by each pylon the name of the martyr was called out. Throughout this procession the *Horst-Wessel-Lied* (anthem of the Party) blared out through loud-speakers. When they reached the *Feldherrnhalle* 16 canon shots rang out. Hitler laid a wreath on the memorial stone of the martyrs as the *Lied vom guten Kameraden* played, followed by the *Deutschlandlied* ("Deutschland, Deutschland, über alles...") which swelled in intensity as the marchers continued their way to the *Königsplatz*—where the martyrs had been entombed in the "Temple of Honor." Here a speech—usually by Goebbels—was made. the names of the martyrs were read out as the gathered Hitler-Youth answered chorally: "Here!" After every name there were three-gun salutes. The *Horst-Wessel-Lied* was again played, followed by the *Badenweiler* march (Hitler's favorite) and the *Deutschlandlied*.

21 December and the "Holy Nights"— Winter Solstice

Although already largely pagan in form, the German Christmas festivities became the targets of Nazi liturgical reinterpretation. Himmler was especially interested in re-Germanicizing the festival as the Yule-Fest. Goebbels and Rosenberg both used more subtle means. In all cases, however, since this festival always had been (even in pagan times) a private family or clan affair and not a public affair, it did not become a candidate for massive Nazi liturgy. It posed a new problem: how to develop National Socialist traditions in private homes. It was 1942 before this began to take on set forms (outside the SS where Himmler's version of the Yule-Fest had long been practiced). The festival was to consist of three major celebrations: 1) of the "troop" (that is, within the NS organizations, military groups, etc.), 2) of the community, and 3) of the family. During the Christmas seasons of 1943 and 1944 the Ministry of Propaganda issued a book called *Deutsche Kriegswihnachten* (A German War-time Christmas) which gave a full private liturgy with songs, poems, customs and legends. This went so far as to present the legend of the dead soldier who returned for "Holy Nights" to participate invisibly in the celebrations of the family.

There were many kinds of ritual used by the Nazis, but a common form underlying at least a part of most of the, and clearly defining many of them, was a 16 point working outline divided into three parts:

Part I:

Fanfares

1. Marching in of the banners and flags
2. Common song
3. Poetic invocation
4. Choral of the troops (ritualized chants)

Part II:

5. The Eternal Watch (Word of the *Führer*)
6. Choral of the troops
7. Address of the highest ranking official
8. Honoring of the Fallen
9. Oath of Obligation (to dead, *Volk*, etc.)
10. Honoring of the Dead (ancestors, heroes, etc.)
11. Choral of the troops

Part III:

12. Solemn vows
13. Common song
14. Honoring of the *Führer* (threefold *Sieg Heil!*)
15. National hymns. i.e. *Horst-Wessel-Lied* and the *Deutschlandlied*

Fanfares

16. Marching out of the banners and flags

As a form of Lesser Magic these rituals had many functions. Among them were the forging of a focused “mass will” of the *Volk*, the creation of a deep sense of self-consciousness as an organic entity, the bonding of that entity to a set of symbols, the projection of the entity through those symbols back in time to the ancestors and forward in time to the descendants.

The ritual devices were often complex and manifold, but they generally consisted of these elements: ritually shaped space, motion within that space, color, sound (music), and the spoken word. All this was played out in a pattern of dynamic tension between the individual and the gathered mass—nowhere is this more symbolically clear than the sight of the *Führer* addressing the faithful troops at Nuremberg.

The magical methodology of the National Socialists, as we can reconstruct it today, extended from private chambers to mass rallies, from traditional folk-festivals to high-tech electronics, from the rites of war to the rites of spring. As with all magic, however, the *aim* must be kept firmly in focus when attempting to understand it. In this instance the aim was the forging of the Master Race—the *Volk* made divine. The methods involved the attempt to separate the genetic foundation for this massive working from the rest (for this hygiene and war were necessary), and the transformation of that foundation (for which ritual and eugenics were needed). The most massive problem was cultural in nature—how to motivate millions of the most modern, well-educated people in the world to cooperate in the most radical social and magical experiment in history? The attempt to manipulate the mass-mind to these ends was the underlying factor in much of that which we can readily identify today as real “Nazi occultism.”

The Nazis and the Left-Hand Path

The closest comparison to the National Socialist doctrines with regard to the left-hand path would be those of Marxism. Whereas Marxism proceeds from a materialistic cosmology and looks to social and economic factors in creating its ideology for the perfectibility of the human species, National Socialism proceeds from a mystically organic model and looks to racial and military factors in creating its model for the deification of the elected *Volk*.

In the final analysis we must again ask ourselves whether the Nazis are in any real sense to be aligned with the left-hand path. On the essential element of self-deification, the Nazis present a mixed picture. The *Führerprinzip* — the idea of an absolute ruler of god-like power — is in a sense consistent with left-hand path ideas. But this is institutionalized in a statist form which is an anathema to the general practice of the left-hand path focused on the individual. Hitler may have been able to practice the path of the left-hand, or perhaps Himmler, but few below them. (And it is highly doubtful whether either of these men understood themselves in this capacity.) The deification in Nazism is contained not in the individual, and not in the whole of the human species (as with Communism) but in the particular organic strain of humanity known as the Aryans. It is the *Volk* as an *organic* construct which will reach the state of divinity in the National Socialist model.

The Nazis were to separate this new “god” from all others, and develop it to a new level of being. If there is a crux to the issue of the nature of “evil” with regard to the National Socialists, or to the question of whether they practiced any sort of “black magic,” surely this is it. The Nazi represents a race-based nationalistic rebellion against the natural cosmic order (or perhaps modern “conventional order”), just as the true Black Magician represents that rebellion in the individual ego.

This fact negates the viability of the essential individualistic component to the practice of the left-hand path. The individual is almost totally irrelevant in the ideology of Nazism—except as a mythic heroic model for behavior suited to the aims of the State.

The National Socialist penchant for rank and status and for hierarchical command structures is not unique in any way. This should not be confused as a sign of magical initiation. A higher rank in an organization indicates the level of service that person is capable of rendering the organization, but is not intended to indicate the level of *being* or essence attained by that individual as a human being. The most “magical” aspect of National Socialist “rankings” would have to do with the relative “purity” of a person’s “blood.” The more pure the person’s blood, the closer he or she came to being a *part* of the divine ideal. As genetic, or eugenic, magic was the major Nazi methodology for working in the field of magical reality — the genetic structure of the *Volk* — “initiatory progress” in this could hardly be measured in individual terms, but only in familial ones.

Indeed the Nazis did use *magic* of a most sophisticated and modern kind. The Lesser Magical use of symbolism and spectacle to manipulate and direct the masses is only rivaled by Madison Avenue. On a higher level, when it comes to magic used to transform the Self into the image of the divine, it is also clear that there was much magic in the practices of the Third Reich. These are most pronounced in the chivalric mythology and methods of the SS and in the meta-ritual of racial transformation. The degree to which these methods could be called Black Magic is open to interpretation. In that the aims are usually collectivist and thought to be “ordained by Nature,” they would seem to be more “white magical.” But seen from the level of the *selected* (separated and independent) folk-group the picture becomes darker. The separated group, with its own idiosyncratic characteristics, imposes its will on the environment around it—contrary to the “natural” flow of convention and historical development.

Antinomianism is also a complex issue when analyzing National Socialism. The Nazis never embraced conventional symbols of evil, and never identified themselves with Satanic imagery. Their antinomianism was of a far more *modern* kind.

Nazi ideology went against the grain of history— it opposed modernism in all its forms. This was not because the Nazis feared *change* or were “conservative” in the usual sense— they were even more radical in their desire to embrace the *future* than their Marxist counterparts. They opposed trends of modernism they felt to be embodied in materialism, positivism, internationalism and Marxism. In this process the Nazis did adopt some features of medieval ideology— such as anti-Semitism. But this was a concession to conventional wisdom rather than a radical departure from social norms of the day.

The great trend of cultural history was toward egalitarianism, materialism, rationalism, and the belief that all problems have essentially socioeconomic and environmental causes. Today we, as a society, stand firmly in the midst of these opinions and sentiments. Many among us worship these values as if they were God Almighty— and it is against this God that the Nazis rebelled.

National Socialism might best be described as a uniquely post-modern, organic school of the left-hand path. They have an organic, collective basis (Folk), but do have a gradual (initiatory) perspective on the transformation of the entity in question from its mundane base into its divine state using magical means— a triumph of the will.

Notes for Chapter 7

(1) Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke, *The Occult Roots of Nazism* (Wellingborough, UK: Aquarian, 1985), pp. 217-225.

(2) Goodrick-Clarke, *The Occult Roots of Nazism*, pp. 33-65 and Edred Thorsson, *Rune Might* (St. Paul, MN: Llewellyn, 1989), pp. 9-26.

(3) Goodrick-Clarke, *The Occult Roots of Nazism*, pp. 7 ff.; Rudolf Rusten, ed., *Was tut noi?: Ein Führer durch die gesamte Literatur der Deutschbewegung* (Leipzig: Hedler, 1914), pp. 43-99 and Lothar, Helmut. *Neuermanische Religion und Christentum* (Gutersloh: Bertelsmann, 1934).

(4) Wilfried Daim, *Der Mann, der Hitler die Ideen gab* (Munich: Isar, 1958), pp. 176-177.

(5) See Hermann Rauschning Rauschning, Hermann. *Voice of Destruction*. [=Gespräche mit Hitler] New York: Putnam, 1940, p. 210.

Chapter 8 THE OCCULT REVIVAL

Against the grain of growing rationalism and scientism of the late 19th and early 20th century there was a groundswell below the surface of establishment culture. This occult movement had its roots in ancient traditions as they had been revived in the Renaissance and early modern era. The deep level appeal of Satanic imagery to this movement is perhaps best accounted for in the fact that it was essentially a counter-cultural force. As James Webb has put it, this constituted a “flight from reason.”(1)

From a modernistic, evolutionary perspective this “flight from reason” may seem to constitute some kind of flaw or cultural sin. *Progress* is, after all, the *summum bonum* of the modern mind-set. The left-hand path elements of the occult revival are therefore quite fitting. A revival of the occult in an age in which the light of pure science was to shine brightest and show the way to a rational future is a powerful antinomian statement.

One aspect of this scientific revolution had to be accounted for in the occult revival: Evolution. Charles Darwin published his *Origin of the Species* in 1859. The compelling idea that man had *evolved* from lower life forms rather than that God had *created* mankind was revolutionary and was a great challenge to traditional religious cosmologies. The occult revival, however, seemed to embrace the concept of evolution—albeit in its own mystical model.

The occult revival can be dated from the year of the foundation of the Theosophical Society (and the birth of Aleister Crowley)—1875. It effectively comes to an end, or to the end of its first phase at the end of World War II. This revival was characterized by a myriad of organizations, societies, orders and schools. But the most important from a left-hand path viewpoint were the Theosophical Society, the orders of Aleister Crowley and their derivatives, the magic of Austin Osman Spare and the Work of G. I. Gurdjieff.

Helena Petrovna Blavatsky and The Theosophical Society

Perhaps no other figure is more responsible for the 20th century occult revival than Helena Petrovna Blavatsky (*née* von Hahn). She was born in the Ukraine in 1831 the daughter of an officer in the Russian army. Her mother and grandmother provided female role models of non-conformity with upper-class values. Helena’s mother wrote novels under the pseudonym Zenaida R-Va. These novels concerned the social position of women in revolutionary terms. Her grandmother, Helena Pavlovna de Fadeef, was an informed correspondent of famous scientists of her day with a keen interest in geology and botany. She even has a fossil named after her: the Venus Fadeef.

In childhood Helena Petrovna was known for her active imagination. She was able to spin wild yarns and create whole worlds out of her mind even at a young age. In 1847, just before she turned 17, she was married by arrangement to Nikifor Blavatsky who was then 40. Blavatsky was to be the vice-governor of Yerivan in Armenia. But after only a brief time Helena abandoned Nikifor and made her way to Constantinople.

For about the next 25 years there is little concrete evidence for what Blavatsky's life was like. To these years, which must have been formative for her intellectual development, Bruce Campbell has assigned four major characteristics:(2)

- 1) She is known to have traveled throughout Europe, the Middle East and North America.
- 2) She was involved with spiritualism and knew Paulus Metamon in Cairo and D. D. Holm in England.
- 3) She led a generally "Bohemian" existence, took drugs (especially hashish), had affairs with several men and perhaps bore as many as two children out of wedlock.
- 4) Also she was possessed of a certain feeling of *mission* about her own life.

In 1871 she founded her first organization, the *Société Spirite* in Cairo. After some further travels she eventually emigrated to the USA in 1873. In New York she worked at various jobs, including the manufacture of artificial flowers. The next year she met Henry Steel Olcott, a journalist and occult enthusiast, at a house in Chittenden, Vermont famous for its "spiritualistic" phenomena. Olcott and Blavatsky became friends, and in 1875 they founded the Theosophical Society with a number of others interested in spiritualism and ancient wisdom teachings. HPB was not the sole leader of the group at first, she was the Corresponding Secretary. Her talents were not administrative, but it was her charisma and writings which attracted and held most Theosophists to the "cause."

Shortly after founding the society HPB went to Prof. Hiram Carson's house in Ithica, New York. She went there to help the professor make spiritual contact with his daughter who had recently died. It was there that she began to write her first major work, *Isis Unveiled*. Together with Olcott she continued writing this two volume opus in New York City. The work was published in 1877. Even then, shortly after its publication, it was noticed that a large amount of it had been plagiarized from about 100 books on the occult commonly available at that time. William E. Coleman found about 2000 plagiarized passages lifted verbatim from these books.(3)

Fraud, trickery and plagiarism were common traits of Blavatsky's method of operation. How much of her efforts in these directions can be ascribed to the motives of the left-hand path Buddhist conjuror and how much to the motives of the confidence (wo)man is left for others to decide.

For the first two or three years the Society stagnated and membership dwindled as it tried to find its own identity outside spiritualism. In 1878 there was a brief official merger between the TS and the Arya Smaj, an Indian organization promoting a return to archaic Vedic, Aryan (Indo-European) values and customs. This was the beginning of a long-time close relationship the TS was to have with Indian society and politics. At the very end of 1878 Blavatsky and Olcott set sail for India, In February of 1879 the headquarters of the TS were moved first to Bombay, later to Adyar. Theosophy became more and more open to increasing amounts of Indian teachings, both Hindu and Buddhist. Over 100 chapters of the Society were opened in India at that time.

It is only after this time (1879) that the Mahatmas ("great-souled-ones"), or Masters, became an integral part of Theosophical teachings, although HPB would later claim that she had been taught by them in Tibet back in that obscure, pre-1873, period in her life. But it seems most reasonable to conclude that the whole story of the Mahatmas was fabricated as a common sorcerer's ploy to gain prestige, power and charisma—much like Anton LaVey and Carlos Casteneda would do in the 1960s and 1970s of our century.

Blavatsky translated her mediumistic talent for communicating with people's dead relatives to one for communicating with "Hidden Masters." here too is the root of the late 20th century craze for "channeling" bazillion year-old extraterrestrials. In 1884 Blavatsky's "phenomena" were investigated by the somewhat skeptical Society for Psychical Research and found to be fraudulent. Also, while HPB was in England her methods were exposed by a former confidant in Adyar.

Blavatsky eventually moved back to England to say in 1887. The last five years of her life were devoted to writing *The Secret Doctrine* (1888) and articles for her own journal *Lucifer* which she founded at that time. She was also engaged in a power struggle with Olcott for control of the Society. As a part of this struggle she founded an "Esoteric Section" as a kind of "inner order" within the Theosophical Society.

In May of 1891 HPB died. But there can be no doubt that her vision and her voice, as heard through her writings have been the guiding principles for the TS through several generations of its existence.

One of the chief contributions of the Theosophical Society to the general occult revival was the profound connections it made between eastern and western occult or religious teachings. Blavatsky would on numerous occasions make statements to the effect that both eastern and western traditions were derived from the great "secret doctrine" the common source of Hindu and Greek wisdom schools.(4) this is, of course, true but the *factual* reason for this, the common Indo-European heritage of both, was still obscured from popular knowledge in Blavatsky's day. This is somewhat ironic since one of the other legacies of the TS to the occult revival was an infusion of at least a "faith" in scientific methods and terminology. The Theosophical Society was to some extent an attempt to bridge the gap between medieval faith and modern science by harking back to "ancient wisdom."

The flow of popularized esoteric information from the east began through the conduit provided by the TS. It was in this body of information that the ideas of left-hand path tantra and right-hand path mysticism entered into the western world on a wide scale.

Theosophy and the Left-Hand Path

The relationship of Theosophy to the left-hand path is highly ambiguous and in many ways foreshadows the same ambiguities found in the magical career of Aleister Crowley, who was only 16 when HPB died. Blavatsky was often quick to identify her movement with the "White Lodge" or the "Great White Brotherhood," which is occasionally contrasted with the "Black Lodge." Blavatsky is usually anxious to claim to be a part of the *White Brotherhood*, while at the same time her works are replete with positive references to Satan and *Lucifer*. Even her own magazine published in the final years of her life was called *Lucifer*. Adding to the ambiguity, she asserts that in theory the end of human development or initiation is the loss of the spark of individuality in the larger fire, the drop within the ocean, individuality must be stamped out as the "self of matter," the "bud of personality" is crushed so that the SELF of spirit — beyond individuality — may thrive.(5)

But as we see her system in action we do not — even theoretically — see selfless souls devoid of personality but rather "hidden" and ascended masters — many said to be still living in human bodies — in the company of great individuals in the history of mankind from Pythagoras to Jesus, and from Confucius to Mesmer. The implicit *reality* of the Theosophical myth is, even by its own definitions, left-hand path. The personality and individual consciousness is not obliterated, but rather these individuals ascend to a level of consciousness, individuation and immortality otherwise reserved for gods and goddesses.

We are also reminded of the spiritualistic roots of Theosophy. Spiritualism is a sort of cult of at least quasi-immortal personalities. Yet in Spiritualism these entities are largely impotent in their dealings with the living — but the Masters virtually control the living, or could do so if they wished.

To some extent we must look at Blavatsky's ideology or system in much the same way we would look at the staging of one of her "phenomena." They are both appearances with hidden realities and with a hidden agenda which comes back to an empowerment of the sorcerer who creates the appearances, and perhaps, if he is observant, the enlightenment of the one who looks on.

Any *traditional* right-hand path practitioner, whether Hindu or Christian, Buddhist or Jew, will quickly see in Theosophy a system which glorifies the individual, promotes the biological interests of the Aryans (Indo-Europeans) and posits a rationally willed method of

self-transformation— any one of which would be theoretical reasons to condemn Theosophy as “left-handed” or “sinister.” But perhaps because of the innate fear and loathing most humans have of the full implications of the left-hand path— knowledge (for ignorance is bliss), consciousness, power (for with it comes responsibility), and individual immortality (for in it there is no peace) — the structures of the left-hand path are hidden and disguised behind semantic sorceries such as: “And now they Self is lost in SELF. Thyself unto THYSELF, merged in THAT SELF from which thou first didst radiate.”(6)

HPB and the “Light-Bearer”

The fact that Blavatsky named her personal magazine *Lucifer* is a positive indication of her attitude toward that idea and figure in the traditions of humanity. *Lucifer* was published at about the time she was writing *The Secret Doctrine* during the last years of her life so the title can not be dismissed as a youthful indiscretion.

Her understanding of Lucifer-Satan (whom she equates on one level)(7) is clearly a variant of the Ophite-Gnostic interpretation. When referring to Hebraic tradition she equates Jehovah Elohim with the demiurge who created the world and man’s physical aspect, and she sees the true god who liberated man and gave him his divine aspects as Lucifer-Satan. This divine aspect is one of dynamic spiritual immortality — as opposed to the static physical immortality offered by Jehovah.(8)

HPB made no apologies for her positive valorization of what orthodox Christian theologians called “devils,” nor for her negative opinion of those “ignorant and malicious” theologians and their God and his angels. The “devils” she sees as the true, higher, more spiritual aspects of the gods (or God).(9)

The God of orthodox theologians is, for Blavatsky, the source of true evil in the world which is equated with “an antagonizing blind force in nature; it is *reaction, opposition, and contrast*” but even in this she can see that in reality such things can be “evil for some, good for others.”(*SD*, II, 413) From the esoteric doctrines of Hinduism and Buddhism she seems to have absorbed the principle that the “good” involves an understanding of duality and the necessity of its preservation, while “evil” is concerned with the destruction of one aspect (either/or) of the duality by the other.

In *The Secret Doctrine* she writes:

In human nature, evil denotes only the polarity of matter and Spirit, a struggle of life between the two manifested Principles in Space and Time, which principles are one *per sé*, inasmuch they are rooted in the Absolute. In Kosmos, the equilibrium must be preserved. The operations of the two contraries produce harmony, like the centripetal and centrifugal forces which are necessary to each other — mutually inter-dependent — “in order that both should live.” If one is arrested, the action of the other will become immediately self-destructive.(*SD* I, 416)

HPB sees in humanity — *or at least a portion of it* — the actual incarnation of the divine spark. In her interpretation of the conflict between Satan and Jehovah she sees that Satan “claimed and enforced his right of independent judgment and will, his right of freeagency and responsibility.” This is the true nature of the “fallen angels.”(10) A “fallen angel” is then an *agathodaimôn* (Gk. “good-spirit”) as opposed to Jehovah and his obedient angels each of which is a *kakodaimôn* (Gk. “evil-spirit”). The “fallen angels” are an older creation possessing free will who rebelled against the *natural order* of Jehovah.(11) One of the revolutionary ideas contained in *The Secret Doctrine* is that the gift of the divine spark is the result of actual *incarnation* of the “fallen angles” in human bodies— through sexual reproduction. Some of these ideas were later picked up and expanded by Jörg Lanz von Liebenfels (= Adolf Joseph Lanz) in works such as *Theozoologie*.

Whether it is in the Hebrew tradition where she interpreted the myth of Eden recorded in Genesis (II-IV) or the in the Greek myth of Prometheus HPB sees metaphors portraying

the transformation of “fallen angels” into physical bodies— thus inseminating carnal humanity with a spark of the divine. Jehovah, or Zeus, created the flesh — senseless and without a mind — but Lucifer, or Prometheus, “represents the intellect infused into humanity.”(12) In this way *terrestrial* man is (or can be) made divine.(13)

Prometheus (and Satan) is seen to break the natural order of strictly preserved cyclic development and puts the divine gift into a weak physical vessel. There arises a tension between the physical vessel and the divine spirit.(14) Again the disharmony between these two dualistic poles is emphasized.

Blavatsky makes it clear that the divine spark is stronger in some people than others. She writes that in a certain portion of humanity “the ‘sacred spark’ is missing ... mankind is ‘of one blood’ *but not of the same essence.*” (15) The portion of humanity in which the “fallen angles” incarnated “... preferred free-will to passive slavery, intellectual self-consciousness pain and even torture .. to inane, imbecile, instinctual beatitude.”(16) All of this relates to the essentially evolutionary aspect of Theosophy’s esoteric teachings.

The Secret Doctrine contains a whole cosmogony which outlines the predetermined evolution of “root races” on this planet. There will be seven of these. At the apex of present human evolution is the Fifth Root Race— the “Aryans.” We are now in the twilight of the Aryan epoch ruled by the Anglo-Saxons— but it will be out of that group that the next root race will necessarily appear. By the way, she located the appearance of the next evolutionary stage as being in North America.(17) the story of the first root races was one of a “descent into matter,” during the course of the Fourth Root Race the balance was tipped in favor of a spiritual evolution— as the species of humanity defined by the divine spark began its ascent back to a state of deity. This describes the evolutionary path of each individual, as well as that of the species as a whole.

The rhetoric of Theosophy — especially in later years among Theosophists coming after HPB — is peppered with references to “black magic” or the “left-hand path.” These are often used so loosely as to mean nothing more than “un-Theosophical.” But it is clear that for HPB herself Lucifer (by whatever name) was her God and that evolution to an immortal state of independent enlightened existence was her goal. This may be sufficient to consider her a Lady of the Left-Hand Path— even though she might not like the terminology.

Theosophy and *The Secret Doctrine* created untold ripples throughout the occult revival. Theosophical ideas, while themselves evolving (or devolving), were absorbed to some degree either directly or indirectly by virtually every occult school in the Anglo-American and central European worlds. Studies of the initiates of the Golden Dawn and its off-shoots show the extent of Theosophical ideas present(18) In Germany not only did the German Secretary of the Society, Rudolf Steiner, break away to form his own successful Anthroposophical Society, but the magical order *Fraternitas Saturni* also shows significant Theosophical influence.

The Great Beast Aleister Crowley

No man is more enigmatic in the history of the occult revival than Edward Alexander Crowley (1875-1947) — better known as Aleister Crowley. He is so enigmatic because although opinions of him and his work are often strong, they hardly ever agree— and what makes matters even more knotty is the fact that Crowley himself seems not to have been totally sure of his own nature: Was he the “Great Wild Beast” or the “World Teacher”— or both?

Most discussions of Crowley quickly descend into recounting of various legends and anecdotes concerning his exploits. These may be found in numerous books, for example John Symond’s *The Great Beast* (1972)— as well as Crowley’s own *Confessions*. My intention here is to concentrate on the *ideas* of Crowley as they possibly relate to the left-hand path system of magical philosophy.

Crowley's father was a well-to-do beer baron and member of a fundamentalist Christian sect known popularly as "the Plymouth Brethren." His father died in 1886, and Crowley's future exploits were largely financed through his inheritance. As a young man his avocations were poetry and mountain climbing. In the last month of 1896, while in Stockholm, he was awakened to the possibilities of magical philosophy. Two years later he was initiated into the "Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn" (18 November 1898). By 1900 he had been initiated to the *Adeptus Minor* grade in the G.:.D.:. , but he was soon thereafter alienated from the organization and began an independent career in magical studies.

In April of 1904 Crowley conducted a series of magical workings in Cairo, Egypt in which he received the words of a text entitled *Liber Al vel Legis: The Book of the Law* from a discarnate entity called Aiwaz. In Crowley's own mythology this event and the transformation it made in Crowley himself is said to have ushered in a new Aeon in human history. It was this event, and the product of it — *The Book of the Law* — would certainly reshape the rest of Crowley's life. In 1907 he founded his own magical order, the *Argentum Astrum* ("Silver Star"). In 1909 Crowley claims the magical grades of initiation referred to as *Adeptus Exemptus* and *Magister Templi* in the G.:.D.:. system. But his claims were for his own magical order, the A.:.A.:. .

The A.:.A.:. ultimately does not fulfill its function as Crowley had envisioned it. So in 1912 he begins an alliance with a pseudo-Masonic German lodge — the *Ordo Templi Orientis* — which teaches forms of sexual magic akin to Indian tantrism. Crowley was to become absorbed in this kind of magic for the rest of his life.

On his birthday in 1915 he claimed the initiatory grade of *Magus*— with the motto or magical name: *Tô Mega Therion*— "the Great Beast." (See Rev. 13:1-18) The last initiatory grade was claimed in May 1921— that of *Ipsissimus*, "his very utmost self."

The "Great Beast" died in relative obscurity in Hastings, England on 1 December 1947 in the fullness of 72 years of age. But his personality and his ideology — or mythology — has cast a shimmering shadow over the entirety of the western magical world during the latter half of the 20th century.

Sources of the Study of Thelemism

Crowley's philosophy, which might best be termed Thelemism (after his Aeonic Word: *Thelêma*, "True Will") or Magick (after his method of attaining and exercising this Will), is amply documented in the written works of Crowley himself. For our purposes the most important of these are *Book of Lies* (1913), *Liber Aleph* (finished 1918, first published 1961), *Magick* (1929), *The Equinox of the Gods* (1937), *The Book of the Law* (1938), *Eight Lectures on Yoga* (1939), *The Book of Thoth* (1944), his own autobiographical *Confessions* (1930), and the periodical *The Equinox* (vol. I nos. 1-10, 1909-1913). Also among the most important primary sources for "Crowleyanity" or "Theriology" are two published diaries *The Magical Record of the Beast 666* (1972) and *The Magical Diaries of Aleister Crowley* (1979). Secondary material on A.C. is voluminous. Much of it is sensationalistic or sectarian in its approach. The most useful of this kind seem to be John Symond's *The Great Beast* (1971), Israel Regardie's *The Eye in the Triangle* (1970) and Colin Wilson's *The Nature of the Beast* (1987). With all the books and sections of books written on Crowley no objective study of his ideas has yet been produced.

Crowley's Magical Orders

Crowley was involved deeply with three magical orders during his lifetime. His association with the Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn was brief, yet formative of many of his ideas. The G.:.D.:. was founded by a group of British Freemasons in 1888. It appears to have been greatly influenced by the Theosophy of Madame Blavatsky, although in many regards it is just an eclectic product of the same occult revivalist milieu of late 19th century western civilization. However, other than the practice of magic for purposes of individual empowerment and enlightenment there seems to have been little of the left-hand path about the G.:.D.:. (19)


The initiatory philosophy of the A.·A.· will be discussed further below when I analyze Crowley's Thelemite initiatory theory. It is useful to realize that the A.·A.· was to initiate its individual members in the magical curriculum of the order that they might better serve the progress of mankind. Magick, the spiritual technology of the A.·A.·, was to be "as systematic and scientific as chemistry." Crowley designed the A.·A.· as a vehicle of his Aeonic Word (Θελημα). Theoretically the design seems well suited to this purpose. But Crowley himself must have found the A.·A.· and its magical methods in some sense less than viable, because in 1912 he formed an alliance with the *Ordo Templi Orientis* (Order of Eastern Templars). The principal method of magical working in the O.T.O. is sexual. It is known that Crowley had experimented with sexual magic as early as 1902.(20) But he was doing no more than poking around in the dark until his contact with the O.T.O. His diary entries from 1914(21) express his insecurities and doubts concerning his effectiveness with this new magical form— this despite the fact that he had claimed the grade of *Magister Templi* (in 1909).

As opposed to the coherent and predictable curriculum of the A.·A.· the O.T.O. system is significantly more mysterious. This is because the secret of sexual magic was to be withheld from the public at large and even from initiates of lower degrees within the O.T.O. The history of this order is better discussed elsewhere.(22) Crowley incorporated A.·A.· ideas into the structure of the O.T.O. which was seen as a valuable tool for the dissemination of his teachings. From a left-hand path viewpoint one of the most interesting aspects of the O.T.O. is its use of the magical technologies similar to those of Hindu and Buddhist tantra.

Crowley's Cosmology

Crowley's cosmology, the way he understood the universal order and his place in it, was dominated by the structures of the Kabbalah.(23) He had first absorbed or internalized this system, and been predisposed toward acknowledging its prestige and supremacy, during his training in the G.·D.·. The principal cosmological tool of the Kabbalah is the Tree of Life.

Figure 8.1: The Kabbalistic Tree of Life



In *Magick* Crowley wrote: "The Qabalah maps ourselves by means of a convention. Every aspect of every object may thus be referred to the Tree of Life, and evolved by using the proper keys." (p. 341) The Tree of Life presents the entirety of the cosmos — the Universe — as a series of numbered emanations from the Absolute to the mundane or material universe. From the magical point of view this "map of the cosmos" is supposed to provide a system of correspondences between and among all things in the Universe. Thus if one wishes to invoke Venusian qualities into one's life — a ritual would be designed using objects symbolic of the 7th *sephira* of the Tree of Life: e.g. the number seven, the color green, the sign and image of Venus. By no means did Crowley invent this mode of thought, of course. It has its origins in prehistory, was already codified by the time of Pythagoras, Judaized by mystical medieval rabbis, and again pioneered by Florentine Renaissance philosophers such as Marsilio Ficino. The system was expanded upon by occultists from Agrippa to Eliphas Levi and formulated in the system Crowley inherited from the G.D.. This philosophy posits a unified field of continuous reality in which everything that exists is in one way or another connected to every other thing.

Another essential element of Crowley's magical cosmology is the theory of evolutionary stages in the history of the development of humanity. This general idea was very much in vogue due to the influence of Madame Blavatsky's Secret Doctrine and the general Darwinist scientific fashion, perhaps coupled with Marxist theories. Crowley's tripartite doctrine of historical evolution (or dialectic) posits an oldest, matriarchal aeon, ruled by Isis, followed by a patriarchal one ruled by Osiris, which reached its end with the dictation of *Liber AL* in 1904. This new aeon is ruled by "the child crowned and conquering"—Horus.(24) This transition from the aeonic rulership of one god to another is what constitutes the "Equinox of the Gods." Crowley's tripartite aeonic progression had been anticipated by Joachim of Fiore (1145-1202) as well as by the heretical Brethren of the Free Spirit flourishing in Germany from the 13th to 17th century. For the Brethren the three ages were ruled over by the Father, Son and Holy Spirit successively. (See chapter 5.) The premise of a primeval matriarchal age had also been forwarded by J. J. Bachoffen's anthropological theories.(25)

Sexuality was, however, fundamental to A.C.'s outlook on life and the world. This is reflected in the theo-cosmology contained in *The Book of the Law*. There we read of the sexo-cosmological and sexo-psychological interacting of two entities (or qualities) *Nu(it)*, which is feminine, and *Had(it)*, which is masculine. Crowley wrote in his 1938 Introduction to *The Book of the Law*:

This book explains the Universe.
The elements are Nuit — Space — that is, the
total of possibilities of every kind— and Hadit,
any point which has experience of these
possibilities.

Here we have symbols of the Absolute, the Universe, and the subjective universe defined by the individual psyche. In his "New Comment" (1920) on *Liber AL* (1:1): "Had! The Manifestation of Nuit." Crowley claims that "The theogony of our Law is entirely scientific. Nuit is matter, Hadit is motion, in their full physical sense... Our central truth—beyond other philosophies — is that these two infinities can not exist apart." (26)

Crowley's symbols — or those of Aiwaz — are chosen from a pseudo-Egyptian storehouse of images. Nuit was the Egyptian goddess of the vault of the night sky. But there is no god called "Hadit"— which Crowley identified with the familiar winged sun disk. The name Hadit seems to have been taken from Arabic *hadit*, "tradition." In any event, the concepts are clear enough. The closest analogs to these basic elements of cosmogony and cosmology are the *yin* and *yang* concepts of Taoist thought, and the concepts of *prakriti* — the unmanifested basis — and *bindu* the universal seed principle — in Indian tantrism.

The Universe is a continuous essence for Crowley. The psyche is a part of it, part of Nature. Attainment is in the end the melding of any one manifestation of self with all else that exists:

Each one of us has thus an universe of his own, but it is the same universe for each one as soon as it includes all possible experience. This implies the extension of consciousness to include all other consciousness. (27)

This is the essence of the Law of Thelema:

“Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.” (AL I:40)

“Love is the Law, love under Will.” (AL I:57)

“Every man and every woman is a star.” (AL I:3)

Crowley often comments on these formulas in ways which make them seem to partake of both right-hand path and left-hand path concepts. However, it is usually clear that he wishes his work to be understood as being of the right-hand path, and the true teaching of the Great White Brotherhood.

Philosophy of Man

Understanding of Thelema (True Will) and the progress of its discovery in the individual is the kernel of Crowley’s philosophy of Man—his Anthropology. Technically, the Law of “Do what thou wilt” is fulfilled upon the “Attainment of Knowledge and Conversation of the Holy Guardian Angel.” Concealed in this rather ambiguous and quaint language is the idea that the individual magician becomes fully and constantly aware of the divinity or “higher self” within, or above, his everyday consciousness.(28) From that moment forward the magician can be informed and transformed by this magical contact. This attainment, and subsequent willed actions informed by “Conversation” with this entity, is the core of the exhortation: “Do what thou wilt.” The will is not the base desire, but the divine or true *thelema*. From Crowley’s own theoretical viewpoint then, the notion that the Law of Thelema is a forerunner of “Do your own thing,” or “If it feels good, do it,” is misguided and inaccurate. (But such “Laws” can never be Understood by the masses who will always degrade them to their level of perception.)

“Love is the Law, love under Will.” This aspect of Crowley’s formula is nowhere more succinctly expressed than in *Eight Lectures on Yoga* (1939). Here he posits that “all phenomena of which we are aware take place in our own minds, and therefore the only thing we have to look at is the mind...” (p. 7) he also goes on to affirm that all human minds are essentially similar and that differences are the product “of systematic sectarian training.” (p. 7) He posits an important premise when he states “all bodies, and so all minds, have identical Forms.” (p. 8) Crowley defines “Love” quite precisely as “the instinct to unite and the act of uniting.” But he tempers this with the admission that this must be done “‘under will,’ that is, in accordance with the nature of the particular units involved.” (pp. 9-10) This Love (Gk *αγαπη*) is the act of the union of one thing with its (naturally determined) opposite.

So, for Crowley, the will toward union and the act of uniting with the *natural* opposite of the individual self (i.e. the Absolute, or Universe) is the measuring stick for what the *True Will* is. Of course, Crowley is well aware of the essential distinction between the left-hand path and the right-hand path, Black Magick and White Magick, and so is always philosophically “correct” in his discussions of these matters. In *Eight Lectures on Yoga* he makes statements that are among the most straightforward in occult revivalist literature about the aim of right-hand path Magick:

It is therefore incumbent upon us, if we wish to make the universal and final Yoga with the Absolute ... to train ourselves in knowledge and power to the utmost; so that at the proper moment we may be in perfect condition to fling ourselves up into the furnace of ecstasy which flames from the abyss of annihilation.

... [U]ltimate [union] ... destroys the sense of separateness which is the root of Desire [= Love] ... [and] ... is to be made by the concentration of every element of one's being, and annihilating it by intimate combustion with the universe itself.(29)

Although Crowley constantly seems to champion the concept of *liberty*— “the Law of Thelema is the law of liberty”(30) — most directly expounded in *Liber LXXVII (OZ)*, which is essentially:

There is no god but man.

1. Man has the right to live by his own law...
2. Man has the right to eat what he will...
3. Man has the right to think what he will...
4. Man has the right to love as he will...
5. Man has the right to kill those who would thwart these rights...(31)

This championing of pure liberty, while when viewed from an orthodox and exoterically law-bound system such as Christianity or Islam appears to be the epitome of the left-hand path and hence a moral framework for Black Magic, must in fact be tempered by Crowley's own interpretation of such formulas. Although the Law of Thelema posits no universal code of morality, it does insist upon the idea that for each individual soul there is one right or natural path and that all such right paths lead to one goal: annihilation of the self. From a purely left-hand path perspective this is a disqualifying factor. All this clearly puts Crowley in a “gray zone” when it comes to our topic.

Crowley's Theology

A definitive theology is difficult in Crowley's case. Certainly he held that Man, and the human mind characterizing the species *homo sapiens*, is the primary creator of gods and goddesses, angels and demons. Man “creates” them by *naming* them, i.e. categorizing them and discriminating between and among them. On the one hand for Crowley “Gods are but names for the forces of Nature themselves.”(32) But he also says that “God [is] the Ideal Identity of man's inmost nature.”(33) In Crowley's thought the supreme God would then be one's own Holy Guardian Angel.

The discarnate entity which dictated *Liber AL* to Crowley in 1904 might at first be thought of as being a type of god-form by some. Others might see it as Crowley's own Higher Self. In *The Confessions* Crowley does himself come to the conclusion that Aiwaz and his Holy Guardian Angel were one.(34) The discarnate spiritual aspects of incarnate human beings can be true god-forms, if they are *invoked often* by means of the “spiritual technology” of Magick. In this regard Crowley has merely returned to the model of *daimonology* as held by the ancients. Primarily the magician is his own god, but this god-form is hidden from his consciousness normally. He must learn and develop techniques for becoming aware of its existence and its characteristics and absorb them into his everyday consciousness.

In Crowley's magical universe, however, there was also a hierarchy of discarnate entities (in some cases perhaps still incarnated in human bodies according to their wills). These were the “Secret Chiefs.” Crowley had, of course, assimilated this conception from the G. . . D. . (with analogs in the Theosophical Society and other occult groups). These virtual demigods play a pivotal role in Crowley's understanding of the conscious entities which motivate change in the world— and in Crowley's life. In his *Confessions* he definitely indicates that the ushering in of the New Aeon and his role in it is the work of the Secret Chiefs.(35) The very concept of entities such as the “Secret Chiefs” is tinged with

left-hand path connotations. These are not “gods” *per sé*, they are humans who have become as gods, or god-like, in their immortality, power, and wisdom. It is not within the purpose or scope book to undertake a discussion of the reality or actual nature of these entities. But for Crowley they existed. Positing one’s self as the prophet of a New Aeon, as the Great Beast, is a lonely task. It is more convenient to assume that one is being “ordered” from “higher up”—so the Secret Chiefs constitute a kind of pantheon of quasi-divine beings who take a personal interest in the enlightenment of humanity and in the sponsoring of individual magicians.

The use of Egyptian god-forms in *The Book of the Law* appears arbitrary.(36) The fact that Crowley was in Cairo when *Liber AL* was dictated, coupled with the popularity of Egyptian god-forms in the G.D., probably best explains their usage. The divine and demonic symbols he tended to use were drawn from every culture, and from his imagination and experience.

To be sure the “god-form” that would interest us most be for this study would be Satan, or perhaps Set. Crowley repeatedly, if poetically and sometimes ambiguously, equates himself and his own “Holy Guardian Angel” (Aiwaz) with Lucifer or Satan.(37) He, of course, also liked to envision himself — at least “Magickally” — as an entity from conventional demonology. Two of his initiatory mottos are also figures from traditional demonology: Baphomet and *Tô Mega Therion* (τὸ μέγα θηριον)— the Great Beast (Rev. 13:1-18) or the Anti-Christ (= Satan). Satan is in turn equated with Set, the Gnostic god-form Abrasax (or Abraxas) and even with Adam.(38) This latter equation is important with respect to the position of Man in Crowley’s system.

But what is the real significance of Satan (by whatever other name) in Crowley’s theological/daimonological formulas? He is quite clear on this:

The Devil is, historically, the God of any people that one personally dislikes. This has led to so much confusion of thought that THE BEAST 666 has preferred to let names stand as they are, and to proclaim simply that AIWAZ — the solar-phallic-hermetic ‘Lucifer’ is His own Holy Guardian Angel, and ‘The Devil’ SATAN or HADIT of our particular unit of the Starry Universe. This serpent, SATAN, is not the enemy of MAN, but HE who made Gods of our race, knowing Good and Evil; He bade ‘Know Thyself!’ and taught Initiation. He is ‘the Devil’ of the Book of Thoth and His emblem is BAPHOMET, the androgyne who is the hieroglyph of arcane perfection.(39)

To understand completely what Crowley is saying we must refer to his general cosmology which is monistic: all apparent *opposites* are in reality unities. This is how Horus is united with Set. (See chapter 3.) They are the light and dark opposites within the same unity. “[T]he true magick of Horus requires the passionate union of opposites.”(40) This is clearly how, for Crowley, this is the Aeon of Horus, but its root formula is “ShT” (rendering Satan, Shaitan, Set, etc.)(41)

Here as elsewhere Crowley is using the familiar practice of antinomianism. In *Liber V vel Reguli* (Ritual of the Mark of the Beast) Crowley lays out his antinomianism and its practice:

This is in fact the formula of our Magick; we insist that all acts must be equal; that existence asserts the right to exist; that unless evil is a mere term expressing some relation of haphazard hostility between forces equally self-justified, the universe is as inexplicable and impossible as uncompensated action; that the orgies of Bacchus and Pan are no less sacramental than the Masses of Jesus; that the scars of syphilis are sacred and worthy of honour as such.(*Magick*, p. 418)

He goes on to explain:

The Magician should devise for himself a definite technique for destroying 'evil'. The essence of such practice will consist in training the mind and body to confront things which cause fear, pain, disgust, shame and the like. He must learn to endure them, then to become indifferent to them, then to analyse them until they give pleasure and instruction, and finally to appreciate them for their own sake, as aspects of Truth. When this has been done, he should abandon them if they are really harmful in relation to health or comfort. Also, our selection of 'evils' is limited to those that cannot damage us irreparably. E.g. one ought to practice smelling asafetida until one likes it; but not arsine or hydrocyanic acid. Again, one might have a liaison with an ugly old woman until one beheld and loved the star which she is; it would be too dangerous to overcome the distaste for dishonesty by forcing oneself to pick pockets. Acts which are essentially dishonourable must not be done; they should be justified only by calm contemplation of their correctness in abstract cases.

(*Magick*, pp. 418-419)

In his "theology" the results of the application of this antinomianism are that opposites, such as the Beast and the Lamb (Rev. 13:8) and the Whore of Babylon and the Woman clothed with the Sun (Rev. 12:1) are only *apparent*, and that from a higher perspective they are unities or equivalencies (Beast = Lamb; Whore = Woman).(42)

The very existence of the conventional "Devil" (as a positive and objective entity of *evil*) is rejected by Crowley.(43) *Evil*, such as it is, is seen as a product of subjectivity and ignorance in humanity: "Satan [is] regarded with horror by people who are ignorant of his formula, and, imagining themselves to be evil, accuse Nature herself of their own phantasmal crime."(44)

Despite the fact that antinomianism is usually characteristic of the left-hand path, Crowley uses it to right-hand path ends. Indeed *tools* or techniques such as antinomianism are essentially neutral and can be used to a variety of ends. The core of Crowley's *magical* philosophy is the willed dissolution of opposites — "Let there be no difference ... between any one thing and any other thing."(45) — in greater unity (agape, love). On the left-hand path antinomianism points to the separateness or isolation of the self or individual intelligence from oppositional categories— but the dissolver remains intact and independent of its dissolutions. While the right-hand path turns antinomianism upon the opposition of self/not-self, or *psychê/physis*, or subjectivity/objectivity as such.

The Technology of Magick

Crowley's theology can only be understood fully in terms of his system of Magick or initiation. Magick is Crowley's technique for practicing "the Science and Art of causing Change to occur in conformity with Will."(46) This "Science and art" is to be most properly applied to the discovery and exercise of the True Will which is unique, but also "natural and necessary" for each individual. Magick is then a program for individual transformation according to the individual True Will of the one being transformed. Crowley wanted to postulate Magick as a new *scientific* discipline. As such he knew that certain universal principles and patterns should apply. This is another factor which distinguishes Crowley from the separative left-hand path wherein the distinction between the limited and nature-bound character of science (*dianoia*) and the unlimited rational intuition (*noesis*) is clear.

However, for the understanding of the structure of the left-hand path as practices in the contemporary world, the theories of Aleister Crowley are important. He provided a sophisticated definition of the character of the left-hand path and what he called Black Magick.

According to Crowley "Black Magick" is characterized by "any will but that to give up the self to the Beloved"(47) (i.e. the Universe which is the opposite of self-consciousness)

or any deviation from the straight line leading to the "Single Supreme Ritual" of "the attainment of Knowledge and Conversation of the Holy Guardian Angel."(48) But he also calls "black" any renunciation for "an equivalent in personal gain,"(49) the use of "[magical]" powers if the object can possibly be otherwise attained,(50) or "the use of spiritual force to material ends."(51) Presumably because Crowley had undergone the "Supreme Ritual," and was in fact a *Magus* (9 = 20) he could regularly perform Magick of the kind in his *Magical Record*:

1. Dec. 4 p.m. [1916]
Anna Grey [woman with whom Crowley performed an act of
sexual Magick]
[object] Wealth
Operation: difficult but success great as to Object. Elixir,
nothing special— good, though when duly mixed
Result: \$45.00 next day.(52)

Brothers of the Left-Hand Path

In the initiatory system Crowley devised for his A.·A.·. he described a certain advanced moment in the process when the initiate could choose to follow the left-hand path. Until that moment, according to Crowley, all initiates are on the same basic path. (See Figure 8:2 for the initiatory system of the A.·A.·.)

The initiate begins as a *Student*, who studies various systems of spiritual attainment from a list of books. Next he becomes a *Probationer*, who undertakes whatever magical practices he wishes making a record of them for one year. After this he becomes a *Neophyte* and acquires "perfect control over the Astral Plane." he then becomes a *Zelator*, who perfects himself in basic yogic techniques of the body and breathing. Next he becomes a *Practicus* and completes intellectual training and study of the Kabbalah. Following this he becomes a *Philosophus* and completes his moral training and is tested for his devotion to the order. He then becomes a *Dominus Liminis* who masters the yogic techniques of *pratyahara* (withdrawal of senses from external objects) and *dharana* (concentration). After this point he becomes an "outer" *Adeptus Minor* and performs the Great Work attaining the Knowledge and Conversation of the Holy Guardian Angel. (Here the Adept can be said to have become aware of his own True or Higher Self.) upon completion of this the initiate is an "inner" *Adeptus Minor* who enters the "College of the Holy Ghost" — or the Order of the Rosy Cross. Next he becomes an *Adeptus Major*, who masters practical Magick— but he does not necessarily understand the true nature of his work. There follows the grade of *Adeptus Exemptus* wherein the initiate becomes a leader of a school of thought. The *Adeptus Exemptus* is a "separate being ... from the rest of the Universe."(53) He eventually transits into the "Abyss" — into a zone of negation — wherein he may either:

- 1) Annihilate himself and become an embryonic
"Babe of the Abyss" — or —
- 2) Remain in the Abyss isolated from the universe
and become a Black Brother.

It is here, and really only here, that Crowley distinguishes between the right-hand path and the left-hand path. Beyond the Abyss the "Brother of the Right-Hand Path" will be reborn as a *Magister Templi* who has annihilated that personality which had limited and oppressed his true self. He "is pre-eminently the master of mysticism ... his Understanding is entirely free of internal contradiction or external obscurity." His work is to Understand "the existing Universe in accordance with His own Mind." The *Magus* is the "Master of Magick ... his will is entirely free from internal division or external opposition; His work is to create a new Universe in accordance with His Will." The *Magus* does this by uttering a Word of an Aeon, or by making "personal progress equivalent to that of a 'Word of the Aeon.'" Beyond the *Magus* is the *Ipsissimus* ("his very utmost self") who is "the Master of

all modes of existence ... entirely free from internal or external necessity. His work is to destroy all tendencies to construct or to cancel such necessities." Further Crowley says: "The *Ipsissimus* has no relation as such to any Being: He has no will in any direction, and no consciousness of any kind involving duality, for Him all is accomplished..."(54)

The Black Brothers, or Brothers of the Left-Hand path, are those "... who 'shut themselves up,' who refuse their blood to the cup, who have trampled Love in the Race for self-aggrandizement."(55) They refuse to exit the Abyss and remain there, retaining their own gathered powers. These powers will, according to Crowley, eventually dissipate—and with them the existence of the Black Brother.(56)

The system of the A. A. . shows a "logical" progression with two virtually obligatory critical junctures for those who would proceed through the grades normally. The first is the Ritual of attaining Knowledge and Conversation of the Holy Guardian Angel. Here the initiate gains awareness of self and receives the power inherent in this self-knowledge. The second critical juncture is the experience of the Abyss. Here the initiate must chose the right-hand path or the left-hand path.

Although Crowley admits to the possibilities of the practice of "Black Magick," for him this has little to do with the pursuit of the left-hand path. Whereas in most areas he is anxious to annihilate the distinctions between categories, such as between the Beast and Lamb, or Set and Horus—he seems equally anxious to preserve the distinction between (White) Magick and Black Magick. Any possible explanation for this incongruity is perhaps to be sought in Crowley's own character or needs. He has no objection to dealing with demonic forces,(57) but it is possible for him to explain lack of success in Magick by positing interference from the "Black Lodge."(58) Certainly he also could point the finger at magical rivals (such as Gurdjieff) or former teachers (such as S. L. Mathers) or former proteges (such as Austin Osman Spare) and call them "Black Brothers" if it suited him.

Vision

It is clear that Crowley's most ambitious intention in life was the establishment of a new universal religion—a new Law that would replace Christianity, Judaism, Islam and all the religions of mankind. His vision was one of universal transformation ushered in by the "equinox of the gods" helped along by his own work. Crowley would often return to the theme of the *universal progress* of humanity. At the same time (e.g. *AL II:25*) the Beast recognized a difference between the "chosen" or elect and the "people" or mob—"which refuses to admit its deity."(59) This attitude is typical of Crowley, he wants it both ways after all. His system is both universalistic, as are the right-hand path religions he sought to replace, and electoral (elitist), as are the mysteries of antiquity, Gnostic sects, and most occult organizations.

Was Crowley a Lord of the Left-Hand Path? Crowley himself sends a variety of mixed signals. He clearly defines what the left-hand path is in his own terms and carefully explains how he is not a "Black Brother." So we must take him at his word that he was not a treader of the left-hand path.

In my opinion the key to Crowley's attitude can be found in his self-image. He thought of his "mundane personality" as a fiendish demon—he often called it "the demon Crowley." He saw himself as limited and insignificant—but his True Self he saw as god-like. So the idea of self- or personality-annihilation and rebirth in the True or Higher Self appealed to him greatly. Analysis of his life shows, however, that the personality of Aleister Crowley appeared to be as strong emerging from the Abyss (on 3 December 1909) as it was going into the Abyss earlier that same year. Of course, our eyes may be deceived.

From the outside looking in it appears that A.C. meets all of the criteria be a Lord of the Left-Hand Path. He practiced antinomianism with a vengeance—but within a theory of strict monism (certainly inspired by his Buddhistic leanings). *Self-deification* is his goal clearly, as he defines it in his own *initiatory* system. It is fundamental to his work that this deification is that of the individual self and that it is accomplished by the will of the

individual magician by means of *Magick*. So, as I have established the criteria, Crowley is a Lord of the Left-Hand Path— but not by his own estimation or evaluation.

One of the major theorists and practitioners of the left-hand path in the latter 20th century, Dr. Michael Aquino, analyses Crowley's vision of himself and his work as being confused— or “perplexed.”(60) Given Crowley's criteria for initiation in the A. . . A. . coupled with Crowley's continued, and even heightened, manifestation of self and personality, a paradox exists. At the level of *Magister Templi* the *individual* self and its capacity to discriminate between one thing and another (i.e. logical thought) has supposedly been annihilated— how then can he “Understand the existing Universe in accordance with His own Mind”?(61) Dr. Aquino writes: “The inevitable conclusion is that there is no Right-Hand Path to the initiatory level of *Magister Templi* (at least not as prescribed by the original G. . . D. . and A. . . A. .). There is *only* the Left-Hand Path, and it is fraught with danger— not a one time crossing of the Abyss test, but a continuous peril that exists from the moment the individual completely realizes him-Self as a Magister.”(62) Aquino's analysis is essentially that Crowley *was* a Black Brother who, because of his unique position and Aeon Work, could not clearly see that fact himself.

The Saturnians

and

Gregor A. Gregorius

The Beast was a goat who spawned a thousand young. Sects and orders based on Crowley's system — or inspired by it — have been numerous in the latter half of this century. The most stable and continuous of the groups independent of Crowley's direct legacy is the *Fraternitas Saturni* (FS) — the Brotherhood of Saturn — led from 1927 to 1963 by Gregor A. Gregorius, whose mundane name was Eugen Grosche. The FS appears even more eclectic than Crowley's systems, and it seems also to embrace the traditional symbols of darkness even more enthusiastically than the Beast did.

Sources for the study of the FS have been limited and unsystematic, especially for those who do not read German. My book *Fire and Ice* was actually the first systematic treatment of the FS in any language. My study may be limited by the particular viewpoint of an author standing outside the system being treated inevitably brings to a subject. Other than this English language discussion, there are several collections of original documents. The most extensive of these is the complete collection of the *Blätter für angewandte (okkulte) Lebenskunst* published between 1950 and 1963. There are also the *Magische Briefe*, many of which have been reprinted by the German occult publisher Schikowski. Because a former Grand Master sold manuscripts of *Fraternitas Saturni* material to a German professor of folklore in 1968, who in turn published them, a floodgate of original FS documentation and some limited secondary material opened on the German market.(63) Some of this is valuable, especially a study called *Die Fraternitas Saturni: Eine saturnmagische Loge* written by Aythos, who is in fact another former Grand Master Jananda (= W. Jantschik).

History of the FS

Fraternitas Saturni tradition holds that the Brotherhood has roots going back to Scandinavian lodges and to the Polish magician and mathematician Joseph Maria Hoëne-Wronski (1776-1853),(64) but its direct ancestry goes back only as far as the Pansophical Lodge and the O.T.O.

The Pansophical Lodge was headed by Heinrich Tränker (Rechartus) and counted among its initiates Eugen Grosche (Gregor A. Gregorius), Karl Germer (Saturnus) and Albin Grau (Pacitus). Grau was an architect, and set-designer, for the German UFA studio in Berlin where he worked on the film *Nosferatu*, among others. Germer was to go on to become more closely associated with Aleister Crowley eventually becoming his magical heir. Tränker had derived his Masonic organizational authority from Theodor Reuss (Merlin/ Peregrinus) who was “Outer Head” of the O.T.O. from 1905 to 1922. In the years just after the First World War Tränker founded a variety of magical organizations, some of

which seem to have existed on paper only, and all of which had “pansophical” in their names. The background of these organizations seems to be one in common with the O.T.O.

The O.T.O. itself derived its organizational lineage from charters obtained from an English Mason named John Yarker. A Viennese industrialist and Mason, Karl Kellner, is said to have founded the O.T.O. around 1896, but no mention of it occurs in print before 1904.(65) Kellner is supposed to have pioneered a system of sexual magic. According to tradition he is said to have travelled to the east, like the fabled Christian Rosenkreuz, and learned the techniques from Masters in India and Arabia. It appears more likely that his teachings were derived from a French branch of the school of the American occultist Paschal Beverly Randolph.(66)

These two already closely related streams of German occultism came together for a time at the so-called Waida Conference in 1925. This meeting was held at Tränker’s home near Waida, Germany and its purpose was to bring Aleister Crowley together with German leaders that they might accept his Law of Thelema. The conference was only a qualified success for Crowley. The participants accepted the Law of Thelema, although some shortly thereafter rejected it. Gregorius then went on in 1928 to establish the *Fraternitas Saturni* as an order which accepted and worked with Crowley’s Thelemic Law, but which remained completely independent of involvement with the Beast personally.

The work of the order was, of course, interrupted by the Nazi years. In 1950 Gregorius reorganized the FS and it enjoyed a very productive phase from that time to the time of his death in 1963. After that there was a period of unsettled leadership until 1971 when the Brotherhood reconstituted itself. The magical philosophy I examine here is that presided over by Gregor A. Gregorius between 1928 and 1963.

Saturnian Cosmology

The cosmological doctrine of the *Fraternitas Saturni*— or its Cosmosophy — is based on dualities and the interplay of dualities: light and darkness, inner and outer, male and female. This echoes Crowley’s “monistic dualism” and his polarity between Hadit and Nuit. The synthesis of polar opposites is a much stronger theme in Saturnian teachings than it is in the writings of Crowley.

From the theories of the “heretical” astrophysicist Hans Hörbiger (1860-1931) Gregorius gleaned a doctrine of the cosmic tension between centripetal and centrifugal forces— between the forces of repulsion/expansion and attraction/contraction. The center of the cosmos is symbolized by the center of the sun, while the outer limits of it is embodied in the orbit of the planet Saturn. (In ancient astronomy/astrology Saturn was the outermost planet as the others were not visible.)

Saturnian teachings give *primacy* to darkness. Darkness is said to precede light and to provide a matrix for the manifestation of the light: Without darkness there is no light!(67) The “dualism” of the FS is not one that seeks to destroy one pole in favor of the other, but rather it seeks to go beyond the polarities through experience of both extremes.

Gregorius places more emphasis on astrological, or “astrosophical” factors than Crowley. For Gregorius the New Aeon was to be as much determined by the transition into the much anticipated Age of Aquarius as by the Equinox of the Gods perceived by the Beast. In traditional medieval astrology the zodiacal sign of Aquarius is ruled by the planetary force of Saturn. In modern forms the planet Uranus is given primary rulership over that sign. The Kabbalah played a significantly smaller role in Saturnian teachings about the nature and structure of the cosmos than it did in the G.·.D.·., A.·.A.·. or the O.T.O.

For the Saturnian the cosmos seems to be a much harsher, more severe, place to survive in than it does to the more “orthodox” Thelemite. The Law of Thelema was in fact modified or extended by Gregorius to conclude: Love is the Law, Compassionless Love (*G. Mitleidlose Liebe*). This compassionless, or “pitiless,” love is derived in part from *Liber AL*:

We have nothing with the outcast and the unfit:
let them die in their misery. For they feel not.
Compassion is the vice of kings: stamp down the
wretched and the weak: this is the law of the
strong: this is our law and the joy of the world.

(AL II: 21)

But the Saturnian formula seems more directly based on the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) who, in his seminal work *Also sprach Zarathustra* (Thus spoke Zarathustra) equated pity (G. *Mitleid*) with self-annihilation.(68) For the Saturnian rejection of “pity” is the magical equivalent of the rejection of self-annihilation. In looking at the Saturnian initiatory path it will be noted that there was no hint of the Abyss phenomenon or the exhortation to destroy the mundane self so that a new one may be reborn from its ashes.

Humanity in the Dark Light of Saturn

In an address entitled “Der Mensch in seiner höchsten Erkenntnisreife” (Humanity in its Fullest Intellectual Maturity)(69) delivered at the Easter Lodge of the FS in 1961, Gregorius discussed the nature of humanity in a way reminiscent of Pico della Mirandola’s “Oration.” As an individual being Gregorius sees the human as an entity caught between two opposing poles of life or creativity and death or destruction, between knowledge and ignorance. But Gregorius does not see these as “good” versus “evil.” He sees both poles as necessary to the evolution or initiation of the individual. Only an elite, however, will ever see beyond the dualities or will be able to utilize both poles for the evolution of the self.

Ignorance or “Agnosis” (G. *Nichtwissen*), when recognized as such by the subject, is a true spur to real knowledge or understanding. Here we are reminded of the declaration of the oracle at Delphi that Socrates was the wisest of men in all Greece because he claimed “to know nothing.” All knowledge begins with an assumption of ignorance. But the ignorance is like a great weight on the spirit and soul— only the strong will be able to use this resistance to enlightenment for the purpose of initiation. The all-pervasive ignorance of the masses is a testing mechanism. The masses incapable of true Knowledge (*gnosis*) become prisoners of unconsciousness where external god-forms are projected in order to allay the humans’ fear of having to doubt. The Saturnian elite, however, recognize that they are their own gods— they must be for there simply are no others. Gregorius writes that the Saturnian initiate “should elevate himself upon the pedestal of a god-like entity, despite his profound knowledge that there is no personal God— just as there is no Devil.”(p. 4) Gregorius poetically expressed this idea in his 1943 poem “Thou art Thine Own God”:

1. Thou must affirm the God in Thee, for every
doubt takes power from Thee.
Every hour of Thy divine knowledge brings
Thee a step higher in Thy journey.
2. Thou canst unfold the spark,
that God bestowed on Thee, to a pure flame
that makes worlds fall and rise again,
God is in Thee! — Thou art Thyself God!
3. Thus Thou canst have Gods enthroned in Thee
build altars, ignite sacrificial flames,
for every dream — and form of thought is
Thy power,
and every force of desire takes a form and
shape.

4. Thus art Thou the shaper of transcendental worlds,
imaginative creator of Thine own realm,
Thou art priest, magus, royal lord
and prince in Thy soul's expanse.
5. Cyprus groves stand round Thy palaces of thought
and blue waves lap at the marble steps
and ships fare out upon the seas,
for Thee, who wearest the purple.
6. The Earth is Thy sorrow that shaped the knowledge
and bitter fruits of Thy Golgatha—
And nevertheless the call rings out to Thee:
Lo! I am here!

Saturnian "Theology"

Despite the insistence on the initiated individual as the true measurement of the divine, certain apparently objective figures of god-like dimensions play a part in the Saturnian cosmology. These apparent divinities are, however, not gods in the traditional sense. They are either objective concrete phenomena (following the way Crowley described the true nature of Nuit and Hadit) or psychogonic projections of individual or collective human minds.

To the former category belong entities such as Saturnus — the creative agency of the cosmos, or demiurge as well as Lucifer and Satana/s— the so-called higher and lower octaves of the Saturnian sphere. To the latter category belongs the GOTOS, the egregore of the *Fraternitas Saturni*. This entity has been built up through the ages as a result of Saturnian magical work by individual magicians and the FS as a whole. The Grand Master of the order stands in a special relationship with this entity as it is identified with the 33^o of the order— the *Gradus Ordinis Templi Orientis Saturni* (G.O.T.O.S.).

The archetypes such as Saturnus and Lucifer become models for the evolution of the magician. They are the patterns of existence in the objective universe which initiates use to shape their own paths of transformation. But the entities that are the pure products of human will are utilized as tools for the creation of certain magical effects. The GOTOS holds together and empowers the FS in a general way and lends its power to individual members who know the keys to gaining access to that power. The creation of such egregores or psychogones (entities generated by the human psyche or will) is a common magical technique in the *Fraternitas Saturni* even on a much smaller scale. In many ways the magical teachings of the FS seem to be a return to the extremely archaic practices of priests, like the Vedic Brahmins, who worship the gods which they themselves have created.

The Initiatory Path of Saturn

The structural framework of initiation in the *Fraternitas Saturni* is provided by the 33 degrees based on the system of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite. This becomes a vast training curriculum for the acquisition of magical skills and techniques. (70) More than the systems of Aleister Crowley that of the FS and Gregor A. Gregorius emphasizes a wide range of magical and meditative techniques and methods as being necessary to progress. This progress is seen as a continuum through the 33 degrees with no annihilation of the self being a part of it.

The path of Saturn is constantly being called one that is both lonely and fraught with danger and suffering— all of which is taken on as a matter of self-determined volition. There is intentional suffering, as Gurdjieff might call it. The role of antinomianism in the *Fraternitas Saturni* curriculum is great. Not only is there an emphasis on dark and foreboding images and experiences, which is meant to weed out those unfit for Saturnian initiation, but there is also the common training principle of going against the grain of the

initiate's natural inclinations. For example, if the person is naturally oriented toward intellectual and analytical pursuits, that person might be directed to emphasize emotive and intuitive methods in training.(71)

The magical methodology created by Gregorius for the FS hinges on *experience* and *knowledge*— the experience of the Saturnian life and of the sacraments of the Brotherhood and knowledge of the Saturnian “Cosmosophy” or wisdom concerning the cosmic order. Solitude is cultivated so as to isolate the true subject of the transformation— the individual self. The transformational process follows along a path defined by the 33 degrees leading from Earth to the core of the Saturnian sphere. In that sphere, according to Saturnian Cosmosophy, is the true reality of the Solar Logos. The Sun is the polar opposite of Saturn. But because the core on one extreme contains the essence of its opposite, the path to Saturn is the surest path to the Sun. In this way the alchemical “lead” is transformed into “gold.” Standard western magical symbolism ascribes lead to Saturn and gold to the Sun. This is the initiatory application of the Cosmosophical doctrines of polarization.

The chief function of the Brotherhood itself in this process for the individual is that the group builds and maintains a constant bond with the Saturnian sphere in the form of the egregore GOTOS. The egregore is the product of concentrated collective thought forms built up throughout the years by the FS. The bond with this egregore both aids in the “re-polarization” of the individual toward the Saturnian sphere and provides energy for effecting practical magical ends.

The Saturnian Vision

Because the *Fraternitas Saturni* has as one of its main teachings that the world is passing into an Aquarian-Uranian Age a fairly developed picture of the envisioned future emerges. It only bears a fleeting resemblance to the much publicized “Age of Aquarius” made popular in the 1960s and 1970s. The astrological sign Aquarius is traditionally ruled by Saturn with his dark and distant aspects. Only in more modern times, with the discovery of the planets outside the orbit of Saturn, was Aquarius assigned to the planet Uranus.

This Aquarian-Uranian Age, ruled by Saturn, will be one in which a spiritual elite will be increasingly powerful. But because the initiatory process of this *Saturnian* spiritual elite takes place on a very individualized basis, cooperation or fellowship between and among initiates will be a great challenge. This is part of the significance of the Brotherhood of Saturn itself. The individuals seek solitude for their spiritual development, but the physical basis needed to sustain the spiritual solitude requires social cooperation. One unrealized, yet definite part of the Saturnian vision was the establishment of a “monastery” for initiates. This monastery would serve as an educational center (and vacation site) for most members of the order, while it would be staffed by a group of high grade initiates who would live there.(72) The monastery would provide the kind of physical and spiritual isolation conducive to Saturnian initiation.

Gregor A. Gregorius and The Left-Hand Path

As compared to the writings of Aleister Crowley, those of Gregorius are much more filled with direct evidence of a self-conception of his *Fraternitas Saturni* as being something of a “dark brotherhood.” The association of Saturn with Lucifer/Satan (as the higher and lower octave of the planetary sphere) is freely made and antinomianism is even a part of the training theory promoted by Gregorius. Of course, magic is the chief tool in FS practice and this tool is used mainly for the purpose of initiation or transformation of the brother or sister through the 33 degrees of the Saturnian system. Finally, Gregorius overtly promoted the idea of self-deification as the end of the Saturnian path. That this is a highly individualized path, and an essentially *solitary* one, is emphasized by the nature traditionally ascribed to Saturn. Perhaps more than any other single figure in the first half of the 20th century, Gregor A. Gregorius exemplifies a true Lord of the Left-Hand Path.

Austin Osman Spare: The Lover of the Self

One of the most uncanny figures of the occult revival was Austin Osman Spare. Spare is odd in that he founded no organized group, wrote little — and what he did write was often obscure and muddled — and was most particularly a graphic artist, not a thinker or philosopher. Spare's magic wells up from the unconscious, from a realm of images swirling in the right hemisphere of the brain.

Perhaps the main reason for discussing Spare as a possible Lord of the Left-Hand Path is that apparently Aleister Crowley once called him a "Black Brother." The reason Crowley gave for this is that he thought Spare's practice amounted to a "cultivation of self-love through pleasure." (73) This comment alone — if it is reliable — necessitate the examination of Spare's ideas for this study. A major problem with the study of Spare's magic is that more has been written and spoken about it than Spare himself ever put into words. We often remain dependent on the interpretations of others — especially those of Kenneth Grant — for some important data. Grant too categorized Spare as a magician of the left-hand path, which Grant defines as the "path of those who use the energies of sex for gaining control of unseen worlds and their denizens." (74) This definition, which seems influenced by Buddhistic attitudes, is far too limited and simplistic for our study. But it is yet another assessment of Spare as a practitioner of the left-hand path.

Spare was born in 1886, the son of a Loudon policeman. He became a graphic artist and edited and published several magazines and books between 1905 and 1927. His most important works are *Earth : Inferno* (1905), *A Book of Satyrs* (1909), *The Book of Pleasure (Self-Love)* (1913), *The Focus of Life* (1921) and *The Anathema of Zos: The Sermons to Hypocrites* (1927). In 1910 he joined Crowley's A..A., but soon dropped out. Spare became increasingly alienated from "normal" society so that by 1930 he had completely dropped out of his usual circles. Until his death in 1956 he lived in a South London slum.

Kenneth Grant met him in 1949 and knew him until the time of his death, whereupon Grant became his literary executor. Spare, chiefly through Grant's efforts, became more well-known in death than he ever had in life. Not only has Grant's "branch" of the O.T.O. been influenced by Spare's magical ideas, but two other contemporary orders owe significant debts to Spare's "system." There were the Temple of Psychik Youth headed by Genesis P-Orage and the "Illuminates of Thanateros" (IOT) once headed by Peter Carroll.

Spare's cosmology and theology are one and the same because he has a pantheistic view of reality. For Spare there is a universal Self called Kia which is also the "primal power" of the universe analogous to the Chinese Tao or the Kabbalistic *ain soph*. Spare theorized that the Kia became bored in its monotonous existence and so "condensed itself," or part of itself into "matter." The planets are used by Kia as staging grounds for the evolution of life. Living creatures are thought to be the "sensory organs" of Kia. The whole physical universe is seen as the product of Kia's will to generate a love object within itself— Kia's will is that of self-love. Therefore conscious human existence has as its highest purpose the generation of experience for Kia to enjoy. "We love Kia by self-love." (75) When self-love dominates in the awareness of a human being that person's motivation is harmonized with that of Kia itself.

So in Spare's view humans are not creatures separate from the natural order, but merely sentient extensions of an absolute reality otherwise cut off from experience of itself. The task of mankind is not to differentiate itself from the natural order through the love of the individual self, but to imitate Kia's cosmic self-love by means of mankind's own communion with the unconscious. Spare, following contemporary psychological theories of Freud and Jung, held that a person has a conscious mind — which is ignorant of experience of Kia — and an unconscious mind. The latter component is the link between

the person and Kia— or reality. The unconscious is thought to be inhabited by “elemental automata” or “atavisms” with their ultimate sources in the deepest levels of Kia. These psychic atavisms are said to be the actual means for Kia’s self-awareness. When humans gain experience of these atavisms, Kia gains wider experience in the world of matter.

Spare, like many magicians contemporary with him, was in many ways a materialist. In *Earth : Inferno* (1904) he implies that the realm of the flesh, or the natural order, is all that really exists. Thoughts to the contrary are illusions.

From a left-hand path viewpoint the most interesting aspect of Spare’s system is not his highly subjective cosmology and “theology,” but his magical technology. The cosmology is essentially a right-hand path system— albeit an idiosyncratic or solipsistic one. But his method of working his own magic is so subjective that it must be considered an exercise in at least one kind of left-hand path *practice* if not theory. Spare created his own personal magical system independent of any known tradition. In addition there is no evidence that he really tried to imply that his system was anything other than just this own personal idiosyncratic system with no necessary universal value. Spare created a totally arbitrary magical symbology. This involved his representational graphic art-work and a peculiar set of symbols he called the “Alphabet of Desire.” He never presented or explained this “Alphabet” in a complete or systematic way. It is a series of glyphs or ideograms each representing an eternal identifiable element in Spare’s own unconscious.

Spare’s method of linking the conscious mind (the material world) with the unconscious (Kia) was to create images consciously and then suppress them into the unconscious where they must be forgotten by the conscious mind. Then they will be free to affect the “flow of Fate” and cause the desired effects in the material or conscious world. This process is what Spare called “making the desire organic” or “fleshing” it.

An example of the way Spare “fleshed” desires is provided by the magical technique of “sigilization.” This involves the creation of unique graphic forms to act as anchors to sink desires into the deep unconscious and to fix them by an unseen chain to the material world. The most intelligible explanation of Spare’s use of various kinds of sigils is found in Frater U.,D.’s *Practical Sigil Magic*.

Ultimately the only reason Spare would deserve Crowley’s designation of him as a “Black Brother” can be found in his practice of creating an entirely subjective, personal and unique cosmology and technology for dealing with it. In this regard Spare *practiced* a separation from the environment even if he did not promote this idea in *theory*. In Spare’s theory self-love is not a turning away from the absolute (Kia) but the only possible direct way to embrace it.

The main problem in interpreting the left-hand path contents of Spare’s ideas is that we are sometimes led astray by the interpretations of other writers. Spare wrote relatively little himself and often what he wrote was unclear and ambiguous. He was a highly undisciplined and virtually unedited writer. But sometimes when reading Spare it is difficult to shake off the nagging feeling that the reader is simply trying to unravel the ravings of a man half-mad by his own design.

Austin Osman Spare makes for an interesting comparison with Anton LaVey. Both are essentially creative artists— and both artistically create their subjective experiences based on a carnal mystery. Spare tended to project the vision more and more *inward* while LaVey projects his *outward*.

The Fourth Way and the Left-Hand Path

If we were to measure the magnitude of “occult leaders” by the greatness achieved by those whom they taught or in some positive way influenced, then certainly the greatest such teacher of the 20th century would be George Ivanovitch Gurdjieff. He was the principal teacher of P. D. Ouspensky and several others who went on to form their own independent groups within what is known as the Work. (See Figure 8.2.) Gurdjieff’s teachings have


formatively influenced people as diverse as architect Frank Lloyd Wright, painter Georgia O'Keefe, film-makers Alexandro Jodorosky and Peter Brooks, authors Katherine Mansfield, J. B. Priestly and Katherine Hume, as well as musicians as diverse as Thomas de Hartmann, Alexander de Salzmann and Robert Fripp.(76) Gurdjieff, despite his unabashedly "esoteric" status, has even exerted direct influence on some schools of "orthodox" psychology, for example *Gestalt*, and his ideas are often held in high regard in the academic world.

Gurdjieff is also an unusual figure in the occult revival because when he came upon the scene publicly in Russia for the first time, it was for the expressed purpose of combating the "occult revival" which he characterized as a "psychosis."(77)

At the same time Mr. G., as he is often affectionately referred to by his followers, is generally shrouded with a mantle of sinister reputation and dark mystery himself. Like others with cultural roots in the lands of eastern Christianity, he seemed to feel little compunction about occasionally associating himself the "the benevolent Devil." Gurdjieff's greatest literary work, *Beelzebub's Tales to his Grandson*, again places Mr. G. in the Devil's lineage. Such references would, however, be nothing but poetic flourishes or deliberate attempts to obfuscate the hidden truths in the absence of more positive evidence. Gurdjieff also has his share of detractors. Louis Pauwels *Gurdjieff* (1972) is a collection of such sinister depictions of Mr. G. He was supposed to have been involved with Hitler and the Nazis — as well as with Joseph Stalin.(78) He is supposed to have been able to stimulate an orgasmic response in women by his gaze alone.(79)

But despite his contemporary sinister reputation, or perhaps *because* of it, even his detractors often ended in extoling his power and sometimes even in carrying on his essential teachings. Mr. G. often ended his association with former pupils in an abrupt or offensive way— he had to drive them away in disillusionment in order for them to gain their own independent existence. Behavior patterns such as these are just one more obstacle in the path of any would-be biographer of G. I. Gurdjieff.(80)

Figure 8.2: The Branches of the Tradition



Remarkable Men

The Lives of G. I. Gurdjieff and P. D. Ouspensky

Gurdjieff was probably born in 1874,(81) perhaps on January 13 (New Year's Day in the Old Style Russian calendar) in Alexandropol, later called Leninakan in the present day Republic of Armenia. But even these basic data are controversial and subject to mythologizing. The whole of Gurdjieff's early life (until 1912) is shrouded in mystery and self-created myth. The most objective biographical treatment seems to be that of James Webb, *The Harmonious Circle* (1980).

His mother was Armenian and his father was an emigre from Greece. The family's original name was probably Georgiades, which was Armenianized to Gurdjian, and when the region became part of the Russian Empire the name was Slavicized to Gurdjieff. In 1877 the family moved to Kars, closer to the Turkish border. It is there that Gurdjieff grew up.

Gurdjieff's earliest teacher appears to have been his father who was an *ashokh*— one steeped in traditional ancestral lore. During his formative years he was exposed to a rich mixture of Greek, Armenian and Russian Orthodox Christian spirituality. These eastern sects of Christianity are not only more open to what might be called in the west "occult" ideas and practices, but are also much less intolerant of divergent spiritual paths. It is even possible that Gurdjieff spent some time training for the priesthood in the Greek Orthodox tradition.(82)

Around the year 1892, when he would have been 18 years old, Gurdjieff underwent a turning point in his life. He decided to seek knowledge and truth no matter what the cost. Shortly after this, in 1895, Gurdjieff tells us that a group of young fellow investigators formed an association they called the "Seekers for Truth." It would also have been about this time that he would have been eligible to be conscripted into military service for the Tsar. There is good evidence to suggest that the young Gurdjieff fulfilled his military obligation to the Tsar in the field of espionage and later even diplomacy in foreign lands to the south and east of Russia.(83) This period of service most likely lasted from 1892 to 1904 or perhaps 1910. He was wounded by gun-fire on at least three occasions during this time, the first time in Crete in 1896 while he was apparently involved with Greek nationalist interests on that island opposing the Turkish forces there.

Most of Gurdjieff's travels and assignments seem to have been concentrated in the *east*— in the regions of present-day Turkestan, Afghanistan, Tibet and Mongolia. It even appears that, under an assumed identity, he became an intimate of the court of the Dalai Lama in Lhasa. These activities in behalf of Russia and Tibet continued until at least 1904. From that time to around 1910 it is said he studied hypnotism and healing arts in the central Asian region of Turkestan. The timing of his return to Russia from central Asia coincides with the Chinese invasion of Tibet in 1910 which effectively put an end to the interest Russian intelligence had in that country.

With his career in the intelligence service at an end, Gurdjieff, at the probable age of 36, began to bring together what he had learned over the past 18 years. He moved to St. Petersburg in 1910 and in 1912 began his new career in teaching his unique system to a select circle of pupils. In 1914 he moved to Moscow, and in the spring of 1915 he met a man who would become his most influential student— P. D. Ouspensky.

The "orthodox" Gurdjieffian mythology would have it that Mr. G. spent the years up until 1910 traveling from teacher to teacher, especially in the Middle East, eventually becoming highly initiated in a major international Sufistic brotherhood. This brotherhood then sent him to undertake the enlightenment of the west using a method and system appropriate to the present culture of the Occident.

From the truly *objective* viewpoint — using the word "objective" as Gurdjieff himself might have used it — it does not matter which version, if either, is factually true. It matters only which one brings the individual *subject* of the search for *truth* closer to his goal.

By the winter of 1916 the chaos caused by the First World War and the onset of revolutionary activity prompted Gurdjieff to move south with his students to the ancient Armenian town of Essentuki on the northern side of the Caucasus mountains. There they remained together through the difficult circumstances occasioned by the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. In January 1919 they moved on to Tiflis on the southern side of the Caucasus near Gurdjieff's family home. There he founded the Institute for the Harmonious Development of Man— but the harsh political conditions forced it to be dissolved in the spring of 1920. By June of that same year it was clear that Gurdjieff and his pupils would have to immigrate to the west as so many other subjects of the Russian Empire had been forced to do. First they went to Constantinople (Istanbul), where the Institute was reopened for a year. But this was only a temporary stop-over for a more ambitious mission to western Europe. The group's first stop was in Berlin, where they stayed from the summer of 1921 to the summer of 1922.

During the stay in Germany there was contact with the artistic communities of Berlin and Hellerau (near Dresden)— where Gurdjieff briefly attempted to gain control over a facility earlier abandoned by the founder of "Eurhythmics" (*Rhythmische Gymnastik*), Jaques-Dalcroze.(84) There is no evidence to show that Gurdjieff had any contact with the then subversive National Socialists— any contact with members of that movement would have come during Gurdjieff's many trips to Germany in the late 1920s.(85)

Paris became Gurdjieff's final destination in the west, as it had for so many other refugees from the Bolshevik Revolution. In 1922 he bought an estate, later named the Priure in Fontainebleau near Paris. Here his Institute was again established and it was here that Gurdjieff's reputation in the west was made. Students came from everywhere, but especially from America.

One famous visitor was Aleister Crowley, who showed up as a weekend guest in 1925. After Gurdjieff had fulfilled his obligations as a host he ejected Crowley with a flurry of invectives. Perhaps Mr. G.'s ire had been raised when Crowley told a group of children at the Priure that he was raising his own child "to be a devil."(86)

Despite the fact that many students were attracted to Gurdjieff's teachings, his manner and means of teaching drove almost as many away after some period. Ouspensky finally broke with him in 1924, and his most dynamic western pupil, A.R. Orage, was driven off by 1931. Even the de Hartmanns, who had been with Gurdjieff since the beginning of his teaching in Russia, were driven off — all by impossible, irrational demands made on them by their "Master." All of this led to financial disaster for the Priure, which eventually had to be sold in 1933. From then until the outbreak of World War II, Gurdjieff lived in transit in various locals in Europe and the United States. It was also during this period that he wrote his major literary productions.

Strangely enough, when war did erupt in Europe, Gurdjieff returned to Paris where he lived out the war years mostly under German occupation. According to him he "sold rugs, owned a company that made false eyelashes — and made 'deals' with many people ..." to get along. This is just one more of the verifiable facts concerning Gurdjieff's life and political dealings that invite sensational speculation.

After the war he again took up an itinerant existence teaching certain pupils and continuing to write and rewrite *Beelzebub's Tales*. Gurdjieff died on October 29, 1949.

Just two years earlier, on October 2, 1947, Gurdjieff's most influential single student, Pyotr Demianovitch Ouspensky, had died in London. Ouspensky's life had been vastly different from that of Gurdjieff. was born in Moscow on March 5, 1878 (Old Style) to a well educated, westernized family. His father was an officer in the Russian Survey Service and an amateur mathematician. His mother was a painter and an amateur student of French and Russian literature. In 1888 his parents took young Pyotr to France to see the Paris Exposition.

Ouspensky appears to have been one of those personality types — common among geniuses and "okkultnik ninkompoops" alike — (and the two types should not be

confused) — who can muster no motivation to learn and study things that do not interest them intensely at that very moment. The result of this in Ouspensky's case is that he failed out of university preparatory school when he was about 16 years old. He then became an auditor in lectures at Moscow University. He read Nietzsche about this time and was greatly influenced by the German philosopher's ideas of the overman. From 1896 to 1905 Ouspensky traveled widely seeking hidden knowledge — his "search for the miraculous" had begun. At the age of 27 he began his career as a journalist writing for both newspapers and magazines. In 1907 he discovered Theosophy, with which he was never quite satisfied. It surely lacked the precision he was looking for.

The social milieu of literary Symbolism and the avant garde became Ouspensky's accustomed existence. He became a free-lance journalist and lectured on occult subjects in the years between 1909 and 1912. In 1912 his first book, *Tertium Organum* was published. This is a valuable record of the nature and quality of his thought before exposure to Gurdjieff's ideas. He spent most of the years 1913 and 1914 in India, where he visited the headquarters of the Theosophical Society in Benares. He found nothing miraculous there.

Another "pre-Gurdjieffian" work, *Talks with a Devil*, written in 1914 in India and Ceylon is of interest to us because in it we learn of Ouspensky's particular attitudes toward the Devil and evil rooted in Slavic folklore as well as in the spirit of his own time and place. For Ouspensky the Devil is the embodiment of Matter. Logic and science are his tools and he uses these to entrap mankind into remaining enslaved to Matter. The Devil could be said not to exist in any real sense— but to be the creation of man through ignorance of the nature of matter and the lack of knowledge concerning the reality beyond material appearances. In this metaphor Ouspensky is firmly on the side of God, as an embodiment of spirituality and against the Devil who is the embodiment of GREAT MATTER.(87) Ouspensky's attitudes can be compared to those of his contemporary countryman, Lenin, who took the other side in this cosmological debate.

Upon his return to Russia in the following year he met Gurdjieff and became one of his pupils. Intensive work with Gurdjieff lasted until 1918 when a combination of revolutionary chaos and some misgivings caused him to go his separate way during the migrations Gurdjieff and his students made before eventually settling at the Priure.

Ouspensky finally immigrated to England in August of 1921 where he at once began teaching the ideas of Gurdjieff. He gathered students around himself and set up a school that would pursue a course independent from that of Gurdjieff himself. Although Ouspensky's school was essentially "Gurdjieffian," he did tend to attempt to reduce Gurdjieff's teachings to generally intelligible principles. But in the last weeks of Ouspensky's life it is reported that he repudiated Gurdjieff's teachings as a whole and advised his students to make a fresh start in their individual quests.(88)

The "orthodox" Gurdjieffian evaluation of the split between Ouspensky and Mr. G. (although this reason is nowhere made explicit) is that Ouspensky wanted to reduce the "system" to general principles which is impossible because the "system" is only applicable to individual persons, times and places as determined at critical moments by a living teacher— a Man Who Knows. The major problem with this interpretation is that it leaves the whole Gurdjieffian movement — or "the Work" — in a hopeless situation upon the death of their Master. This would be at least one reason for Gurdjieff uttering his reputed last words: "I'm leaving you all in a fine mess!" to his followers at his death-bed.

Sources of Study

Many of Gurdjieff's students, and their students, have written copiously on "the Work." Perhaps the best general introduction is Kathleen R. Speeth's *The Gurdjieff Work* (1976), while the best in-depth introduction to the basic ideas remains Ouspensky's *In Search of the Miraculous* (1939). Several other studies by Ouspensky continue to be invaluable for understanding Gurdjieff's basic system. These are *A New Model of the Universe* (1931), *The Psychology of Man's Possible Evolution* (1947) and a posthumous

collection of shorter works and lectures, *The Fourth Way* (1957). The direct approach to Gurdjieff through his own writings: *Herald of the Coming Good* (1933), *Beelzebub's Tales to His Grandson* (1949), *Meetings with Remarkable Men* (1963), and a collection of early talks included in a collection entitled *Views from the Real World* (1973), and *Life Is Only Real Then, When "I Am"* (1975) would be bewildering without the guidance of either secondary sources or a teacher in the Work. This is only to be expected since all of Gurdjieff's own works were written with the main intention that they would be read as a part of guided work within his system.

The Organization of the Work

Before Mr. G.'s death, of course, the true center of the Gurdjieff Work could be easily focused on him and his Institute for the Harmonious Development of Man— at least until the closing of the Priore in 1933. But other major teachers of Gurdjieff's system did emerge, even in his own lifetime. These included P. D. Ouspensky's group in London as well as groups around A. R. Orage. After Gurdjieff's death, however, the Work splintered into many schools with many former students founding their own branches. These are delineated on the bottom half of the diagram below. The most direct line of the tradition would appear to be the Gurdjieff Foundations instituted by Jeanne de Salzmann after Gurdjieff's death. It is said that in the days before his death Mr. G. instructed Mdme. de Salzmann on how to carry on his Work.

The typical Gurdjieff Foundation group works under the guidance of a teacher and elder students. They have weekly meetings which usually involve a question/answer format (students pose questions and the teacher answers them), after a while the physical exercises or "movements" are studied as well as the writings of Gurdjieff. Also typical of these groups is that they will acquire some piece of property where the group will labor on the physical structure of the property as a form of exercise.

There are no provisions for formal initiations or recognitions of various levels of development in the Gurdjieffian school— although such levels of initiatory development are theoretically clearly articulated in the system itself. It seems that perhaps behind some of Mr. G.'s apparent "antics" was the hidden agenda to "shock" advanced students into venturing out on their own after the Work had done all it could for them. The "initiatory system" of Gurdjieff verged on the Darwinian as only the fittest survived and thrived within and beyond the confines of the Work.

The Work

Gurdjieff's Work is predicated on a definite anthropology — and understanding of man — or "psychology." But to call it a psychology may be going too far when being very precise about what Gurdjieff taught. *Psychology* is the understanding of the *soul*— which Gurdjieff categorically denied that the "normal," average man even has (or needs).

Mr. G. taught that normal man is *asleep* and completely *mechanical* in his actions. He is non-conscious and therefore can *do* nothing. Events *do* him, so to speak. "Things just happen." Normal man is impotent. his "I-consciousness" is *fragmented*. Normal man is not just one, but many. Many "I's" vie for focus in the normal man with no central controller present. "*Man is a plurality. Man's name is legion*" (89) (This is an obvious reference to Mk. 5:9 where Jesus asks a demon in a man what its name is. it answers: "Legion is my name, because we are many.") Normal man is *mortal*, having no *soul* (or *essence*) to survive in the *post mortem* state. Gurdjieff used the Platonic metaphor of man being imprisoned(90) — his goal is to escape to freedom. But like Plato's men in the cave, normal men need the help of those who have escaped before— they need the help of "Men Who Know."

The extraordinary man, the "Fourth Man" is in contrast to the normal man free, and he is *immortal*. This is due to the fact that he has been able to build up an essence in himself — or a true soul — which comes from a crystallization of a unified I-consciousness. This kind of man then becomes *potent* in the world around him. he can actually *do* things rather

than having things “do” him. The Fourth Man is no longer mechanical (except when he wills himself to be so) — he is awakened and no longer asleep.

The following table contrasts the characteristics of the “normal man” and the “Fourth Man.”

Normal Man		Fourth Man
asleep		awakened
mechanical		non-mechanical
impotent		potent
fragmented		unified
mortal		immortal
imprisoned	—> escape —>	free
	with help of those	
	who have escaped before	

Gurdjieff taught a definite structure of the individual which consists of four “bodies:”

1. Physical or Carnal Body (body)
2. Astral or Natural Body (feelings, desires)
3. Mental or Spiritual Body (mind)
4. Causal or Divine Body (I-consciousness, will)

Not all men have all four bodies. Only the first body is possessed by all. The other bodies must be developed through the Work of some kind. Even mastery of the Carnal Body requires Work, however.

There are, according to Gurdjieffian teaching, four *ways* of working: 1) the Way of the Fakir, who develops power over and through the Carnal Body, 2) the Way of the Monk, who develops unity in himself through his emotions or Natural Body, 3) the Way of the Yogi, who develops power through knowledge and even understanding, i.e. the Spiritual Body. The Yogi often attempts to enter the fourth state of the Divine Body, but finds this difficult because equal mastery of the first and second bodies must be gained also. 4) The Way of the Sly Man—the *Fourth Way* — in which all sides of the individual — the physical, emotional, and mental — are developed in a balanced and harmonious way. These are the *only* ways of working. Each of these ways develop some or all of man’s hidden potentialities. This development is not, however, part of a natural law. “The law for man is existence in the circle of mechanical influences, the state of ‘man machine.’ The way of the development of hidden possibilities in a way *against nature, against God.*”(91)

To explain how these four bodies are, or can be linked together in the life of an individual, Gurdjieff called on an old Indo-European metaphor used by both Plato and the philosophers of the Indian *Upanishads* which compares the carnal body to a chariot, the soul to a horse, the mind to the driver, and the consciousness to the will of the driver.(92) The problem with normal man is that he is driven by his chariot, rather than having his will in control. Gurdjieff’s position is that normal man is driven by the chariot itself or by the horse, whereas only the will or consciousness of the Fourth Man is truly in control of the lower bodies. The contrast between these two extremes is shown by the diagrams in figure 8.3 which Gurdjieff produced for his early students in Russia.(93)

The Seven Men

The Concept of Initiation in the Fourth Way

The aim of development in the Gurdjieffian system is the potent immortality of the *individual*. Gurdjieff taught that *individuality* (a permanent and unchangeable I-consciousness) and *immortality* are qualities which *can* belong to man, but which *do not naturally* or normally belong to him.(94) Furthermore, this development is only possible for a *few* individuals. This is partly due to the fact that the knowledge needed for such development is in limited supply.

Mr. G. taught that as far as the mass of humanity is concerned, *nature* controls the level of development. Man only evolves as it serves the purposes of nature to allow him to

evolve.(95) “Changes likely to violate the general requirements of nature can only take place in separate units.”(96)

Figure 8.3: The Horse and Driver

“Carriage”	“Horse”	“Driver”	“Master”
Body Desires	Feelings and	Mind	I-Consciousness or Will
Carnal Body	Natural Body	Spiritual Body	Divine Body

“Humanity neither progresses nor evolves.”(97) As the human species exists for the needs and purposes of nature on this planet, evolution of the species beyond a certain point is detrimental and actually impossible.(98) Evolutionary possibilities do exist for *separate* individuals only. “Such developments can take place only in the interests of the man himself against, so to speak, the interests and of the planetary world.”(99) Forces seem to resist the evolution of large masses, but individuals can slip past the resistance. “What is possible for individual man is impossible for the masses.”(100) Gurdjieff further insisted upon the idea that mechanical or unconscious evolution is impossible. “The evolution of man is the evolution of consciousness. *And ‘consciousness’ can not evolve unconsciously.*”(101)

Mr. G.’s system outlining the stages of such development in the Fourth Way comprises a seven-level scheme which is a systemic part of his over all cosmology. (See Figure 8.4.) The First Man has his center of gravity, or focus of consciousness in his physical or instinctive center. The kind of knowledge he can be said to have is imitative. The Second Man has his focus in the emotional center and the type of knowledge he has is based on his likes and fondnesses. The Third Man has his center of gravity in his intellectual center and his knowledge is that of subjective logic. The tendencies toward being one of these three types is innate in each individual. The Fourth Man develops in an extraordinary way. He develops a *permanent* center of gravity and his knowledge is increasingly objective—and it is knowledge which he must have received from someone at the fifth level. The Fifth Man makes his knowledge whole and indivisible. All his knowledge belongs to a unified I-consciousness. This knowledge must have been gained from a man at the sixth level. The Sixth Man possesses all knowledge possible for man—but it could still be lost—it too must have been gained through contact with a Seventh Man. The Seventh Man has perfected his knowledge which has become both purely objective and permanent with an immortal I-consciousness.(102)


Despite this well articulated system of initiatory development, these levels do not seem to be recognized within Gurdjieffian schools themselves. The system is a description of a process but not a scheme for the recognition of “degrees.” It would appear that when, within a school or group, individuals reach the fourth or fifth level it is inevitable that they would leave the group to form their own schools. This is perhaps the secret behind the vigorous and high level spread of Gurdjieffian groups in the world.

Ouspensky clearly indicates that all real initiation is *self*-initiation: “Systems and schools can indicate methods and ways, but no system or school whatever can do for a man the work he must do himself. Inner growth, a change of being, depend entirely upon the work a man must do on himself.”(103)

Cosmology

Fourth Way cosmology is closely linked with its “psychology.” Everything that is, or which develops, does so in a certain way or pattern. In many ways Mr. G.’s system is, like so many others generated in eastern Europe in the late 19th and early 20th century, a *materialistic* one. By this he seems to have meant that there was only one continuous, ultimately harmonious universe bound together with definite, even if mysterious, laws. There is not one mundane world and another heavenly one which absolutely transcends it. In this model he again follows Plato— but more precisely he reflects a Pythagorean universe.

Figure 8.4: The Cosmological Octave



Gurdjieff taught the primacy of two laws in the cosmos—the Law of Three and the Law of Seven. These two cosmic laws are harmonized by the octave, exemplified in the most recognizable device of the Fourth Way, the enneagram. (See Figure 8.5)

The law of Three is based on a concept apparently common to all Indo-European traditions. It is also demonstrated in the Indian doctrine of the *gunas*: *rajas*, *tamas*, and *sattva* (activity, inertia, and being). For Gurdjieff the three principles are the active, passive, and “neutralizing.” This latter term can be misleading. In fact, according to Fourth Way teaching, the active and the passive alone tend to cancel each other out unless and until the “third force” acts as a catalyst that they may create something new. The Absolute is characterized by these three principles or qualities. The Law of Three becomes a creative force through the octave.


In the octave again the Pythagorean roots of the Fourth Way system are clear. Gurdjieff showed how the octave of the musical scale corresponded to the cosmological octave. (See Figure 8.4)

The developmental progress of an individual is linked to his relative freedom in the universe. The fewer laws the individual is subject to, the freer the individual is. According to Mr. G. the physical body is subject to the 48 laws of this planet, the astral body is subject to the 24 planetary laws, the mental body is subject to the 12 solar laws, while the Fourth Body is only subject to the six laws of all the suns of the universe. When an individual is liberated from the lower laws and thus becomes progressively more free, immortal and potent this is because there are fewer and fewer laws constrain the individual.

The Enneagram

In *Meetings with Remarkable Men* Gurdjieff ascribed the symbol of the enneagram to a legendary “Sarmoun Brotherhood.” This appears to be pure mythologizing on Gurdjieff’s part, but that has nothing to do with its usefulness as a symbol. Gurdjieff said of it that it rendered books useless because it contained all the wisdom necessary to human development. The ninefold cosmology is common among Indo-European mythologies—most prominently among the Germanic peoples with the “nine worlds” contained in the cosmic tree called Yggdrasill.

Figure 8.5: The Enneagram



The enneagram describes the harmonization of three dissimilar processes: linear progression, dynamic cycle, and static coalescence. All three are necessary and none is reducible to one of the others. Figure 8.5 shows all three properties. This is how the Law of Three and the Octave are harmonized and it is by understanding how this works that progress in development and mastery over events in one's life are gained.

The serpent of sequential linear time, Cronos, describes the apparent eternal progress of events, while the dynamic (and non-linear from the perspective of the sequence 1-9) recurrent cyclical rhythm of 1-4-2-8-5-7 is demonstrated by the complex "hexad" within the circle and the static coalescence of 9-3-6 is indicated by the static triangle.

A Fourth Way Theology?

There is no theology in the Fourth Way. "God" or "gods" appear to be virtually irrelevant to the concerns and methods of the Sly Man. It is here that the close relationship between the Fourth Way and Buddhist ideas is quite clear. In all of Gurdjieff's writings there is only fleeting reference to what he once called "*esoteric Christianity*." Mr. G. seems to have created a myth wherein the teaching of Jesus was passed "from generation to generation" reaching "the present time in its original form." (104) But if this is true this "*esoteric Christianity*" appears to be just another way of saying "non-Christianity" or Christianity without God or Christ. Nowhere in Gurdjieff's original teachings is there anything which resembles traditional religious concepts or practices found in either early Christianity or orthodox Judaism. However, most of Gurdjieff's prominent followers (including Ouspensky and Bennett) tried to make Gurdjieff's teachings appear more "Christian" than they originally were by using examples or illustrations of his teachings drawn from Christian sources.

The Methodology

Gurdjieff taught according to no discernible set methodology. Neither did he leave behind any such method. Part of the essence of the disagreement between Gurdjieff and Ouspensky revolved around the latter's desire to seek and formulate a universal coherent methodology of the Fourth Way and Gurdjieff's steadfast insistence on the primacy of the particular teacher-pupil relationship at a particular and unique time and place.

It seems that Mr. G.'s primary concern in this was that the pupils be guided in a way which would balance their development and maintain that balance. If a pupil was overly intellectual Gurdjieff might recommend physical or emotional Work, and so on. This understanding of the teacher is, however, dependent upon the essence of the teacher and can not be quantified or regularized.

There are, however, *general* lines of development in the Work. Essential to practical progress is involvement with a school and the help of a teacher— One Who Knows.

The first line of Work is focused on the self— the individual. One must first practice *self-observation*. Gurdjieff told the members of his early Russian group to write an autobiography without suppressing anything. This was seen as a test for further progress. (105) The pupil is given exercises in self-observation— seeing themselves as objective beings. Everything from bodily habits and movements, to emotional reactions, to patterns of thought are observed without any attempt at first to control or change anything. This process usually is enough to learn directly about the multiplicity of "I's" within the personality. Self-observation may evoke flashes of *self-remembering*. Self-remembering is the most important part of the first line of the Work. In self-remembering all three centers— the thinking, feeling, and moving centers — are active. One is hyper-aware of self and environment with one's full attention. Attention is developed to a high level. One of the common exercises for the development of attention and preparation for self-remembering is sitting in quiet meditation every morning before daily activity begins. (106)

As the first line of Work is focused on the individual, the second line is centered on how that individual relates to other individuals. "The hardest thing of a man is to endure the manifestations of others," Gurdjieff is reported to have said. (107) The "manifestations of others" provide the *friction* necessary to the further development of essence. Gurdjieff

advised pupils to learn to endure the “manifestations” of people they could not ordinarily bear without nervousness or discomfort. Suppressing the outward expression of negative emotions provides a friction for the development of internal essence over the personality acquired through external experience.

The third line of Work is devoted to the school in selfless service. This is only truly possible once a high level of essence — or consciousness — has been developed and the fragmented personality is relatively disarmed.

In the Gurdjieffian system *essence* is built up through all practical exercises. The exercises cause friction between a person’s essence and personality. The essence is what is real or relatively permanent about an individual, the personality is the product of outside influences. The Work of developing essence must be pursued in a way balanced among all the centers. Imbalanced development is, according to Gurdjieff, the usual cause of the cessation of development of the essence. Most of what a person appears to be is nothing but an accumulation of personality traits. The development of the individual pursued in the Work is the development of the essence. Not all essences of individuals are noble, and the personality is not “demonized.” On the contrary the personality contains the information or tools the essence will need to develop itself.

“Evil” and the Fourth Way

Although this is not a study in evil *per sé*, the over all subject matter makes it desirable for us to know what a teacher like Mr. G. thought “evil” was. On one level he noted that for normal (or subjective) man “evil is everything that is opposed to his desires or interests or to his conception of good.”(108) A permanent idea of good and evil is “connected ... with the idea of man’s development through conscious efforts ...”(109) Everything which promotes this development — or awakening — is good that which hinders it is *evil*. Gurdjieff maintained that good and consciousness were so closely bound to one another that *no conscious act of evil is possible*. He once set his pupils the task of committing an act of “conscious evil” and none could do it.

Gurdjieff also addressed the problem of “black magic.” If you return to the definition of Black Magic given in chapter 1: “Black Magic is for the exercise of independence from the universe and pursuing self-centered aims,” you will note that the main aims of the Work accord with that definition. However, Mr. G. did not use the language of Black Magic and Satanism, or did so on a limited basis, so his definitions are quite different. According to Gurdjieff, black magic “is the tendency to use people for some, even the best of aims, *without their knowledge and understanding*, either by producing in them faith and infatuation or by acting upon them through fear.”(110) In terms of the left-hand path philosophy, this is a perfect description of most institutionalized forms of the right-hand path!) Black magic is not evil magic it is simply magic which works on others unconsciously. As regards magic in general, in the same context, Gurdjieff says: “... there is neither red, green, nor yellow magic. There is mechanics, that is what ‘happens,’ and there is ‘doing.’ ‘Doing’ is magic and ‘doing’ can be only of one kind. There cannot be two kinds of ‘doing.’”

Is the Fourth Way Left-Hand Path?

From a structural and methodological standpoint the Fourth Way generally presents a picture in complete harmony with those of the left-hand path. It is possibly only in the lack of recognition of the historical and archetypal analogs of the system within Satanic symbolism that the Fourth Way falls short of the criteria of being a school of the left-hand path. but this is practically a matter of aesthetics.

Fourth Way teachings, and even its very methodology, are often antinomian. There is a constant “going against the grain” of nature, of God, of the mechanism of the universe. Its aim is the attainment of an awakened independently existing intellect and relative immortality (self-deification), this is individualistic, it comes in initiatic stages (the “seven men”) and its chief technology is *doing*— the use of the will to cause the mechanism to conform to its volition (i.e. “magic”).

Gurdjieff is in many ways a more pure practitioner and teacher of the left-hand path than Aleister Crowley or any other reputed “black magician” of the early occult revival—a movement he saw himself actually fighting against.

Modern Witchcraft and the Left-Hand Path

Witchcraft, or “Wicca” is an area of the contemporary occult revival often involved in discussions of Satanism and by inference the left-hand path. Current adherents of “Wicca” are usually at great pains to point out that their new religion has nothing to do with the worship of the Devil. They maintain that such assumptions are carry-overs from the propaganda of the medieval and early modern churches for whom all heretics or heterodox worshippers were *ipso facto* Satanists: If they worshipped or venerated anything but the Holy Trinity they were worshipping an image *contrary* to God and were therefore *Satanic*. This included not only unconverted or apostetic pagans or heathens, but also Muslims and Jews. Many modern witches claim they are reviving or preserving ancient, pre-Christian, but not necessarily anti-Christian, practices and beliefs. But, of course, from the standpoint of orthodox religious authority all that is merely another way of defining Satanism in its most virulent form.

Modern “Wiccans” can trace the origin of their neo-pagan religion back to the late 1930s. Most attempts to ascertain the origins of the Wiccan belief system end up focused on the personality of Gerald Brosseau Gardner (1884-1964). Gardner had little formal education and spent most of his adult life until 1936, when he retired from the commercial branch of the British Civil Service, in the Far East. In his retirement Gardner returned to England and slowly began to create the religious system called by the name “Wicca” today. Although the particulars of the system evolved or changed over the years the essential elements remained relatively stable.

The most useful written sources for the study of the historical foundations of modern Wicca are Aiden Kelly’s breakthrough study *Crafting the Art of Magic* (1991) together with Doreen Valiente’s *The Rebirth of Witchcraft* (1989). Primary sources for “Gardnerianism” are his “Book of Shadows” (*Ye Bok of ye Art Magical*) coupled with his own published works *High Magic’s Aid* (1949), *Witchcraft Today* (1954) and *The Meaning of Witchcraft* (1959). For most of its developmental years, however, Wicca remained a system the essence of which was only transmitted through oral coven teachings and ceremonial experience.

From its putative beginnings in the late 1930s the “Wiccan Movement” has grown to shape the spiritual lives of several hundred thousand practitioners, mainly concentrated in the Anglo-American world. It virtually exploded over the span of half a century with no central organization or leadership. That, if nothing else, should speak to the power of the *essence* of Gardner’s vision.

The ideal Wiccan organization is the “coven” made up of six male/female couples headed by a high priest or priestess. Originally, since Wicca was supposed to be a survival of an ancient cult of nature and fertility only heterosexual couples could be admitted. However, the more recent demographics of the movement would show that a large percentage of Wiccans in general and their coven organizations now has a specifically *homosexual* orientation. The “clergy” or priesthood in a given region or tradition may form a “council” but for the most part each coven is an independent entity ruled by its priestess or priest. Wiccan initiation consists of three levels or degrees—the most advanced of these being that of “High Priestess” or “High Priest.” Once this level is attained in the coven it is customary for that person (and perhaps his or her consort) to “hive off” and create a new coven. This is the traditional way the Wiccan movement spread according to a sort of “apostolic succession” from Gardner.

A study of the aims and methods of modern witchcraft or Wicca will show it to be nothing other than a universalist duotheistic cult of sexuality. This cult is focused on the

establishment of ersatz families in an urbanized largely rootless civilization and on the practice of methods which are felt to re-connect the individual and the group with some natural source of power housed in nature and especially in sexuality. Although it may have many outward similarities with the tantrism discussed in chapter 2, honestly it could not be characterized as having anything to do with the left-hand path.

The only reference of any kind of self-deification comes in the form of the belief that the priest and priestess can, for a time, incarnate the God and Goddess respectively in order to carry out the "Great Rite"— ritual coitus. They do not embody unique or individual divinities but *The God* and *The Goddess* who are universal. Of course, modern witches do use techniques of initiation and magic. However, the initiation is actually most often a path of pre-set training in coven and craft lore and ritual technique rather than a program of the transformation of the essential being of the initiate. Magic is mostly used for critical needs (healing, personal worldly advancement, love, etc.)— and then only rarely. Wicca is truly a new *religion* with all the expected hallmarks of a religion. Within the cult all are said to be on an essential level *equal*. This is the basis for at least one explanation of their practice of ritual nudity.

There are several antinomian aspects of Wicca: the taking of the name "witch" (categorically an anti-social label), use of sexuality and nudity (and, in its pure and original form, flagellation), and the anti-modern stance of looking *backward* in time (real or imagined) to find its value system. Most of these antinomian characteristics offend not against the old religious establishment, but against the new "creed" of positivistic modernism.

But taken as a whole the Wiccan system is clearly a right-hand path one. Its main purpose is to reintegrate the individual into an organic model of society (in this case the symbolic coven) and nature and the cycles of nature, and the integration of the group into a universal scheme of nature embodied in the God and Goddess. In its most authentic form in western European culture, *wiccecraft* is a revival of the ancient Indo-European cult of the third function.

During the last half of the 20th century there has been a good deal of friction between self-professed Satanists and Wiccans. The Wiccans usually see the Satanists as bad for their image with the public and usually spend a fair amount of time explaining why their Horned God is not the "Christian" Devil, and how they are not Satanists but only gentle nature worshippers desiring only to "Harm none .." While Satanists generally have little respect for Wiccans whom they see as cashing in on the glamor of the sinister imagery of Devilry while claiming in essence to be no different than any other religion. The *real* source of this friction has nothing to do with "imagery"— but with the *reality* that Wicca is a right-hand path system (along with orthodox Christianity, Islam and Judaism) and philosophical or "religious" Satanism is usually a true left-hand path system. The two, Satanism and Witchcraft, may *appear* to be similar, but in fact are worlds apart. The friction is simply the result of people's inability to distinguish between image and substance.

The occult revival has had two significant phases. In many ways Gardner's Wicca has been the bridge between the two phases. The first phase, which has been the subject of this chapter, was relatively restricted to certain levels of society and was taken relatively more seriously than the average "New Age" thinker, cult or philosophy is today at the end of the 20th century. This seems largely the result of socioeconomic changes following World War II. Magical systems and the occult traditions have become consumer goods marketed to the masses right along with the latest soap or automobile. Of course, we are here again speaking only in terms of *appearances*. In reality, no matter how secrets are sold, they can not be possessed now in any other way than they were at any time in the past— through hard individual work. Everything else to the contrary is an illusion. The current practitioners of the left-hand path seem to have grasped this reality, and it usually forms a part of their philosophies.

Notes for Chapter 8

- (1) This is a major thesis of James Webb's *The Occult Underground* (La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1974).
- (2) Bruce F. Campbell, *Ancient Wisdom Revived: The History of the Theosophical Movement* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), pp. 4-6.
- (3) Campbell, *Ancient Wisdom Revived*, pp. 33-34.
- (4) Campbell, *Ancient Wisdom Revived*, pp. 36-37.
- (5) Helena P. Blavatsky, *Voice of the Silence* (Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1971), pp. 12;20.
- (6) Blavatsky, *Voice of the Silence*, I: 80)
- (7) Helena P. Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine* (Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1974) vol I, p. 193; 411-424; vol. II, p. 60.
- (8) Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. II, pp. 242-243.
- (9) Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. II, pp. 475 ff.
- (10) Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. II, p. 193.
- (11) Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. II, p. 60.
- (12) Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. II, p. 421.
- (13) Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. I, p. 198.
- (14) Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. II, p. 420.
- (15) Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. II, p. 421.
- (16) Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. II, p. 421.
- (17) Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. II, pp. 444-446.
- (18) Ellic Howe, *The Magicians of the Golden Dawn* (York Beach, ME: Weiser, 1975), pp. 54-55 *et passim* and Ithell Colquhoun, *Sword of Wisdom* (New York: Putnam, 1975). 118 ff.
- (19) The bibliography on the Golden Dawn is enormous. The best general history seems to be the one by Howe, *The Magicians of the Golden Dawn*.
- (20) Read in Crowley's typescript diary in the Humanities Research Center at the University of Texas, Austin.
- (21) Aleister Crowley, *The Magical Record of the Beast 666* (London: Duckworth, 1972), p. 14 *et passim*.
- (22) No extensive objective history of the O.T.O. exists, see Francis King, *The Secret Rituals of the O.T.O.* (New York: Weiser, 1973), pp. 9-35.
- (23) Bibliography on the modern occult revival Kabbalah is voluminous. An interesting study of Kabbalah for *goyim* is provided by Stevan Davies, et al. "The Kabbalah of the Nations: Anglicization of Jewish Kabbalah," *Studia Mystica* 3:3 (Fall, 1980), 34-47.
- (24) Aleister Crowley, *The Law is for All* (Phoenix, AZ: Falcon Press, 1975), p. 106 and *Magick* (York Beach, ME: Samuel Weiser, 1973), pp. 171-172.
- (25) See Johann Jakob Bachoffen, *Myth, Religion and Mother Right* trans. R. Manheim, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), includes a translation of *Das Mutterrecht* originally published in 1848.
- (26) Crowley, *Law is for All*, p. 70.
- (27) Aleister Crowley, *The Book of the Law* (New York: Magickal Child, 1990), p. 22.
- (28) Crowley, *Magick*, pp. 355-383, *et passim* and *Vision and the Voice* (Dallas: Sangreal, 1972), *passim*.
- (29) Aleister Crowley, *Eight Lectures on Yoga* (Dallas, TX: Sangreal, 1972), pp. 12-14.
- (30) Crowley, *Eight Lectures*, p. 20.
- (31) Printed in *The Equinox* III:10, p. 144.
- (32) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 238.
- (33) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 146.
- (34) Aleister Crowley, *Confessions* (London: Arkana, 1979). p. 610.
- (35) Crowley, *Confessions*, pp. 394; 403-404; 452-453 *et passim*.
- (36) Crowley, *Book of the Law*, p. 22.
- (37) Crowley, *Magick*, pp. 296; 375.
- (38) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 172.

- (39) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 296.
- (40) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 347.
- (41) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 416.
- (42) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 343.
- (43) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 296.
- (44) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 172.
- (45) Crowley, *Book of the Law*, I:22.
- (46) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 131.
- (47) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 60.
- (48) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 294.
- (49) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 177.
- (50) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 299.
- (51) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 295.
- (52) Crowley, *Magical Record of the Great Beast 666*, p. 47.
- (53) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 480.
- (54) Quotes on descriptions of grades from Crowley, *Magick*, pp. 327-333.
- (55) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 295.
- (56) Crowley, *Magick*, pp. 295-296.
- (57) Crowley, *Magick*, pp. 296-297.
- (58) Crowley, *Magick*, pp. 247-249.
- (59) Crowley, *Law is for All*, p. 192.
- (60) See John Symonds, *The Great Beast: The Life and Magick of Aleister Crowley* (Frogmore, UK: Mayflower, 1972), p. 454.
- (61) Crowley, *Magick*, p. 331.)
- (62) Michael A. Aquino, *Book of Coming forth by Night: Analysis and Commentary* (San Francisco: Temple of Set), p. 35.
- (63) See the bibliography provided by Stephen E. Flowers, *Fire and Ice* (St. Paul, MN: Llewellyn, 1990), pp. 209-215.
- (64) Flowers, *Fire and Ice*, pp. 1-4.
- (65) Flowers, *Fire and Ice*, p. 8.
- (66) See Paschal Beverley Randolph, *Sexual Magic* trans. Robert North (New York: Magickal Child, 1988.)
- (67) Flowers, *Fire and Ice*, p. 56.
- (68) Friedrich Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* (trans. Walter Kaufman in *The Portable Nietzsche* [New York: Viking, 1954], pp. 200-202.
- (69) Published in *Blätter für angewandte okkulte Lebenskunst* (May 1961), pp. 1-9.
- (70) Flowers, *Fire and Ice*, pp. 78-87.
- (71) Flowers, *Fire and Ice*, p. 41)
- (72) "Das weltliche Kloster" *Blätter für angewandte Lebenskunst* (Nov. 1953), pp. 1-8.
- (73) Kenneth Grant, *Images and Oracles of Austin Osman Spare* (London: Muller, 1975), p. 7.
- (74) Grant, *Images and Oracles*, p. 7, n. 1.
- (75) Austin Osman Spare, *Book of Pleasure (Self-Love)* (Toronto: 93 Publishing, 1975), *passim*.
- (76) Kathleen R. Speeth, *The Gurdjieff Work* (New York: Pocket, 1976), pp. 149-165 and Ja-
Webb, *The Harmonious Circle* (New York: Putnam, 1980), *passim*.
- (77) G. I. Gurdjieff, *Herald of the Coming Good* (New York: Samuel Weiser, 1970), p. 3)
- (78) Louis Pauwels, *Gurdjieff* (New York: Weiser, 1972), pp. 62-65 and Webb, *The Harmonious Circle*, p. 45)
- (79) Colin Wilson, *The Occult* (New York: Random House, 1971), pp. 402-403.
- (80) The best objective biographies are provided by Webb *The Harmonious Circle* (1980) and Colin Wilson, *G. I. Gurdjieff: The War Against Sleep* (Wellingborough, UK: Aquarian, 1986).
- (81) Webb, *The Harmonious Circle*, 25-26.
- (82) Webb, *The Harmonious Circle*, p. 35.
- (83) Webb, *The Harmonious Circle*, pp. 44-73.

- (84) Webb, *The Harmonious Circle*, pp. 187-188.
- (85) Webb, *The Harmonious Circle*, p. 187.
- (86) Webb, *The Harmonious Circle*, pp. 314-315.
- (87) See J. G. Bennett's introduction to P.D. Ouspensky's *Talks with a Devil* (London: Arkana, 1988), p. 11.
- (88) Bennett, Introduction to Ouspensky, *Talks with a Devil*, p. 10.
- (89) P. D. Ouspensky, *In Search of the Miraculous* (New York: Harvest, 1949), p. 59.
- (90) See Plato's "Myth of the Cave" in the *Republic* (Cornford, *Republic*, pp. 227-235 as well as specific references to the body as the "prison of the soul," e.g. in the *Phaedo*.
- (91) Ouspensky, *In Search of the Miraculous*, p. 47.
- (92) Plato *Phaedrus* 246; 253, see Hamilton and Cairns 1963, pp. 493ff; 499ff., and the *Katha Upanishad* 3, see Robert E. Hume, *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1931, 2nd ed., pp. 351-352.
- (93) Ouspensky, *In Search of the Miraculous*, p. 41-42.
- (94) Ouspensky, *In Search of the Miraculous*, pp. 40-41.
- (95) Note that this forms an interesting parallel to the attitude of the Marquis de Sade toward Nature.
- (96) Ouspensky, *In Search of the Miraculous*, p. 56.
- (97) Ouspensky, *In Search of the Miraculous*, p. 57.
- (98) Ouspensky, *In Search of the Miraculous*, p. 57.
- (99) Ouspensky, *In Search of the Miraculous*, pp. 57-58.
- (100) Ouspensky, *In Search of the Miraculous*, p. 58.
- (101) Ouspensky, *In Search of the Miraculous*, p. 58.
- (102) Ouspensky, *In Search of the Miraculous*, pp. 315.
- (103) Ouspensky, *In Search of the Miraculous*, pp. 71-73.
- (104) Webb, *The Harmonious Circle*, p. 520.
- (105) Speeth, *The Gurdjieff Work*, p. 119.
- (106) Speeth, *The Gurdjieff Work*, p. 122.
- (107) C.S. Nott, *Teachings of Gurdjieff* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961), p. 100.
- (108) Ouspensky *In Search of the Miraculous*, p. 158
- (109) Ouspensky *In Search of the Miraculous*, p. 158.
- (110) Ouspensky *In Search of the Miraculous*, p. 227.

Chapter 9 Anton Szandor LaVey and the Church of Satan



By the latter half of the 20th century the first occult revival had run its course. All its major prophets were dead— Blavatsky, Crowley, Gardner, Spare, Gregorius and Gurdjieff. But by the culturally tumultuous mid-1960s a new cycle of the occult revival loomed on the horizon— one that would be played out on the popular level as never before.

Into this new occult theater there stepped a mysterious man with a message for his time. That man today calls himself Anton Szandor LaVey. The philosophy he has expressed for almost three decades represents the first major breakthrough of a purely left-hand path form of thought in the modern western world. Whereas others might have had structurally left-hand path philosophies — such as G. I. Gurdjieff or Gregor A. Gregorius — they did not overtly combine their philosophies with culturally accepted images of the demonic. LaVey synthesized external demonic imagery and a coherent focus on the independence of the individual. He brings a mass of new information into the model of the left-hand path from areas of human thought previously — and subsequently — ignored by occultists. But we will see how he synthesized all this into a unique — if often pessimistic — *Weltanschauung*.

This chapter was written without the cooperation of Anton LaVey. Permissions were not granted to quote from his works as extensively as I might have liked. In the absence of his own words explaining his philosophy, the reader will often have to bear with my interpretations. These may on occasion impugn LaVey's philosophy with more system than he ever intended.

LaVey's ideas are well documented. However, facts concerning his life and background are — even in his own lifetime — shrouded in mystery. This, it turns out, is a self-created mystery and one that is really a part of the magical philosophy of the man. In this book I focus as much as possible on the *ideas* of the Lords of the Left-Hand Path and eschew as much as possible the “soap opera” aspects of biography that only tend to distract us from the central meanings of people's lives. With LaVey, however, it is important to understand how his philosophy revolves around the way he has been able to recreate himself out of self-chosen images. It is in this aspect — hidden though it usually is — that LaVey exercised his most god-like power.

There were other people who made the Church of Satan the institution it was between the years 1970 and 1975, such as Diane Hegarty-LaVey, John Ferro, Adrian-Claude Frazier and Michael Aquino, but the philosophy underlying the Church before, during, and after that period was the personal philosophy of Anton LaVey which gives the Church its continuity. As a general practice, I will address the central personal philosophy of LaVey rather than trying to fit any other elements into the over all Church philosophy.

The Life of Anton LaVey

The saga of Anton Szandor LaVey is not yet at an end. Therefore this section must necessarily be provisional. The LaVey story is a complex one the crux of which is the understanding of its mythic components and the tension between mythology and historical facts.

If it has not become apparent in the contents of this book already, it should be explicitly mentioned now, that it is often so that the *myth*, i.e. the idealized and eternal essence, of a person's life is more important for us than the *biography*, i.e. the historical data of external existence. It is more important because it is more likely to be relevant to our individual existences and more likely to be of some *use* to our individual situations than bare factual biography. Rarely do we get so much opportunity to gain a glimpse into the myth-making process as we do with Anton LaVey.

The chief published sources for the LaVey legend are Burton Wolfe's *The Devil's Avenger* (1974) and more recently Blanche Barton's “authorized” biography *The Secret Life of a Satanist* (1990). Both of these works appear to have been approved word-for-word by LaVey himself and so must be considered as much self-portrayals as anything else. They provide the canon of myth. Few treatments of LaVey can be called both objective and informed. A most revealing, if all-too-brief, account is provided by the journalist Lawrence Wright in an article for the September 1991 issue of *Rolling Stone* magazine.

Essential to the nature of the myth of any figure such as LaVey are the influences which shaped that figure's thought and action. LaVey himself provided a core list of such influences on his thought on the dedication page of the original printings of his seminal text *The Satanic Bible* (1969). It is telling that in more recent printings of the book this page has been omitted.

On that list appear 19 primary personages with 20 more given a sort of “honorable mention.” (There is also one animal, Togare, LaVey's famous pet lion, and the Nine Unknown Men.) Almost 70 other names appeared in a similar list in his *Satanic Rituals* book. These too have been removed in recent printings of the book. Space does not permit me discuss each one of these personages in any detail, but the primary list is extremely important to understanding LaVey's Satanic philosophy. The 19 primary men are (in the order he listed them): Bernardino Nogara, Karl Haushofer, Grigory Yefimovitch Rasputin, Sir Basel Zaharoff, Allesandro Cagliostro, Barnabas Saul, Ragnar Redbeard, William Mortensen, Hans Brick, Max Reinhardt, Orrin Klapp, Fritz Lang, Friedrich Nietzsche, William Claude Dukinfield, Phineas Taylor Barnum, Hans Poelzig, Reginald Marsh, Wilhelm Reich and Mark Twain. After the names of each of these LaVey characterizes them

with a dedicatory phrase. These are given in quotation marks in the discussions below.

Karl Haushofer (1869-1946), “a teacher without a classroom,” was the founder of the theory of “geopolitics” and a professor of geography at the University of Munich. He was sympathetic with National Socialism and exerted influence on its ideology, especially through one of his students, Rudolf Hess.(1) However, LaVey’s image and admiration of him comes through the modern mythologizing contained in *The Morning of the Magicians* in which the authors have Haushofer involved in various occult goings-on in Tibet and with the infamous *Thule Gesellschaft* of Rudolf von Sebottendorf. There is, however, no evidence for these more “occultnik” connections.

Rasputin (1872-1916), “who knew the magic of a child,” was much admired by LaVey because he saw the Russian “mad monk” as a lusty manipulator of people (especially women) and power. All traits respected by LaVey. But as we saw in chapter 6, Rasputin was not likely to have had anything really “Satanic” about him. LaVey was most certainly inspired by more lurid accounts of Rasputin(2) — and by the film *Rasputin: The Mad Monk* (Hammer, 1965).

Sir Basil Zaharoff (1850-1936), “a gentleman,” was an arms merchant who sold weaponry and encouraged his customers to use their purchases— all while not only becoming wealthy but being knighted by the king of England too!

Cagliostro (1743-1791), “a rogue,” was the assumed name of an Italian magician and alchemist named Guiseppe Balsamo. He billed himself as a “Count” and the “Grand Kophta” of the Egyptian Lodge, but what was less known was that he had been expelled from several countries due to his fraudulent dealings. He was popular with the people and a supporter of revolution, but ended his life in the dungeons of Pope Pius VI.

Barnabas Saul was the first “screyer,” or medium, employed by the Elizabethan mage John Dee (1527-1608). After leaving Dee’s service, Saul disavowed his visions.

Ragnar Redbeard (1842?-1926?), “whose might is right,” is a story unto himself. “Redbeard” was perhaps the pseudonym of Arthur Desmond, an atheist and social Darwinist street-philosopher from whose book, entitled *Might is Right*, LaVey lifted whole sections to create the “Book of Satan” portion of the *Satanic Bible* (pp. 30-35).

William Mortensen, “who looked ... and saw,” wrote a photographers’ manual entitled *The Command to Look* (1937). The psycho-optical theories contained in it greatly influenced LaVey’s approach to art and to images and the way they can influence the human mind. It must be considered a key-stone to LaVeyan Satanism.

Hans Brick, “who knows the law,” wrote a book entitled *The Nature of the Beast* (1960) which was a formative influence on the formulation of LaVey’s social philosophy, especially as contained in the *Lex Talonis*, or “Eleven Rules of the Earth.”

Max Reinhardt (1873-1943), “a builder of dreams,” was born Max Goldman in Austria and became famous as a theatrical director who specialized in staging huge spectacles.

Orrin Klapp (b. 1915), “the walking man,” is a sociologist whose works *Heroes, Villains and Fools* (1962) and *The Collective Search for Identity* (1969) were greatly influential on LaVey’s ideas of social movements and change.

Fritz Lang (1890-1976), “who made moving blueprints,” was an Austrian film director who made such classics as *Metropolis* (1926) and *M* (1930).

Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900), “a realist,” was a German philosopher and forerunner to the existentialists. His ideas of the *overman* (or “superman”) and the “will to power,” as well as his ideas concerning the existence of natural “masters and “slaves” are greatly admired by modern philosophical Satanists.

W. C. Fields (1880-1946), “who saved me a journey to Tibet,” was the stage-name of William C. Dukinfield.

P.T. Barnum (1810-1891), “another great guru,” was the American showman famous for his exhibits of freaks and establishment of circuses. Barnum’s supposed basic philosophy: “There’s a sucker born every minute” was taken to heart by LaVey and used as a mainstay of his worldview.

Hans Poelzig (1869-1936), "who knew all the angles," was a German architect who specialized in grandiose and imaginative structures. An example is the Grand Theater in Berlin, also called the Max Reinhardt Theater (1919). He was also the set designer for *The Golem* (Deutsche Bioscop, 1914).

Reginald Marsh (1898-1954), "a great artist," was an illustrator, scene designer and painter of gritty street scenes, greatly admired by LaVey who is himself a painter of unusual subjects.

Wilhelm Reich (1897—1957), "who knew more than cabinet making," was a German psychologist who held that there was a material force called "orgone" which worked in conjunction with the human orgasm. This force could also be collected in "cabinets" called "orgone accumulators."

Mark Twain (1835-1910), "a very brave man," was the pen name of Samuel Langhorne Clemens the great American writer. LaVey much admires Twain for his works *Letters from the Earth* (1962) and *The Mysterious Stranger* (1969). In an early Church of Satan document LaVey praises Twain as "one of the greatest of the Devil's advocates in history" and as "the most noble embodiment of the Satanist."⁽³⁾

This list of influences provides invaluable insight into the formation of LaVey's philosophy and outlook on life. Of the 16 identifiable men fully half of them are artists of one kind or another. Of these, five dealt with the creation of visual imagery and two, W. C. Fields and P. T. Barnum, were best known as "trickster" figures. The idealization of *image makers* should provide some clue as to the true nature of LaVey's philosophy and magic.

Beyond these influences there are at least three others which are known but which remain relatively unacknowledged by LaVey: the horror writer A. Merritt, the magician Aleister Crowley and the philosophical writer Ayn Rand.

Merritt wrote a novel called *Seven Footprints to Satan* (1928) which contains a characterization of Satan — who is ultimately shown to be a carnal being — upon which LaVey seems to have based his own living portrayal of the Prince of Darkness. In that novel Satan is a conspiratorial mastermind who draws in followers— subjects them to a tortuous game of chance in which they must ascend a staircase without stepping on seven predetermined steps. If they succeed they can have any wish fulfilled, if they fail they will become the slave of Satan. His zombie-like followers become addicted to a drug, called *Kheft*, which he distributed to hold them in thrall. Satan also espouses a philosophy of life in which he claims that only three things are worthwhile: amusement, beauty and "the game" (which supposedly involves chance). A fourth component, *power*, is also mentioned. This provides the rationale for a sort of "meta-game" beyond the apparent staircase game which is in fact *rigged* in Satan's favor.

Although LaVey views Crowley as a deluded, drug-addicted adventurer, he admires "the world's wickedest man" for having lived a full life. In *The Devil's Avenger* Crowley is mentioned as an early influence on the adolescent "Tony LaVey."⁽⁴⁾ Indeed Crowley does appear to have been a role-model for LaVey, as perhaps Gerald Gardner was. LaVey saw Gardner as following in Crowley's footsteps— after A.C. had "made it safe" to be an occult leader by taking the heat of negative publicity in the early part of the century. Crowley had been the villain, but being transformed by historical developments into a hero— a pioneer of liberated thought — and men like Gardner and his imitators (such as Alex Sanders) were riding his historical coattails in the more tolerant 1950s and early 1960s— usually as being portrayed as "fools." The parallels between the development of Gardner's publicity campaign (including his "witch museum" and tabloid coverage) and the one mounted by LaVey in the mid-1960s to early 1970s is remarkable and worthy of further study. "Occult leaders" such as Crowley appear to have been less magical or philosophical role-models and more strategic ones for LaVey. In the Church of Satan serious consideration of Crowley's magical philosophy would only be given by Michael Aquino, who wrote a study of it for the Church publication *The Cloven Hoof* ⁽⁵⁾

The Russian ex-patriot philosopher Ayn Rand's books were recommended in the Church of Satan reading list in the early 1970s. In subsequent years her influence was not touted too highly. But her impact was apparently formative on the most succinct presentation of LaVeyan Satanism: "The Nine Satanic Statements." In an article written for the *Scroll of Set* (June, 1987),(6) G. Smith points out the obvious parallelism between the number and order of these statements and a speech given by John Galt, the protagonist in Rand's novel *Atlas Shrugged* (1957). However, the rhetorical style of the "Statements" is in turn seems drawn from that of Ragnar Redbeard's *Might is Right*.

That most of LaVey's ideas are not original, and that his philosophy is largely made up of bits and pieces of the philosophies of others which he recomposed according to his own tastes and style — unique to himself and to his time — might also be said of some of the other subjects in this study. We could say the same of every one who ever created a religion, whether Gautama the Buddha or Gerald Gardner. What makes LaVey somewhat unusual in this respect is that he often seems to insist on the idea that he *invented* a way of thinking, that his Satanism is something akin to a product upon which he has a copyright of some sort. But more remarkable than the idea that LaVey invented his Satanism out of bits and pieces of obscure philosophies is the fact that he actually invented *himself* out of the depths of his own mind.

The Myth of Dr. LaVey

No other figure in the second wave of the "occult revival" has had anecdotes about certain aspects of his life more widely recorded than Anton LaVey. Is this record mere history or is it more remarkably the outer form of an act, or "working," of Lesser (Black) Magic? If one wanted to write a full and factual biography of Anton LaVey it would require much research, and commercially published works would probably only provide the mytho-magical backdrop to the all-too-human, or all-too-demonic, drama lurking below the surface.

The first significant effort at separating fact from myth has been made by Lawrence Wright. At present a clear separation of myth and fact remains impossible. I will recount here briefly the reported events of LaVey's life as given in *The Devil's Avenger* and *The Secret Life of a Satanist*, both of which are authorized biographies, supplemented or commented upon by data gathered by Wright and other sources. It is not the purpose of this book to delve into "tabloid" aspects of the lives of the personalities studied. But in some respects it is important to understand the way a magician might use and invent "history" as a source of personal power. Anton LaVey appears to be *the* outstanding modern example of such sorcery.

Howard Stanton Levey, who was later to be re-invented by himself as Anton Szandor LaVey, was born in Chicago on 11 April 1930. His parents' names were Michael and Gertrude, although he likes to refer to them as "Joseph" and "Augusta" in his biographies. Michael Levey became a successful businessman in the liquor trade. Not long after Howard's birth the family moved to northern California.

Although predominantly Jewish, his family contained a variety of religious and ethnic backgrounds. Religion in any formal sense seems not to have been emphasized in Howard's early years.

"Tony" — as he was nicknamed — apparently discovered art and music at an early age. When he was 14 he found a copy of William Mortensen's *The Command to Look*. In this "how-to" manual of photography (originally published in 1937) Tony saw a key to magic and to the manipulation of others. He would use these principles later in his own paintings. He also must have begun to learn a great deal about music and the playing of various instruments.

In the "authorized" biographies it is reported that Tony went with one of his uncles to Germany in 1945 just after the war ended.(7) He has often claimed to have been, at 15, the youngest musician to have played for the San Francisco Ballet Orchestra— as second oboist. This seems unlikely as, according to the research of Lawrence Wright, there was no orchestra by that name, nor a musician by his name in any San Francisco orchestra.(8) The next year, at 16 years of age, Tony dropped out of high school.

One of the most important factors in the LaVey legend is his association with the circus as a lion tamer. It is widely claimed that he worked for the Clyde Beatty Circus beginning in the spring of 1947.(9) Again no record exists of anyone by his name ever working for the Beatty Circus.(10) From there he claims to have begun a career playing a variety of keyboard instruments in various places ranging from carnivals to night clubs and strip joints.

It was at one of the latter type of establishments in Los Angeles that Tony claims to have met, and had an affair with, Marilyn Monroe in 1948.(11) Serious biographers of Monroe have expressed extreme doubts about her employment in strip shows and her association with LaVey.(12)

From Los Angeles Tony moved back to northern California. In 1949 he is supposed to have enrolled in City College of San Francisco for courses in criminology, and from this to have developed a second career as a police photographer. It was as a photographer of scenes of senseless brutality and violence that LaVey was supposed to have confirmed his dim assessment of human nature.(13) Again, however, public records show no trace of him under any name at City College or on the payroll of the police department.

In 1950 he met Carole Lansing and in 1951 they were married in Reno, Nevada. The record of this marriage is the first appearance of the name "La Vey."(14) Their daughter, Karla, was born in 1952.

It was apparently around this time that LaVey began to become more deeply interested in magic and occult culture. He is said to have made contact with the "Church of Thelema" headed by Francis Israel Regardie, a one-time personal secretary to Aleister Crowley. LaVey's contacts with groups, however, remained informal. He appears to have pursued his interests in magic — as he had all his personal interests — privately and unconventionally. Throughout the 1950s, it seems he mainly supported himself and his family through his many jobs playing piano and organ in various San Francisco area night clubs and theaters. Throughout this time he was also said to have acted as a "psychic" investigator and professional hypnotist.

Beginning in the mid-1950s LaVey began living in a house then owned by his father Michael Levey on California Street in San Francisco. Eventually this was to become the infamous Black House.

In 1960 LaVey became interested in a 17 year old movie theater usherette named Diane Hegarty. He eventually had her move into his house and soon thereafter he began giving Friday night classes in various occult subjects. During the early 1960s regular visitors to LaVey's house coalesced into what became known as the "Magic Circle." This "circle" included the avant garde film maker Kenneth Anger, anthropologist Michael Harner, the locally famous "mad countess" Carin de Plessin (who was indeed a member of the Danish peerage, as well as writers, doctors, lawyers, prominent night club people and some members of the police force.

In 1962 LaVey divorced Carole, but never officially married Diane. On 19 November 1963 Diane bore Anton a daughter whom he named Zeena Galatea LaVey.

Starting as early as the mid-1960s Anton had been drawing attention to himself locally by keeping big cats as pets and often walking them in public on a leash. The first of these, Zoltan, was a black leopard. Zoltan was killed by a car near the Black House in 1964. Soon thereafter LaVey acquired Togare, a 10 week-old Nubian lion.

In that same year a local American Humane Association television production for children, called *The Wonderful World of Brother Buzz*, gave a glimpse inside the house and its occupants Anton, Diane, Karla, Zeena—and Togare. The film shows the interior of LaVey's private world much the same as it would appear four years later, after the founding of the Church of Satan, in a 1968 documentary, *Satanis: The Devil's Mass*. This is important for the understanding of the genesis of the Church of Satan.

The Early Church of Satan 1966-1970

"To 1966— The Year One!"
in *Rosemary's Baby* (1968)

A member of LaVey's Magic Circle, who had experience in publicity and financial matters surrounding churches and non-profit organizations, Edward M. Webber, suggested to Anton that he found a church based on his teachings.(15) This was done in a rather informal ceremony on 30 April 1966 — *Walpurgisnacht* — a traditional German witches' festival made famous in literature by Goethe's *Faust*. The year 1966 was declared the year *Anno Satanis* and Anton LaVey declared himself the High Priest of Satan and Exarch of Hell.

The more conservative and socially influential people in the "Magic Circle" seemed to have supported this development and wanted the Church and the Black Pope to move on to more serious and substantial ground. But LaVey appears to have sabotaged this direction of development by seeking the most lurid kind of publicity. He put on a "Topless Witches Review" in a theater in San Francisco. One of his witches was Susan Atkins, then using the stage name Sharon King. She would later go on to become one of the "Family" gathered around Charles Manson.

The Black Pope, it appears, had his own vision of what he was doing. Institutions of any kind had always been an anathema to him. So, it seems, the Church of Satan, as an institution, was born in a state predestined for a certain kind of damnation.

In the years between 1966 and 1970 the Church existed as a more or less local San Francisco phenomenon. The wider publicity it gained was chiefly through the personality and activities of Anton LaVey himself. He continued with topless witches shows and with his public lectures at the Black House. The lectures were usually punctuated by a theatrical, or psychodramatic, ritual demonstration. On 1 February 1967 LaVey presided over a wedding ceremony between writer John Raymond and socialite Judith Case. On 8 December the High Priest of Satan officiated at the funeral of Navy Seaman Edward D. Olsen— complete with honor guard. These public acts outraged and fascinated elements of the mass media and their audience.

The High Priest was asked to be a "technical advisor" for Roman Polanski's film version of Ira Levin's novel *Rosemary's Baby* in 1967 as well. This was the beginning of several cinematic advisory roles LaVey was to have, including *The Devil's Rain* (1975), and *Dr. Dracula* (1976). This latter film contains some obviously LaVeyan ideas on the possibilities of immortality.

During the years of 1966 and 1967 LaVey carried on an ambiguous personal relationship with the film actress Jayne Mansfield. Accounts of this relationship vary from those provided by LaVey — which show the actress as a sexually masochistic worshipper of the masterful High Priest —(16) to that provided by Mansfield's biographer May Mann and others— which show her being pursued by an aggressive LaVey and somewhat repelled and perhaps a bit frightened of him.(17) In any event, Anton and Jayne's lawyer and confidant, Sam Brody, did not like one another. For a variety of causes, so the legend goes, the Black Pope put a curse on Brody. On 29 June 1967 Jayne Mansfield and Sam Brody were killed in a car wreck in Louisiana. After her death LaVey spoke more

provocatively about her involvement with the Church. (Only later, after 1975, did LaVey begin to tell how his curse had worked its magic— in an unintentionally tragic way on the actress, when he was only trying to get the lawyer.)

The summer of 1968 saw the release of Polanski's *Rosemary's Baby*. LaVey, whose eyes at least had a bit part in the film playing the Devil who impregnates Rosemary, was also employed in publicity for the film's premier at the Marina Theater in San Francisco. At that premier was a young Second Lieutenant shortly bound for active duty in Vietnam named Michael A. Aquino. Aquino would later exert enormous influence within the Church and subsequently found the Temple of Set in 1975.

The Greater Church of Satan 1970-1975

The Satanic years V to X were perhaps the high point of the life of the Church of Satan. This period was ushered in with the publication and release of *The Satanic Bible* in January of 1970 as an Avon paperback. Now the sensationalistic publicity was backed up with a succinct expression of LaVey's Satanic philosophy available in every neighborhood bookstore. The Church could no longer be the local San Francisco phenomenon it had been. In 1968 Church membership had been only 50-60. (COS, p. 17) Despite the enormous surge in worldwide publicity generated by the release of the *Satanic Bible* actual membership in 1975 had only grown to about 250.

Over the five-year period the Church gained members from all over the world. Local Satanists wished to organize and hold rituals in emulation of events at LaVey's Black House. Now the Church needed an administration. Much of that administration was handled by Diane, who often responded to correspondence under the name "Lana Green." During this period another important administrator became that young army officer who had first seen LaVey at the premier of *Rosemary's Baby*, Michael Aquino. He was named a Priest of Satan and a member of its ruling body, "The Council of Nine" (Or alternatively "Council of the Trapezoid") in 1970 upon his return from Vietnam. From late 1971 to midsummer 1975, he was the editor of the *Cloven Hoof*, the chief in-house publication of the Church.

Also in 1971, LaVey's second book, *The Compleat Witch: or What to do when Virtue Fails*, appeared. This book might at first glance seem to be a rather extremist book for women on "how to get men." It contains all sorts of advice many find outrageous— such as telling women to save portions of their sanitary napkins or tampons in a pouch and to use the subtle odor from it as a perfume-talisman to attract the erotic interest of men. (18) But as a whole it is not only "the first 'self-help' book" of the me-generation 1970s, but also a manual of the principles of what LaVey called "Lesser Magic." Most of LaVey's magic has been of this type— sometimes on a grand scale (such as the publication of the *Satanic Bible* or the generation of media attention to cause shifts in public opinions or attitudes) and sometimes on a small scale (such as when he would charm or frighten individuals in his immediate environment).

Late in 1972 LaVey's third book — and last one for more than two decades — *The Satanic Rituals* appeared in the bookstores. This is a collection of rituals some of which are originally by LaVey. But many of the texts were written by others. "The Black Mass" was by Wayne West, then a Priest in the Church, "The Call to Cthulhu" and "The Ceremony of the Nine Angles" were both by Michael Aquino, as was the "Adult Baptism" ritual. (19) Now the Church's literary base was in place. All of which continued to generate attention and publicity for the High Priest.

Outside of San Francisco the Church structure continued to grow. Local groups of the Church, called "Grottos," were established in various places. By 1975 there were, or had been, a total of around a dozen Grottos established in the US and abroad. These sometimes caused problems for the "Central Grotto" in San Francisco. There appears to have been an

increasing underlying friction between the centralized personality cult surrounding Anton LaVey in San Francisco and the more widespread transpersonal Church throughout the country during this period.

Several regional gatherings, called "Conclaves," were held, mainly in the northeast, between the years 1971 to 1974. The last one was held in Windsor, Ontario in August of 1974. No national or international Conclave was ever organized for the Church of Satan, and Anton LaVey never attended any of these regional Conclaves.(20)

During this middle, or greater, era of the Church of Satan an initiatory structure was worked out— which seems to have come only as an afterthought to the foundation of the Church. These are discussed in some detail below. LaVey's original attitude toward initiation, grades, and so on, appears to have been subjective at first. If he felt a person was worthy of being named — or "elevated" as he liked to call it — to the Priesthood or Magistracy, he simply "elevated" them on his personal authority as High Priest. Organizationally this remained possible because the "Church of Satan" was never actually incorporated as a *Church*, but rather remained more or less an assumed name for Anton LaVey's business purposes.

This tendency re-emerged in LaVey in 1975 when he, after previously authorizing and endorsing the idea that the Priesthood of Church as to be Recognized on merit alone,(21) reverted to the idea that it could be "bought" through donations to the "Church" (i.e. to LaVey himself) or merely on his personal judgment.(22) The resultant fallout from existing members of the Clergy led to what might be called a schism in the Church in the summer of 1975. A large percentage of the non-San Francisco membership and Clergy resigned from the Church at that time. It was at this time that Michael Aquino is said to have assumed the "Infernal Mandate" — a term not used by LaVey himself — and with it formed the Temple of Set. (See Chapter 10) This event brought an end to the wider experiment known as the Church of Satan — as it, and its leader, returned to the reclusive existence deep within the recesses of the Black House.

The Withdrawal of Dr. LaVey The Church of Satan after 1975

LaVey's public pronouncements had placed Church membership over 25,000— and eventually claims would be made into the millions. In fact *active* Church membership never exceeded a couple of hundred. That is not to say LaVey has not influenced millions of people— sales of his books exceed would indicate such numbers. The schismatic events of 1975 caused the Church of Satan, such as it remained, to return to being mainly a personality cult gathered around Anton.

Publicity surrounding the Church of Satan and its founder dwindled and became more and more infrequent throughout the late 1970s and early 1980s. The *Cloven Hoof* continued to be published— and its contents revealed a High Priest less interested in the techniques of magic and more interested in social commentary and the maintenance of a reclusive and unique life-style. But because of this refocusing his writings from this period are even more unique than anything earlier. Post-1975 accounts of the Church and LaVey emphasized the idea that the organization had "gone underground" or entered a "second phase," but continued to be strong.(23) Little more was heard of LaVey on the public scene until the mid-1980s.

Perhaps it is part of the legacy of a large segment of America's culture moving to ultraconservative — often bordering on the medieval — positions on issues of "religion" or "social values," but by the middle of the 1980s there was a renewed interest in Satanism. This time, however, it was not in the open and inquisitive spirit of the late 1960s and early 1970s, but rather in the narrow and bigoted one of the 1980s. These new medievalists sensed that something had gone deeply wrong with American society, and who else could be at fault but S-A-T-A-N!

A combination of this renewed negative interest and the internal struggles going on within the Black House itself led to a reemergence of Dr. LaVey. The first portrait of the resurrected High Priest came in a story about him in the February 23, 1986 edition of *The Washington Post Magazine*.⁽²⁴⁾ In the intervening years he and Diane had gone their separate ways (in 1984) and LaVey had acquired a new “girl Friday”—Blanche Barton. In partnership with her the Church was revitalized in the late 1980s and early 1990s. This period of revitalization continues to the present.

There was also at this time a resurgence in LaVey’s public exposure— as shown in the number of resource materials published between 1988 and 1992. But the life story of Anton Szandor LaVey by this time had no real events to recount. He had completed his magical transformation from Howard Stanton Levey and lurked within the recesses of the Black House truly transformed into something akin to one of the Black Brothers as described by Aleister Crowley. (See chapter 8.) The story of Howard S. Levey may be a fascinating tale of human travails— but in fact Anton LaVey has made that tale irrelevant as he has re-invented himself and isolated that self from all that would disturb it. Within LaVey’s own magical system and universe, it is not important what he has *done*, but only what he *IS*. There will be yet a final chapter to the “LaVey Legend”— but as for now it stands in the Is-To-Be.

Sources for the Study of Anton LaVey

Primary Sources

To understand the Black Pope, one must start with what he himself has either written or adapted. His major published works are *The Satanic Bible* (1969), *The Complete Witch* (1971), reissued in 1989 as *The Satanic Witch*, *The Satanic Rituals* (1972) and numerous articles printed in *The Cloven Hoof*, the internal organ of the Church of Satan between 1969 and 1988 when it ceased publication. In 1992 LaVey’s long unpublished manuscript, *The Devil’s Notebook* was made available by Feral House. Some of the essays in this book had been released over the years in *Cloven Hoof* articles. The versions printed in the 1992 book are, however, sometimes abridged or reedited versions. Most of this material presents a serious and erudite man of broad learning and unique tastes. Another document that has to be considered a primary source is an article introduced by John Fritscher consisting almost entirely of LaVey’s own words as he comments on a wide variety of topics.⁽²⁵⁾

Secondary Sources

Few, if any, institutions of the second occult revival have had as much written *about* them as the Church of Satan.⁽²⁶⁾ It has been covered widely in all communications media. LaVey was a frequent guest of night-time talk show hosts from Joe Pyne to Steve Allen, stories about the Church appeared in every major news magazine, perhaps hundreds of articles have been written about LaVey and his Church.

These secondary sources must be divided into two categories. The first category consists of those works over which LaVey seems to have exerted direct and final control. A highly sympathetic account of the Church was given by Arthur Lyons in a book entitled *The Second Coming: Satanism in America* (1970). Lyons was at the time a I^o member of the Church and has remained friendly with LaVey through the years. His later book, *Satan Wants You* (1988) essentially repeats only information that seems to be personally approved by Dr. LaVey himself.

Even more extreme is the case of the first “biography” of the Black Pope by Burton Wolfe (also an off-again, on-again “member” of the Church) entitled *The Devil’s Avenger* (1974). Michael A. Aquino reports that he read a draft of the proposed book by Wolfe early in 1974 which was *totally different* from the one finally published in November of that year. Aquino is convinced *The Devil’s Avenger* is really more an autobiography than anything else.^(COS, 355) Finally in this category are two more recent books by Blanche

Barton: *The Secret Life of a Satanist* and *The Church of Satan* (both 1990). All of these are valuable as portrayals of LaVey and his organization as he would have others view him and it.

Another category of secondary sources is made up of those uncontrolled by LaVey. One group of these consists of academic or scholarly studies. However, even in these we find that the authors have been very friendly with LaVey on a personal level. Randall H. Alfred studies the Church from 1968 to 1969— in the course of his study he also became a member of the Church and its ruling council.(27) His resulting article was not published until 1976 in a volume entitled *The New Religious Consciousness*.(28) Another scholar, Edward J. Moody, joined the Church in San Francisco and participated in ritual activities and eventually became a Satanic Priest himself. His active involvement lasted from October 1967 to August of 1969. Later he published two articles, “Urban Witches” (1971) and “Magical Therapy: An Anthropological Investigation of Contemporary Satanism” (1974). Another scholar, and long-time friend of Dr. LaVey, Marcello Truzzi, wrote about the Church in 1972 in an article for the *Sociological Quarterly*.(29) These studies are valuable as alternate perspectives on LaVey and his philosophy, but in all cases the authors are still under the spell of LaVey’s considerable personal charisma.

The other category of secondary material is journalistic in nature. Such journalistic accounts of LaVey and the Church of Satan abound.(30) Most of these are superficial and repetitive of often-heard anecdotes about the Black Pope’s exploits. However, there have been a few reports which have provided some important information. The most significant of these is the 1991 article by Lawrence Wright in *Rolling Stone* already mentioned. Others of some importance include Walt Harrington’s essay for *The Washington Post Magazine* in 1986, Grant Harden’s widely syndicated newspaper piece in October 1978 and Dick Russell’s article in *Argosy* in 1975.

Two interesting film documentaries exist. One is the comical *Wonderful World of Brother Buzz* episode (1964), the other is the Ray Laurent documentary film *Satanis: The Devil’s Mass* (1970). This latter film is the source continually used for file footage in television reports relating to Satanism. It provides for a great deal of insight on the public perception of LaVey in the local San Francisco area during the early years of the Church. The film consists of ritual sequences and interviews with LaVey and other members of the Church as well as with LaVey’s neighbors— who provide some of the most interesting and amusing perspectives. Those who look closely will see young Isaac Bonewits — a later would-be druid — having his “member” blessed by the High Priest.

Beyond doubt the most important single document chronicling the Church, especially from about 1969 to 1975, is the mammoth and privately printed volume entitled *The Church of Satan* by Michael Aquino (1983; 1989; 1992). As Aquino was an important Church official and confidant of LaVey’s during the years covered intensively, the work gives a special insider’s view. At the same time because of the subsequent split with LaVey, it is perhaps more objective than even those studies published through more scholarly outlets by those who remained under LaVey’s charming spell. Aquino includes almost 400 pages of text and well over that number of pages of primary documentary evidence in the form of appendices. This book is not available commercially.

The Organization of the Church of Satan

In the first 30 years of its existence the Church of Satan has operated under several different organizational plans. However, one set of principles outlined fairly early in the history of the Church seems to have guided it more than anything else: “The position held by Anton LaVey as High Priest is monarchial in nature, papal in degree, and absolute in power.” (31) This is essentially because LaVey incorporated the Church as a sole proprietorship — as a “business” of which he is the boss. (Note that this is how LaVey

believes *all* churches and religious organizations should be required to do business. This is the second point of his five point Pentagonal Program.)

The origins of the Church of Satan as an organization are controversial. According to LaVey the idea for the Church came to him in a “blinding flash” of initiatory awakening.(32) He then evolved the Magic Circle, also secretly known as the Order of the Trapezoid, according to LaVey, into the governing body of the Church. This became known as the Council of Nine (or alternatively the Order of the Trapezoid).(33) Other sources indicate a more mundane inspiration. One of LaVey’s long-time neighbors appears in the film *Satanis* saying: “According to Mr. Webber, a publicity man whom I met, he and Mr. LaVey came upon the idea that, with LaVey owning a lion, a Satanist church would be a wonderful offshoot since he did evidently believe in the Devil.” A later interview with that “publicity man” basically confirmed this view (*Scroll* 17:3, pp. 7-8.)

As with all organizations in a historical perspective the “facts” only tell a part of the story. Though they may be relevant to complete understanding, they only convey external appearances which, as often as not, conceal more enigmatic realities. If the historical *facts* were known, the cynic might be tempted to dismiss Moses as a political opportunist, Jesus as a manipulative, power-mad sorcerer, and Mohammed as a blood-thirsty conqueror. In the cynical scope of things the supposed “factual sins” of Anton LaVey don’t seem so bad after all.

The chief officers of the early Church were that of High Priest held in perpetuity by Anton LaVey and that of High Priestess held exclusively by Diane LaVey. The Church was essentially a “papa and mama shop.” Supposedly at various times the Council of Nine met— but its role was always strictly advisory in its capacity.(Alfred, p. 184) No official provision has ever existed for the removal of LaVey from his position for reasons made clear before.

Most interesting for the purposes of this book is the degree system of the Church of Satan. Its structure has remained more or less intact from the early days of the Church, although the criteria for “elevation” through the degrees have undergone some changes. This system will later become the basis for the Temple of Set degree system, so it is of essential importance in understanding the process of initiation for these two influential organizations on the left-hand path.

Pre-1975 Degree System of the Church

For the Church of Satan there are definitely two eras or epoches with regard to the degree system, pre-1975 and post-1975. The earlier system was geared for the development and maintenance of a “sacred” organization separate from the mundane world, while the later system has been geared for a “secular” form of Satanism.

The original degree scheme consisted of five levels— at least externally. These were signified with Roman numerals I - V with an appended degree symbol (°). They were also given dramatic titles, such as Warlock and Enchantress. Three important articles from the pre-1975 *Cloven Hoof* are the basis of the following discussion— “An Explanation of the Various Degrees of the Church of Satan” (1970), “What is a Satanic Master?” (1971), and “Official Degrees of the Church of Satan” (1972). The latter article was actually written by Michael A. Aquino.

I° Apprentice, or “Active Member,” is one who is *formally committed* to the philosophy of Satanism. Members remain at this level perpetually unless they resign or are expelled by the Council of Nine.

II° Warlock (male) or Witch (female) is one who has passed a formal examination on Satanic philosophy and magic. These could then become leaders of local Grottos in preparation for the Priesthood.

III° Priest (male) or Priestess (female) is one who has established and maintained an authorized Grotto while upholding the dignified image of the Church. This “image” would

include things from the kind of car the person drives, to their living quarters, to economic stability, to personal appearance. Members of the clergy would represent the Church in the media and so they had to have a high level of communications skills. In addition to these external requirements, the prospective Priest or Priestess had to take a written examination relevant to the degree. The imperative here was that the Satanic Priesthood would be made up of the kind of people who would be successful in all phases of life and not just those who were running into the occultic world to gain the recognition they were not able to gain it in the *real world*. LaVey was very serious about the necessity of high standards for the Priesthood of Satan: “[T]he Priest of Satan must be better read, more self-aware, more achieved for his years, more articulate, more genuinely dedicated to his chosen faith than are the clergy of any other religion known to man.”(34)

IV^o Magister — or Master — is one who has built up his Grotto to the level where additional members of the Priesthood are necessary in the area. Magisters act in a way similar to that of Bishops, Archbishops, Cardinals in the Roman Catholic Church. This administrative attitude toward the Magistracy was short lived— a peculiarity of the optimistic atmosphere of pre-1975 Satanism in America.

Beyond this administrative function, to be appointed as a *Master* by the High Priest, the Priest or Priestess would be evaluated according to criteria that were later kept secret. However, in the 1971 *Cloven Hoof* article on the subject the High Priest defined a Satanic Master as someone who has created something by *conscious* application of certain principles which has significantly influenced or modified the lives of great numbers of the world’s population.(*CH* 3:9 [1971], p. 1.)

This definition in many ways bleeds over into the definition given in an earlier article of the Fifth Degree.

V^o Magus is the degree conferred on members of the *Magistry* “who have discovered and brought forth a new magical principle and utilized it in a manner that profoundly affects the activities of the world.” (*CH* 2:11 [1970], p. 8.) Mysteriously, LaVey, writing as John M. Kincaid, alludes to “four additional degrees” beyond that of Magus. These are never discussed again, although the Temple of Set was to develop the VI^o Ipsissimus. These and whatever other criteria pertinent to the degrees of Magus and Magister were also made secret at a later date. LaVey himself is the only person ever recognized as a Magus in the Church of Satan. By the way, the official form of address for a Magus is “Doctor,” and it is for this reason that LaVey is sometimes so addressed by his followers, not because he claims to have an actual academic Ph.D from an accredited university.

In the early days it is clear that LaVey considered himself a unique historical “embodiment of Satan,” who was the Satanic Magus of the present “Age of Fire” which began in 1966/I. His Task was the “bringing of Satanism into the world as an organized, legitimate, above ground persuasion— and with it restoring the dignity of man’s own godhead.” (p. 8)

Post-1975 Degree System of the Church

Following the watershed year of 1975 the degree system changed in some essential ways, yet the basic validity of the five degrees of Satanism is still upheld.(35) According to LaVey at this point the degree system as it had been was an experiment in seeing how far Satanists could be organized. But as he sees it now, true Satanists remain non-joiners and are virtually impossible to organize.

A concrete example of the results of this realization comes in the form of the official color designation of the ceremonial medallions worn by members of the Church. According to a *Cloven Hoof* article published early in 1976 there was originally no official policy on the colors of the medallions worn by members of the Church at various levels of initiation.(36) Then, with increased standardization in later years, Official policy required that I^o members wear a black Sigil of Baphomet against a red background, II^o members wore black ones against a white background, III^o members of the Priesthood had white Baphomets on black

backgrounds, while IV^o members of the Magistry originally wore specially designed silver pentagrams — later this was changed to a Baphomet on a blue background. The one and only V^o — LaVey himself — was to wear a free-standing silver pentagram. In the case of LaVey, as the High Priest of Satan, this was struck through with a lightning bolt. But the 1976 article abandons all of that formality in favor of the reported individual freedom of the early days. Colors such as “peacock green” and “opalescent pink” became available for a time — in celebration of unconventional Satanic aesthetics.

The post-X degree system has become keyed to another, alternative, scheme of development which is said to describe not only the historical evolution of the Church of Satan, but personal initiation as well. This is the schemata of the five (or six) *phases* of Satanism(37)

First Phase Satanism is characterized by the key concept of *Emergence*. In the history of the Church of Satan this is when the Satanic Age was crystallized into reality and made manifest in society. LaVey sees this as the equivalent of the I^o Apprentice level in the original initiatory scheme when applied to individuals. At this stage an outward show of Satanism with public rituals, and so on, may be important to help the individual break down social or psychological barriers to development.

Second Phase Satanism is marked with that key idea of *Development*. Historically this is the period of public expansion by the Church. It is also seen as a stage of distillation in which the Satanic “ideal” is separated from that which does not meet these criteria.

Third Phase Satanism is distinguished by the key concept of *Qualification*. This involves the development of respectability and an image of prestige to the outside world.

Fourth Phase Satanism is marked with the key idea of *Control*. “Ideal” elements isolated in Phase Two are stratified and further isolated into a separate and definite social structure. In personal initiation this is the stage where mastery begins. There is an isolation from the general environment in which true individuality can manifest itself.

Fifth Phase Satanism is indicated by the key word of *Application*. Techniques developed through the first four phases are employed as the “Myths of the Twentieth Century” are understood and exploited. At this end of the initiatory spectrum LaVey says “we still have Magisters and Magistras who divorce themselves from the mainstream as much as possible and arrange their lives to earn money at things that entail a minimal amount of contact with or input from the herd— artists, directors, writers, performers, entrepreneurs of various kinds...”(38)

For LaVey these Phases have, so far, ended in a posited Phase Six which involves “the development, promotion and manufacture of artificial human companions.” this will be discussed at further length elsewhere in this chapter, but at this point it is important to note the initiatory logic of Phase Six. As an essential part of left-hand path initiatory technique involves the *separation* of the subject from his or her environment in order that a true individual essence can be distilled, LaVey’s decidedly sociological and materialistic brand of the left-hand path ideology virtually demands a progressive isolation from the influences of other people. As Sartre said, “Hell is other people.” In an inversion of this, LaVey maintains that “other people” must be artificially replaced in accordance with the will of the magician in order that an “Infernal Paradise” can be created.

The conclusion on the Church of Satan as an *organization* must be that it only existed as such for a few years— from 1966 to 1975.

Major Doctrines of the Church of Satan

There have been three major doctrinal documents issued by LaVey since the inception of the Church of Satan in 1966/I. Typically they come in the form of enumerated aphorisms some of which can be understood on various levels. These official doctrines should be allowed to shape our primary understanding of LaVey’s teachings and hence of his Church of Satan.

The Nine Satanic Statements

(Circa 1966: First published in the *Satanic Bible* 1969)

These statements are the mainstays of the philosophy of the Church of Satan, and are often reprinted in journalistic discussions of LaVey and the organization.

The first six of the Statements are couched as contradictory formulas— Satan represents indulgence, vital existence, and undefiled wisdom instead of abstinence, spiritual pipe dreams and hypocritical self-deceit. There is a “this” *instead of* “that” — so that not only is a positive affirmation given, but also an accompanying negative assertion. This is partially indicative of LaVey’s particular form of dualism which will be explored below.

The likely origin of the formulaic presentation of the Nine Satanic Statements in the work of Ayn Rand has already been noted above.

The First Statement, inspired by the Redbeard text *Might is Right*, extols indulgence as the essence of LaVeyan Satanic philosophy. In the *Satanic Bible* (ch. VIII) LaVey is careful to distinguish between indulgence and compulsion, that is, between consciously and willfully practicing an act which gives one pleasure and fulfills a natural desire and unconsciously and uncontrollably committing an act which one “can’t help but do.” Indulgence is the fulfillment of a desire with its origins in one’s essential human nature. Compulsion is outside one’s conscious control. LaVey sees as natural indulgence in all the so-called seven deadly sins of Christianity: greed, pride, envy, anger, gluttony, lust and sloth. Each of which he views as a possible catalyst for positive and natural human activities or attitudes— such as ambition, self-respect, self-preservation, material or physical well-being and pleasure of all kinds. (See the *Satanic Bible* ch. III.) The fact that most people today, and the whole “western industrialized economy” is really *driven* by the desires of the masses to indulge in all of the seven deadly sins is a powerful argument for the presence of a Satanic Age.

Abstinence is seen as the unhealthy, coerced cessation of natural human aspirations, or the belief that these are somehow evil or bad and that a moral person should abstain from them.

The crucial factor in distinguishing between or among indulgence, compulsion and abstinence is the actual will or nature of the individual. One should not have to *work* at what one wishes to indulge in— it should come naturally and be pleasurable.(39)

After 1975 the Temple of Set philosophy re-interpreted LaVey’s use of the word “indulgence” in terms of an Aeon Word, analogous to Crowley’s *Thelema*. This dignity of the word was never formally claimed by LaVey, though repeatedly he has summed up his Satanic philosophy in that word.

The Second Statement relates to LaVey’s essentially materialistic, epicurean philosophy of life. “Vital existence” — the power of living flesh — is not only extolled over things “spiritual,” but spirituality itself is relegated to the category of a “pipe dream”— an illusion. The spirit and god are not so much seen as positive enemies in LaVeyan philosophy as they are illusions or unrealities which are *used* by the mass mind to console and protect itself— through self-deceit.

The Third Statement targets this self-deceit which is one of the Nine Satanic Sins. This opens the door to hypocrisy which is one of the chief manifestations of the “herd mentality” against which LaVeyan Satanism seeks to fight. This is LaVey’s version of the Delphic exhortation to “Know Thyself.” Understanding of this and of the way the world is *really* put together represents the “undefiled wisdom.”(cf. LaVey’s translation of the 19th Enochian Key.)

The Fourth Statement — “Satan represents kindness to those who deserve it, instead of love wasted on ingrates!” relates to chapter V of the “Book of Lucifer” in the *Satanic Bible* (“Love and Hate”). In that chapter LaVey argues that one can not love without limitations.

"If anything is used too freely it loses its meaning." (40) So LaVey teaches not to force one's self "to feel indiscriminate love" which he condemns as "unnatural." This very *unnaturalness* is what leads the Christian evangelist or inquisitor to be able to say "I love you," or "I'll pray for you," while harboring deep seated hatred or worse yet actually giving the thumbscrews one more turn. Love should be given to those one loves, hate should be given to one's enemies.

The Fifth Statement — which extols vengeance, over "turning the other cheek" — again relates to chapter V of the "Book of Lucifer" as well as to the most controversially titled chapter "On the Choice of a Human Sacrifice" (Ch. IX). LaVey gives the moral and ethical license to the true Satanist to take vengeance on his enemies— in a *magical* way. This is done either through "Lesser magical" psychological methods or through a "Greater magical" conjuration of destruction. It can not be over-emphasized that LaVey never advocates "human sacrifice" as conventionally understood. What is advocated is the inner freedom of Satanically aware individuals to "take justice into their own hands" and indulge themselves in a healthy full-blown hatred for anyone or anything which has wronged them sufficiently to deserve it. This is a powerful socio-political statement which speaks out for the sovereignty of the Satanic individual over and above the collectivist state "justice" system. It is almost as if LaVey could see the increasing and widespread breakdown in our criminal justice system from his still relatively pacific late-1960s point in time.

Statement Six: "Satan represents responsibility to the responsible, instead of concern for psychic vampires!" again has to do with the social relations of the Satanist and is further expounded in chapter VII of the "The Book of Lucifer" in the *Satanic Bible*. LaVey has always been most wary of people who attempt to ingratiate themselves with capable people and begin to take from them more than they give in return— in whatever kind of human relationship. These people he calls "psychic vampires." Satanists will either get whatever they need or want from their own resources or from others in a give-and-take relationship.

Statement Seven is essential to understanding the basics of LaVey's theory of what mankind is — his anthropology. He sees man as essentially "just another animal"— as a natural creature b "beast of the fields." *But* he must also account for man's special status. This he does by referring to man's "divine spiritual and intellectual development." Although he may not find the words agreeable, he must concede that there is *something* which separates humans from the "other animals." LaVey views this factor as something man simply puts to natural use— as increasing his capacity for viciousness. This philosophical point on the true nature of mankind and the relationship between the intellectual and bestial parts of man remain problematic in LaVey's thought.

Statement Eight: "Satan represents all of the so-called sins, as they all lead to physical, mental, or emotional gratification!" is a further expansion of Statement One. It is a specific exhortation to indulge in those things which the collective or mass culture may call sins— because by virtue of their very rejection by the mass they can be exalted as worthy aspirations for the individualistic Satanist. The Satanist uses "public opinion" as a "reverse barometer" to analyze the social environment and to distinguish between the Satanic and non-Satanic.

The Ninth Statement is the ironic "punch line" to the series. It states that historically Satan has been an ally of the church, as he has kept the churches "in business"! But this is not meant as flippantly as it might seem. The notion of "the other," the "opponent"— which is the essential meaning of the Hebraic term "Satan"— is always necessary to the maintenance of a right-hand path institution or belief system— from the church to the market place. The right-hand path must always *have* an enemy, while the left-hand path somehow always seems to have to *be* that enemy.

The Nine Satanic Sins

(First published in the *Cloven Hoof* 119 in 1987)

These “sins” provide an invaluable negative mirror of the LaVeyan philosophy. In the original presentation of the text each of these key terms is provided with a short commentary.

(1) The first sin is *stupidity* and is indeed the is the primary Satanic Sin: “It depends on people going along with whatever they are told.” LaVey views this as something the mass media actually *cultivate* in order to dupe the masses— the Satanist must learn to see through this.

(2) The second sin is *pretentiousness* which is seen as a corollary of stupidity as it is one’s proclivity toward pretentiousness that is appealed to through flattery — “Everyone’s made to feel like a big shot” — and thereby one is most easily manipulated.

(3) The third Satanic sin is *solipsism*, which according to LaVey is very dangerous. This may also be because LaVeyan Satanism likes to think of itself as highly objectivistic, and as the word is generally defined it conveys the idea that *only the self exists* — a radical form of subjectivism. The world outside the self, and the relationship of the self — or ego — to that world is essential in defining the life and attainment of success for the Satanist. The outside world must be controlled in accordance with the will of the Satanist— which is reminiscent of the Epicurean attitude towards the external world.

(4) The fourth sin is *self-deceit*, which has already been cited as a highly undesirable trait in the Third Satanic Statement. In a way all of the other eight “Sins” revolve around this key concept which may be distilled as a lack of self-awareness or self-knowledge. Satanists must know themselves before they can indulge in those things which are truly an expression of their unique existences.

(5) The fifth sin is *herd conformity*, which is especially heinous because not only would one be giving up personal control or sovereignty— one would be doing it to an impersonal collective mass. It is within the Satanic lifestyle to practice “dynamic submission”— that is, giving over one’s loyalty or freedom for another’s use as long as it ultimately benefits (fulfills the true desires) of the one who so submits him or herself. But in this latter case it is very personal and individual.

(6) The sixth sin is a *lack of perspective*, which essentially means that the would-be Satanist is not keeping his or her actions in “the wider historical and social” context. If the larger patterns are not perceived, focus is soon lost and the will of the “wannabe” Satanist could be quickly led astray by the herd mentality.

(7) The seventh sin is what LaVey calls a *forgetfulness of past orthodoxies* is part of the lack of perspective— the lack of historical perspective. If one does not know the roots of something it can easily be replaced by marketers as the “new” (and hence in the mass-mid) “improved” model. The Satanist generally realizes that there can really be nothing that is in its essence *new*.(41) The very ideology responsible for *orthodoxy*, i.e. the standardized imposition of a system of beliefs/values over a whole population, makes such forgetfulness possible (and profitable).(42)

(8) The eighth sin is termed *counterproductive pride*, which is something in which one of the “Satanic virtues” — pride — can become a “sin” if it is out of balance with the pragmatic goals of the individual.

(9) The ninth and final Satanic sin is a *lack of aesthetics*, which is interesting because so much of LaVey’s form of Satanism is built up along aesthetic lines. So much of Anton LaVey is an *artist*— a musician, a painter, a weaver of tales — his “system” is largely a product of aesthetic constructs. Aesthetics comes from the Greek word for the “senses”— it is what is pleasing or pleasurable as sense data. Aesthetics have a subjective and objective component, both of which should be observed and applied in Satanic activity. Ignoring this, or not cultivating it, would be unthinkable in his world.

The Eleven Rules of the Earth

(First published in *The Cloven Hoof* March 1970, p. 3)

These “Eleven Rules” can be summarized as the *Lex Satanicus* (Law of the Satanist) which simply states “Do unto others as they do unto you.” Also included in this is the *Lex Talonis* (Law of the Talon) which supports the Darwinian view of the “survival of the fittest.”

This body of laws may be taken as the essence of Satanic ethics as far as LaVey is concerned. Long after these Rules were written LaVey railed against those who would call themselves “ethical Satanists” because he felt this to be a redundant phrase.⁽⁴³⁾ However, he does feel it necessary to spell out exactly what the ethics of Satanism are in these Eleven Rules of the Earth— some of which consist of a codification of common courtesy.

The first three Rules involve not overstepping the bounds of respect for other people i.e. Don’t give opinions or advice unless asked, don’t tell your woes to others unless they want to hear about them, and when you are in someone else’s home, show respect, or don’t go. People should be given their space— psychologically, emotionally and physically, and one should be able to expect the same respect in return. But the fourth Rule tells one how to deal with a person who does not respect one’s space: “...treat him cruelly and without mercy!

Rule Five — “Do not make sexual advances unless you are given the mating signal” — harkens back to the message of the first three as the would-be Satanist is warned against making unwanted sexual advances. The Devil is always a gentleman and never an overbearing oaf.

The Sixth Rule, which states that one should not take another’s property *unless* it is a burden to the other person (!), is formulated according to a typically LaVeyan construct in which victimizers, or predators, only make victims, or prey, of those who appear *willing* to fulfill that role. The root of this construct or theme in LaVey’s thought is found in his theories of Sado-Masochism discussed.

The Seventh Rule shows LaVey’s essential reverence and respect for the very *idea* of magic. He admonishes the Satanist to acknowledge magic if it has been successfully employed it to obtain some desire. LaVey maintains that if one denies magic after having successfully used, one will then lose that gain. It is this technique of magic, rather than any symbol of it — such as Satan — which is singled out by him for this level of reverence.

With the Eighth Rule LaVey returns to the two-edged construct of the victimizer/victim. He admonishes the Satanist not to complain about things to which it is unnecessary to be subject. Only this time it is from the purely “Masochistic” side. If one does not *need* to subject one’s self to a situation, yet continues in it, then perhaps it is because one does *need* it after all. If so— there is no sense in complaining about it. Such behavior would be quite unseemly.

Rules Nine: “Do not harm little children!” and Ten: “Do not kill non-human animals unless attacked or for your food!” are of tremendous ethical importance. Long before the virulent and libelous “anti-Satanic” smear campaigns of the mid-1980s, in other words before LaVey was really “defending” Satanism against any specific charges or accusations, he was repeatedly on record as standing against the harm of children and animals (or non-human animals to be more accurate). This topic is also addressed in the *Satanic Bible* (pp. 87-89) in some detail.

The last Rule of the Earth — “When walking in open territory, bother no one. If someone bothers you, ask him to stop. If he does not stop, destroy him!” — comes back to the themes of the initial Rules. The Satanist should mind his own business when he is outside his own “lair.” If someone violates the Rules regarding him, he should inform the other of the violation. Now, if the other does not heed the warning the violator must be *asking* to be destroyed— and the Satanist is within his natural rights to oblige.

Throughout the 1980s LaVey made some interesting statements defining Satanism and the Satanist which provide further insight into his doctrines in more recent years.

In 1982 he wrote "Satanism is more than a philosophy; it is a lone stand, a symbolic act of defiance against thought suppression." (44) In 1985 he provided a nine point definition of the characteristics of a Higher Being—the deified Satanist. Almost all of which LaVey himself regularly violates. Among them are "don't advertise" (!), "Be creative...never rip off" (!)—to name but two. Also among these characteristics is a bully-philosophy: "...people will realize the benefits [of] contributing to your happiness, or the tough luck that can befall them by getting you sore." (45)

The next year LaVey defined Satanism again and defended his use of the term by saying that his "brand of Satanism" is a conscious alternative to conventional and institutional thought. He identifies "Satanism" as a *stimulating* (or fun) *name* for the exercise of innovative thinking which goes against the thoughtless conformity to mainstream thinking in any avenue of life. Here he perhaps foreshadows the "recreational religion" of contemporary society. (46)

The Satanic Cosmology

or

The World According to the Abominable Dr. LaVey

Anton LaVey is not, nor does he intend to be, a systematic philosopher. He is more a weaver of images—a sorcerous philosopher—a performance artist working in the social and imagistic media of the latter 20th century. As such it requires some work, and, I hope, some sympathetic understanding to illicit from his written works the essence of his worldview. In many ways LaVey poses some new questions for the world-be follower of the left-hand path. The role of society and of the interaction with other human beings (or the lack of same) become essential to his Satanic philosophy. But equipped with the analytical questions I have put to all the earlier schools of the left-hand path, the encounter with LaVey's Church of Satan yields a great harvest of new ideas about the nature and scope of the path of the left-hand. LaVey's Satanic cosmology will be seen to be materialistic, cyclical, dualistic and limited. The problem of the position of the will of the Satanic magician within this cosmos remains, however.

LaVey's system of thought is based on a uniquely *magical* form of materialism. For him all things that exist do so in a material form. There is no such thing as "spirit," "god," or "heaven" as commonly believed in and taught by orthodox religions or held by popular superstition. This theoretical idea is the proverbial *forest* of LaVey's system which the *trees* of individual manifestations of this concept sometimes obscure. It is easier to see the materialism in his understanding of mankind or the workings of magic than in the impersonal abstraction of cosmology. LaVey always begins and ends with concrete things which can be *sensed*. This approach rarely leads him off into abstract speculation.

For LaVey "God" (i.e. the ultimate power in the universe) is *Nature* and Satan is the embodiment of Nature. (47) This is not to reduce LaVey's philosophy to pure objectivistic positivism. There is indeed, and perhaps somewhat paradoxically, a definite *metaphysics* embedded in LaVey's materialism. The world may be a material reality only, but its functions can be so mysterious that vast amounts of its true character and structure remain hidden from normal mankind's view and understanding. For the most part man brings this ignorance upon himself— it is simply more comfortable to be ignorant for most people. This is why, as P. T. Barnum said: "There's a sucker born every minute."

LaVey's metaphysical materialism is not entirely original. He derives much of it from a number of sources which seem to include the Epicureans (whom he sometimes invokes), (48) de Sade (ultimately de la Metterie), Marx and Freud (whom he admires). It is this long-standing tradition of philosophical materialism which more than anything else LaVey identifies as the *Satanic* philosophy or tradition. Here he is very much in keeping

with the attitudes of the Slavs, both ancient and modern, who in their dualistic folk religion identified God with the spiritual world and the Devil with the material one.

Cycles of Fire and Ice

The clearest statements made by LaVey concerning the abstract order of the cosmos are concerned with *cycles* or *rhythms*. In the *Satanic Rituals* he wrote two pages (219-220) under the heading: "The Unknown Known." Here he outlines a theory of the successive Ages of the world which cycle or oscillate between Ages of Ice in which "God" rules and man (= Satan) is suppressed and Ages of Fire in which an rules and "God is beneath." These cycles are governed by the Law of Nine.

First there is a nine year period characterized by *action*, then a subsequent nine year period characterized by *reaction* to that original impetus. Taken together the 18 year span of time is called a "Working." Nine Workings equal an Era (162 years) and nine Eras add up to an Age (1,458 years) and nine Ages equal an Epoch (13,122 years).

The last Age of Ice came to an end in 1966. This pattern of oscillation between extremes is the clearest abstract model for another *leitmotif* in LaVey's thought: dualism. Dualism will be discussed at length in the next section, but another aspect of the cyclical pattern must not be overlooked: that of *rhythm*. Perhaps welling up from LaVey's obvious native musical nature and talent is an inherent sense of rhythm. He often writes of the importance of music to magic(49) and even concerning the primacy of rhythm over the actual meanings of words in magical incantations.(50)

The role of rhythms in ordering the world is more specifically addressed in a *Cloven Hoof* article in 1980 entitled "Megarhythms."(51) Here LaVey claims to be able to chart future public likes and dislikes "based on one simple rule: the attraction of opposites." If it's *in* today, it's destined by this megarhythmic law to be *out* tomorrow. The timing of these shifts is presumably somehow coordinated with the oscillation process within the Working 18 year period.

"Angles" form another abstract construct which gives shape to LaVey's cosmology. These "angles" — geometrical models which seem to have the power to create certain effects in the objective and subjective universes— are most precisely discussed in a *Cloven Hoof* article entitled "The Law of the Trapezoid." This Law states that figures or spaces made up of obtuse or acute angles (those less or more than 90°) have an unsettling effect on the mind unless they are recognized as such— whereupon they can be empowering and energizing.(52)

Supposedly when LaVey was investigating haunted houses earlier in his career he discovered that it was not necessarily "departed spirits" but rather a by-product of the actual geometry of the building or room in which the "haunting" was taking place that was causing the phenomena.

Again this aspect of LaVey's cosmology, or understanding of the world, can be derived at least in part from one of his artistic interests— in this instance from graphic arts and the influence of the theories of William Mortensen. See Appendix B for an outline of Mortensen's ideas. Certain shapes, angles and lines evoke first and foremost a visceral — even if unconscious — *fear*. Fear is the most basic and powerful emotion known to man because it is necessary to his physical survival. This remains so in today's "civilized" world, even if it is less obvious than in Ages past. Hence knowledge of its power is more useful than ever before.

LaVey makes his most magically potent statement on the power of the Angles in the ritual text of *Die elektrischen Vorspiele* (The Electrical Prelude) first published in the *Satanic Rituals* (pp. 106-130). The German text printed there is a (poor) translation of the original English, not the other way around. There is no evidence for the validity of the German versions of any of LaVey's rituals. The original text, as performed on occasion by LaVey in his early Church rituals, is printed as Appendix 5 in Michael Aquino's *The*

Church of Satan. In this text LaVey speaks of a Barrier outside of which are predatory beasts ("Hounds") which can enter and exit this world through "angles" according to certain "cycles." there is also the dichotomy between "angles" and "curved dimensions" (which are more of this world). The basic idea for this ritual came from the science-fiction story "The Hounds of Tindalos" by Frank Belknap Long, who is one of the Lovecraft circle. In a letter to Michael Aquino Long recollects having pulled the word "Tindalos" in the title "out of thin air." He said it might have suggested itself to him through the word "tinder" as he was thinking of something fiery.(53) It is, however, more likely that this is an example of cryptonesia and that somewhere Long had read about the Melanesian concept of *tindalo* which is a "spirit" that can cause insanity when it possesses a person.

LaVeyan Dualism

There is certain kind of "dualism" inherent in the very structure of the left-hand path because its practitioners always seek to separate or individuate themselves from the environment. There is always a "this" and "that," "self" and "not-self." The right-hand path practitioner seeks to destroy the distinctions and so can avoid this structural dualism but can seldom avoid moralistic dualism between "good" and "evil."

Anton LaVey's philosophy is founded on some basic dichotomies in the cosmological psycho-sensual and sociological realms and his thought is otherwise peppered with dozens of other dichotomies.

The main dichotomy is the cosmological one between matter and "spirit," or more accurately stated that between reality, or actual existence, and illusion or conditioned response. In a very real sense LaVey turns Augustine on his head and claims "being" for matter and "lack of being" for the world of spirit. For LaVeyan Satanists it comes down to seeing reality for what it is rather than allowing others to interpret and package a false reality for them. Invariably when one allows someone else to create one's cosmology the creator always *gains* something. Satanists will therefore not allow this to happen, preferring to base their cosmologies on the most objective facts known. Whether this objectivity is most accessible in the world of the senses or in the world of the psyche is the basic line of demarcation between the two modern branches of the left-hand path.

Within the realm of the senses the principal LaVeyan dichotomy is between pleasure and pain. There is nothing more basic — and hence more powerful — in human existence and experience. LaVey's works are laden with overt references to Sado-Masochism. This is a complex topic in LaVey's thought, and one better discussed in detail in connection with his understanding of humanity in a later section. This dichotomy is so pervasive that it seems part of his dualistic cosmology and not just a subjective creation of the human psyche. The human mind simply perceives the universal dichotomy as pleasure/pain.

In two 1980 *Cloven Hoof* articles LaVey explored the topic of eustress, which is the opposite of "distress." He theorizes that in today's society distress is "so commonplace that it represents comfort, security, and— fun," that *distressful* situations are transformed into *eustressful* ones. According to LaVey people feel insignificant in today's world. "There is overpopulation and underrecognition." (54) They feel that way for the most part because each individual really is insignificant in the larger scheme of things. But the individual abhors this condition— it is really *distressful*. The whole marketplace of entertainment, glamor, and so on, is geared to turn that distress into eustress (at a profit to the marketers). This is done by misdirecting the individual's attention to some vicarious existence— the lives and fortunes/misfortunes of movie stars, sports figures— or soap opera characters. The person is made to *feel* significant— for a price of some kind.

In the sociological realm LaVey's dualism is equally profound. The most essential element of this seems to be the dichotomy between the *individual*, or non-conformity, and the *collective*, or conformity. This element or theme in one way or another underlies more of his *Cloven Hoof* writings than any other. In his philosophy the *summum bonum* is

indulgence in the genuine desires of the individual carnal ego. In opposition to this stands *abstinence* from those desires governed by collective dictates or religion, politics, fashion, the media, *ad infinitum*.

The essence of LaVeyan Satanism is *indulgence* in individual desires according to the conscious will of that individual separate from, and contrary to, the dictates of forces outside the sovereign individuality. This is not as easy as the casual observer might assume. LaVey points out that most things people “indulge” in are actually things they are *supposed* to enjoy—according to their peer group, social stratum, or whatever. Most people just go along with the herd and “enjoy” the things they are supposed to enjoy—and then at the end of their lives wonder why they really had so little fun along the way. It is to this kind of life that the non-Satanist is condemned. This conformity to the herd mentality is the antithesis of structural Satanism. In the Middle Ages the “white lighters” conformed to the dogmas of the church, today those same conformists are more likely to kowtow to the dictates of political ideologies, trendy fashions or media generated consumerism.

“The reason why an archetypical Satanist will eschew whatever is popular lies in his disdain for and avoidance of whatever has been programmed for others.”(55)

So humanity itself is divided into two groups—the Satanic non-conformists who indulge their genuinely individualized desires and the “rubes” who conform overtly or covertly to the herd mentalities of religion, science, politics, fashion, the media, etc. The self-aware Satanist is virtually always in a position to prey upon the rubes, the dupes of the mass mentality. LaVey’s pointing out of this obvious fact makes his philosophy seem especially “politically incorrect” to many would-be critics. Few like to be made to feel the distress of their present condition.

The division of mankind into two classes, those in the know and the “marks” or “rubes” is, on the surface at least, an aspect of LaVey’s philosophy illustratively drawn from his carnival experience. But if we strip away the hypocrisy in ourselves we will see that those same “metagames” so obviously and crudely played in the carnival are reflected in most human endeavors—right up to the tops of our ivory towers and deep into our halls of state.

This division between Satanists and the conformist herd is essential to the first point in LaVey’s more recent “Five-Point Program”—Stratification.(56) This will be discussed further in the “Vision” section later on. Stratification is the process of separating, or creating conditions which will facilitate the separation, of the “weak” from the “strong.” LaVey has always stood for such stratification and elitism based on merit and strength—this is why he was apparently drawn to the philosophy of Ragnar Redbeard initially. For LaVey there is the “higher man” (= the Satanist—by whatever name) and the “lower man.”(57) The “higher man” is aware of all the metagames in life and knows how to play them, while the “lower man” is merely a pawn in such games.

Besides these major dichotomies and dualities LaVey often invokes the dichotomy between concepts such as the past and present, night and day (he detests the *sun!*), life and death, silver and gold and dozens of others. At the same time he is aware of the dangers of dichotomizing unproductively. He decries the “lower man’s” thought process—and his language—as being “binaric.”(58) This idea appears based on some of George Orwell’s theories about language and thought.(59) “*Binaric* is based on the premise that only *one* of two choices can be readily processed by most (*including* human) computers. There are no shades of grey, so to speak. Either *on* or *off*, *understood* or *not understood*.”(60) He also rejects the labels of “white magic” and “black magic”(61) and in so doing says: “There is no difference between “White” and “Black” magic, except in the smug hypocrisy, guilt-ridden righteousness, and self-deceit of the “White” magician himself.” LaVey bases his rejection on the prejudiced definition of “white magic” as that used for benevolent workings, and “black magic” as that employed for malevolent ones. We have defined these

terms differently for purposes of this study. For LaVey, as for G. I. Gurdjieff, magic is conscious *doing*.

Before I leave the discussion of LaVey's dualism I would like to note that he harbors two distinct types of dichotomies in this thought. One is truly oppositional— such as that between reality (“vital existence”) and unreality (“pipe dreams”) or between the individual and the collective— while the other lies in a spectrum— such as that between pleasure and pain, distress and eustress. The first kind expresses the essence of the role of the Satanist as a categorical *opponent* or adversary to prevailing “norms” on a macrocosmic or microcosmic scale, while the second kind refers to the magician's ability to transform one quality into another as an act of will.

The Power of Limited Resources

LaVey, sometimes reacting to current popular ideas about “unlimited” human potential, always champions the cause of *limitation*. First and foremost he sees this limitation as a cold, hard, if unpleasant, fact. But he also understands it as a potential source of real power— as opposed to imagined unlimited resources.

I believe this attitude to be correlated to LaVey's basic materialism. In the “natural” world we see that resources are limited and so there is no reason to assume, in LaVey's view, that this is not the case in matters of consciousness or human creativity.

In the chapter “Love and Hate” in the *Satanic Bible* (pp. 64-65) LaVey posits that in reality the human capacity to love is limited. We can not love everyone. Love is a limited commodity. Those who claim to love universally always hypocritically harbor even vaster quantities of hate.

Like Gurdjieff before him, LaVey holds that knowledge is also a limited commodity because the brain's ability to retain it is limited. Mr. G. openly stated that knowledge was a material substance. “I know damned well that a mind can only retain so much data ... whatever new stuff that goes in, must boot some old stuff out.”(62) LaVey cultivates a “trick” to ensure that his “knowledge bank” will retain its unique character. He calls it the “augmentive principle.” New data will only be allowed entry if it directly relates to a preexisting “favorite set of engrams.” It this way he believes himself able to arrest the process of meaningless mental change for the sake of change and retain “what seems to be the most valuable commodity in the world today: a strong, unique, personal and lasting identity.” From a left-hand path perspective this speaks to the eventual necessity of crystallizing an essence, which is self-defined and delimited, and which becomes the subject of deification and eventual immortality. Despite LaVey's efforts at packaging his thoughts in a crude style (increasingly typical of his work after 1975) he here gives some profound and sophisticated, yet practical and “down to earth” left-hand path technology.

Not only are there natural limitations in place which affect human knowledge and creativity, but LaVey also sews the benefits of artificial restrictions on creative freedom In a 1981 issue of the *Cloven Hoof* he extols the virtues of *censorship*. This demonstrates that the Black Pope is as able to “blaspheme” against the sacred cows of the “liberal establishment” just as well as he does against those of the “religious right.” To him they are all the same anyway— rubes and dupes. He defends censorship — which is an artificial limitation of artistic or intellectual freedom — based not on a desire to quell a certain viewpoint but rather to encourage true creativity and vitality of imagination. A lack of limits promotes *sameness* chiefly because artists are then free to practice excess which in turn dulls the imaginative powers of the audience or readership. “Censorship is a means towards personal freedom, the most personal of freedoms: a mind that can still function as a creative and thinking tool, *not* by what it is ‘free’ to do in all its collective sameness, but what it is *motivated* to do because of certain limitations.”(63)

LaVey's extolling of limitations is, or can be, a hallmark of the left-hand path insofar as it is a corollary of the necessity of *separation* of the self from the surrounding environment and transforming it according to innate patterns hidden within. Without such limits or boundaries the self or individuality is quickly swallowed up by the mass— and even more quickly if that lack of limitations is promoted in the name of "individuality." LaVey always likes to point to the "hippies" of the late 1960s and early 1970s as examples of people who walked in lock-step (peer-group approved clothes, drugs, opinions, verbal mechanisms, etc.)— all in the name of "doing their own thing."

Of LaVey's many radical ideas none seems as radical as his proposal that Satanists create and dwell in an artificial world and society of their own designs. Here he suggests a new view of cosmology— one that is at once material and a product of the human imagination. The fourth point of the Five-Point Plan is the design and manufacture of androids to act as artificial human companions— or slaves. The fifth point of the Plan extends this idea to *Total Environments*. These are to be privately owned and operated communities — or Environments — which totally conform to the aesthetic wishes of those living or visiting there. This is the basic idea behind LaVey's earlier talk about the establishment of "Pleasure Domes" in which the Satanist could indulge his particular tastes. In these Total Environments the Satanist would be free from a kind of "aesthetic pollution" with which he is usually constantly bombarded— much to the detriment of his ability to indulge in his desires.

Androids and Total Environments are logical cosmological conclusions to LaVey's cosmology— they provide a material (real) option for the true Satanist to indulge his highly idiosyncratic tastes separate and free from the collective norms of society which are an anathema to his view of "the good life."

The Satanic View of Mankind

The human being is the central focus of LaVeyan Satanism. It is through our humanity we view the world— "Man is the measure of all things," said the Sophist Protagoras— and it is in humanity we find the ultimate godhead. According to LaVey's philosophy, Satanism is the true religion of mankind, by mankind and for mankind. At the core of his anthropology is a carnal understanding which places a high degree of importance on the erotic component in human life. This aspect is typical of philosophies having their origins in this century— from the psychoanalysis of Sigmund Freud to the sexual religion of Gerald Gardner.

Man = Beast = "God"

At least when talking about the Satanist himself, anthropology and theology are merged. But to the non-Satanist the study of mankind is closer to demonology. This is because "white light" religious systems equate "human nature," the natural desires of man, with manifestations of sin implanted by Satan. Indeed the "Satan," the "enemy" or "adversary" of the orthodox God is humanity itself— of which the image of Satan is a symbol. This structure ensures that "Satan" will always be "tempting man to sin" and hence he will need the church to absolve that sin. This is how "Satan" has "kept the church in business all these years" (Ninth Satanic Statement.)

The Satanist rejects this structure and embraces his own carnal individuality as the focus of any godhead. Man is seen entirely as a creature of Nature— a beast or animal — with no "spiritual" component. "[Man] no longer can view himself in two parts, the carnal and the spiritual, but sees them merge as one, and then to his abysmal horror, discovers that they are only the carnal— AND ALWAYS WERE! Then he either hates himself to death, day by day— or rejoices that he is what he is!"(64) The former choice of self-hatred is that of orthodox religion, the latter choice of self-acceptance is that of Satanism.

Man is a natural beast— but self-aware in his bestiality— and since the true and only God (= Satan) is Nature, Mankind is itself the physical embodiment of God as a self-aware

entity. In this way Mankind is that part of Satan (= Nature/"God") which is aware of its own existence.

If Man maintains a loving or respectful attitude toward himself, toward the true carnal and bestial core self, then he will show love and respect for the most noble and pure embodiments of that self, e.g. children, animals and other beautiful things. But if he is filled with self-hatred he will wish to hurt and destroy any and all external symbols of himself and his true nature. This is why so many "white light" religions have dying or suffering "gods" and why they are so ready to sacrifice themselves or other things. "The Satanist does *not* hate himself, nor the gods he might choose, and has no desire to destroy himself or anything for which he stands!"(65)

Man as a Carnal Ego

The highest or most exalted element that defines the human being is the *carnal ego*. This "carnal ego" is at once material — it is a part of the fleshly vehicle — and a matrix for *awareness*. The ego — the "I" — is aware of itself as the subject (= doer) of the actions it undertakes or wills. Man's awareness of this carnality provides the highest form of knowledge—the "Undeified Wisdom."

This is a point LaVey spends very little time elucidating. It remains a vague, yet vital and implicit part of his comprehensive worldview. The philosophical problem that remains is that as soon as I say "man is just an animal, which is *aware* of its animalness" I have already myself made the essential distinction between man and animal: self-awareness. This problem is not unique with LaVey, of course, all philosophies which see humanity as an undifferentiated part of an all-encompassing Nature face this problem. Epicureans, Enlightenment rationalists, Romantic vitalists, Marxists, and Anarchists all confront this quandary. Man — consciousness — seems to be so much outside Nature, working contrary to her "wishes," rebelling against her constraints— yet there is no truly objective and irrefutable evidence or data which proves the existence of some positive quality called "spirit" or "intelligence." The materialist simply posits that the laws by which matter is able to produce intelligence are so complex and mysterious that they have not yet been deduced. But in any event the *idea* of an invisible "spiritual" reality in opposition to this material and vital existence has generally been used as a weapon against mankind since the beginning of history. LaVey's religious philosophy calls for an end to "spiritual pipe dreams" and extols the virtue of pure "vital existence."

Satanic Society and the Invisible War

Anton LaVey has led a reclusive life, and increasingly so since 1975. During the same period his writings have increasingly shown concern with social realities and problems from a Satanic perspective. This focus on social, inter-human realities is understandable from two angles. First, it is in keeping with the Satanic preoccupation with non-conformity with the "herd mentality." Social norms help to define the limits of a possible Satanic society. Second, as society is a matter of here and now existence it is of a higher concern to the materialistic Satanist than any metaphysical speculations.

LaVey sees society as an important reality— albeit an often distasteful one. It, more than anything else, is the matrix in which the LaVeyan Satanist lives. Society is LaVey's chief nemesis as he has observed how the "white light" value system has outgrown medieval religious forms such as Christianity and become ensconced in the new media dominated consumer society of the late 20th century.

As with most schools of the left-hand path, the Church of Satan proposes an elitist design for society. The Satanist is someone set apart from and above the mass of society.(66) What is more, the isolation from society the Satanist cultivates can, according to LaVey, be a great source of power. In a 1990 *Cloven Hoof* article entitled "Power

through Alienation” he states: “A Satanist is not a revolutionary, but an alien, who by his very alienation, is performing the ultimate revolt against the mindless drones who fear the very rejection on which a Satanist thrives.”(67) By rejecting social norms and taking the role of Satanist — the alien — the individual is progressively freed from the constraints of society. At the same time LaVey derides the illusory “miserable quest for ‘individuality’” touted as the *norm* for present-day society. Everybody wants “to be like everybody else” and at the same time “think for themselves.” Here the hopeless situation of the normal person comes into sharp relief.

For LaVey society and its conformist norms acts as a great “resistor” to the Satanic will to non-conformity. This resistance of the Satanic will is painful but also gainful— as without the resistance the Satanist would be awash in undifferentiated possibilities. Resistance leads to strength. But this is not a benign relationship. The conformist would is seen as a great adversary bent on the destruction of the Alien, the Satanist— and so there is now underway a great Invisible War.

The Invisible War was first mentioned by name in the second quarter 1986 issue of the *Cloven Hoof*, although it had really been an underlying theme from the beginning of the Church of Satan. In this first discussion LaVey was somewhat vague about the parameters of this war stating that it “is highly sophisticated, breaking down normal mental and physiological functions until malaise, incompetence, or destruction befalls most individuals.”(68)

The purpose of this war is the “containment and control” of individuals. Weapons used in this war, also called World War III, include weather control, viral and bacterial diseases, ultra- and subsonic technologies, television, chemicals in food and beverages, psychological smoke screens (diversions and misdirections from the true conflict), the extended weekend (timer to consume and be further indoctrinated), and urban warfare (real violence induced mainly through drugs).(69)

It is an “invisible war” because the enemies are not obvious— perhaps even to themselves. The fastest way to identify the enemies is, whenever confronted with one of the offensive weapons used in the “war,” to ask the question: “Who gains?” this question usually renders some specific answers. But the true enemy lurks even deeper. The agents of the enemy — actual people undertaking acts to the benefit of the enemy’s agents — keep the secret even from themselves. “They can’t even be honest with themselves— so keeping *certain* secrets is easy. If it means losing money unless they keep their customers believing particular things, people will keep their mouths shut. If it means being hated and rejected for what the secret hides, then it’s easy.”(70)

People can keep “monstrous secrets” because they have been encouraged — by the opposing force in the invisible war — to *forget* who and what they truly are. LaVey writes: “*Forgetfulness*, relinquishing your past, is demanded by the State— anyone who chooses to disobey this rule is subject to substantial emotional and financial penalties.”(71) This forgetfulness is equated with a mythic Greek “chair of forgetfulness,” analogous to drinking the waters of the underworld spring Lethe, and identified as a punishment. It is interesting to compare LaVey’s ideas on the virtues of remembering with those of G. I. Gurdjieff (or Plato for that matter). For LaVey by remembering the past we preserve our individual selves— and so become aware of who we really are. But as he usually does, LaVey takes this idea and reduces it to an insight which prevents us from being “sold a bill of goods.”

Tempting as it might be for some to dismiss LaVey’s ideas about the Invisible War, many of his ideas seem valid and even obvious if one allows one’s cynical or harshly realistic mind to rule rather than one’s sentimental fantasies and wishful thinking. Also, his ideas are no less “paranoid” than a hundred special interest groups scurrying about the contemporary scene— LaVey just puts them all together in a comprehensive vision.

“Satanic Sex”

This is the title of the sixth chapter of the “Book of Lucifer” in the *Satanic Bible*. There can be no doubt that it was through sexual imagery that LaVey first brought great attention to the Church of Satan—his naked altars, “Topless Witches Review,” photo layouts in “men’s magazines,” and so on.

In doing this LaVey was practicing a magical talent for using the *timing* factor. The time — the late 1960s and early 1970s — was the time in which such imagery could be effective, and it was. An early issue of the *Cloven Hoof* contains an indication that there were three main reasons people were joining the Church: sexual freedom, furtherance of a New Satanic Society, and the practice of magic. A new attitude toward sex and sexuality is part of the late 20th century *Zeitgeist*. Aiden Kelly has pointed out the intrinsic importance of new sexual doctrines in the spread of modern witchcraft(72) — again especially in the U.S. during the same period. But “Satanic Sex” is something quite different from any other religious sexual doctrine. LaVey declares sexuality to be both of primary importance in human behavior *and* that it is an area of life in which absolute and free indulgence should be practiced — which includes the freedom to indulge in *abstinence*.

“Satanic Sex” is utter sexual freedom. The only thing about sexual practice that a Satanist might feel “guilty” about would be, in the words of de Sade’s “Dying Man”: “... I repent: I only plucked an occasional flower when I might have gathered an ample harvest of fruit...”(73) The essence of this philosophy is that of indulgence. One should find out what one’s tastes and predilections *truly are* (apart from cultural and social pressures) and then freely indulge these tastes. This includes the right to indulge in asexuality.

Even in the midst of the “sexual revolution” LaVey was astute enough to see the fact that American culture remained (and would continue to remain, despite appearances) a sexually repressed society. This is basically good news to the Satanist because of the need for and existence of *limitations* which fuel the imagination of individuals. Many aspects of the “sexual revolution,” e.g. the idea of sexuality as therapy (“Normal sex is good for you!”), unisex fashions and attitudes (“There’s *really* no difference between men and women”) and casual or “free” sex (“Everybody’s doing it!”), among other attitudes lead to a reduction in the potential for real Satanic Sex. This is because Satanic Sex is based on “fetishistic” or highly idiosyncratic sexual tastes, the sexual polarity between male and female, and a significant emotional intensity.

Gender Politics and Imagery

Contrary to the general cultural drift toward unisex values and fashion trends of the last two decades, LaVey consistently promoted a strict aesthetic distinction between the sexes. He insists on the profound differences between men and women, which is consistent with his more general theory of *carnality*. If the flesh is different in form, it follows that the “soul” will be different in a corresponding degree.

LaVey’s most extended treatise on this difference is his 1970 book *The Complete Witch*. The essential problem it addresses is the same as that of feminist literature of the same period: How can women achieve or obtain power? In both the works of LaVey and those of feminists, who would find this an abomination, it is generally conceded that the male gender either possesses the power sought, or that it embodies or behavioralizes that power. The feminist solution to the problem is for women to become more like men (in image and values) that they will be able to wrest the power away from men themselves. LaVey’s solution is for women to win a man and hold him with her particular feminine charms — and thereby acquire whatever power he has or will have. LaVey wrote: “[I]f a woman wants anything in life, she can obtain it easier through a man than another woman, despite woman liberationists’ bellows to the contrary.”(74) Such statements demonstrate

his ability to be the Adversary, the Satan, of contemporary cultural fashions and trends as much or more so than he is that of traditional orthodox "religion."

Although LaVey's stated preference is for men to be decidedly masculine and women to be decidedly feminine, there is a deeper reality revealed in a 1978 *Cloven Hoof* article entitled "Confessions of a Closet Misogynist." (75) Here he discusses himself as an example of a misogynist whose disdain for "soft, yielding, voluptuous woman" is based on *jealousy*. Such a woman creates "dualistic yearnings" in the strongly masculine man. "Essentially, a true misogynist is a straight man who, because he is a potential pushover for women and realizes it, resents the power a truly feminine woman wields, wishes he had a bit of it himself, secretly admires it, and seeks to capture it before it captures him." (76)

These ideas flow from LaVey's sophisticated conceptions about "epicurean sadism" and masochism and his theory of the androgyny of the personality in which the majority self made up of an apparent external personality which is a reflection of a core personality very similar to it. The gender of this personality is the same as that of the body of the subject. However, LaVey theorizes that there is another, minority or demonic, personality which lies between the outer and core selves. This has the gender opposite that of the subject, and contrasts not only sexually but also in physical type. It is to this type of persona the subject will be naturally attracted sexually. (77) These general principles are often applied by LaVey to a variety of studies in human behavior and society.

Another of LaVey's sexually conditioned theories revolves around the power of early erotic imprints on the consciousness of an individual. This phenomenon is called Erotic Crystallization Inertia (ECI) by LaVey. Later in life the subject returns to the images imprinted in his or her ECIs for vital sustenance. ECIs are almost predicated on the idea that the subject has a strong sexual imagination so that images not overtly related to simple procreative functions of sexuality are endowed with by the imagination with tremendous erotic power. Imagination — the power of the mind to creatively fill in or complete situations it encounters with emotional or intellectual meaning only vaguely suggested by the situation— is crucial to all of LaVey's thought. In many ways his Satanism is a philosophy of the imagination.

"The Marquis LaVey"

In a discussion of the sexual connotations of LaVeyan Satanism the topic of Sado-Masochism must be considered as a dominant theme. Theoretically it is in perfect accord with the entire body of LaVey's ideology. It is based on a carnal duality— that between pleasure and pain, between predator and prey. This again indicates the pervasive principle of there being polar extremes, positive and negative, active and passive, male and female, between which there is a law of the "Attraction of Opposites." Another principle of LaVeyan thought, that of *limitation* or restriction leading to creativity, also plays a role in his implicit doctrines surrounding Sado-Masochism.

The most comprehensive previously published view of this aspect of LaVeyan thought can be found in the chapter "Masochistic America" in the book *Secret Life of a Satanist*. (78)

Although primarily a sexual or erotic idea, Sado-Masochism is something LaVey sees as a factor prevalent throughout society even in matters not considered overtly "sexual." In the relationship between the sexes, or between any two individual humans, LaVey always observes a dominant/submissive model. One will primarily dominate the other, one will be the master, the other will be the slave. But LaVey is quick to point out that there is also power to be gained in being the slave— it just depends on who the master is and what the slave gets in exchange for her (or his) slavery.

The whole idea of "eustress" in society already discussed has, according to LaVey, its erotic corollary in Sado-Masochism. Punishment, initially an unpleasant thing, evolves into a form of gratification, especially if it is handed out by a stimulating person. (79)

LaVey sees many “fitness” and “health” regimens of the recent past as eustress phenomena— thinly disguised (though properly sublimated and sanitized) forms of masochism. People burn themselves under the sun, exercise in ways designed to maximize discomfort (“No pain, no gain!”), and starve themselves in strict dietary disciplines.

In the wider socioeconomic context inherent masochism is used as a marketing device to ensure consumer anxiety and dissatisfaction (= pain), which can then only be “alleviated” with products or consumer trends which are profitable, and which are usually in an of themselves painful (physically, emotionally, financially, etc.).

LaVey views some elements of mankind (and especially womankind) as needing a certain amount of misery, pain and slavery. This inherent need *will* play itself out in life one way or another. If one is a “self-destructive masochist” this need will be played out in unhappy circumstances of life. Real defeat and misery are the result. But is one is a “self-affirming masochist” who is conscious of this element in the personality and who exercises it in a creative and self-aware manner, then the real defeat and misery will be exorcised in a pleasurable and fun way.(80) The latter expressiou of Masochism is entirely positive and self-affirming. All inherently masochistic people *will* be slaves, self-consciously masochistic ones can choose their masters, while the zombie-slaves become the wretched cattle of “the company,” “the cause,” “the job,” “the trend” or whatever impersonal “master” presents itself.

LaVey demonstrates his personal experience with Masochistic women in his understanding of the phenomenon of “aggressively passive” or “demandingly masochistic” women— to whom the obliging and enthusiastic Sadist can soon become the slave.(81)

In keeping with his organic/materialistic cosmology, LaVey theorizes that women are especially masochistic because they are endowed with great amounts of “excess energy.” this can apparently only be relieved through physical means, and so he has suggested the construction of “Auto-Erotic Agitation Tumblers” which vibrate and bounce the woman around until sufficient excess energy has been released— and orgasm is achieved.(82) The possible necessity for such devices also speaks to the general lack of men who can facilitate similar results.

LaVey’s theories on Sadism are also interesting and sophisticated. He realizes the role of the Sadist or Master as that of a facilitator of the self-aware Masochist’s experience. There is a true exchange of power in which both gain something they inherently need. He also recognizes the roots of the true Sadistic impulse not in hatred or anger, but in jealousy or envy. He seems to see the Masochist or Slave as a projection of the Sadist’s or Master’s own “demonic self”— which the Sadist then proceeds to train, control— and when necessary punish.

The Sadist is also the Artist. Recall the profound definition of Sadeanism given in chapter 6: “The pleasure felt from the observed modifications on the external world produced by the will of the observer.”(83) This can also be true of the Artist or magician. This “spur” which urges the subject to imagine something in the subjective universe and cause it to come about in the objective universe is an essential component of LaVey’s personal work. It recalls the myth of the misogynistic Pygmalion who created the sculpture of Galatea — his perfect woman. He then fell in love with her, but her stony form was unreceptive to his ardor. Aphrodite took pity on him and caused her to take on fleshly form that she could be his wife.

It is interesting to note that LaVey named his second daughter *Zeena Galatea*.

Another phenomenon that LaVey connects with Sado-Masochism is lycanthropy, or werewolfery. Some of his theories seem inspired by his favorite book on the subject: *Man into Wolf* by Robert Eisler. In a 1978 issue of the *Cloven Hoof* LaVey first published his essay “How to Become a Werewolf: the Fundamentals of Lycanthropic Metamorphosis; The Principles and Their Application.” (This was then an excerpt from his then unpublished *Devil’s Notebook*.) (84)

The formula LaVey describes is one designed to transform the “civilized” man into an instinctive *sexual predator*.

LaVey invokes the Mortensenesque emotional formula of sex, sentiment and wonder as “triggering mechanisms” for the metamorphosis from man into beast. But he sees that in the person undergoing the transformation there is a basically bipolar personality: the perfect gentleman and the total beast.

The actual *place* where the metamorphosis occurs is one which has actually been “charged” with repeated acts of predation— this atmosphere then continues to attract both “hunters” and “hunted” alike. The hunted are attracted to the area because of the frightening thrills evoked by the *locus*, while predators are attracted by the presence of their prey. (85) The “preserve” can be a “lonely path through the trees”— but it could just as easily be a singles bar or an S/M club.

In the game of predator/prey LaVey suggests it is optimal if willing partners are involved. Lycanthropy is an indulgence by a “Higher Man” in his inherent bestial nature— which will never be apart from him as long as he is human. Again we see ritualized indulgence in behaviors otherwise considered destructive and certainly taboo.

The theme of Sado-Masochism is prevalent in the Church of Satan and not just a private obsession of LaVey himself. Another 1978 *Cloven Hoof* article by Priest Paul Pipkin (a real person, not a LaVey alter ego) is entitled “The Ritual Chamber at Roissy.” This is an exploration of ritual and aesthetic themes drawn from Pauline Réage’s *Story of O*.

The elements of limitation or restriction (bondage, slavery, humiliation, submission), dominance, predation (pain), gratification (pleasure), pride and mastery — and most of all the realization of previously imaginary scenes — are all essential elements in both actual Sado-Masochism and in the philosophy of Anton LaVey. He demands that society come to a new understanding of terms such as slavery— to see them for the reality they present and to accept it: Indulge it. He suggests that men and women enter into a “private pact” to center on the “master/slave component of a successful relationship” (86) — when such a relationship is truly desired by the partners involved.

Even LaVey’s later obsession with droids can be explained from the Sado-Masochistic perspective. If the master desires the absolute control or restriction of his Slave — what could be more restricted or controlled than an inanimate object? LaVey’s fascination with androids (gynecoids?) is rather like Pygmalion telling Aphrodite: “I liked Galatea better as a sculpture— turn her back to stone!”

It is no wonder that the ideas of de Sade on matters of sexuality are reflected in LaVey’s philosophy since the very underpinnings of de Sade’s understanding of the world and humanity’s place in it are so remarkably paralleled in LaVey’s own essentially materialistic ideology.

Satanic Ethics

The writings of Anton LaVey give expression to an internally consistent set of ethics which he considers innate in the Satanic philosophy. In what some might consider a paradoxical and ironic way, the Black Pope is a man virtually obsessed with morality and ethics. Machiavellian though these ethics might be, they are nonetheless strong and vital. Just as the mythological, Miltonian, figure of Satan is an expression of rebellion against the inherent cosmic injustice embodied in Jehovah, Anton LaVey is an expression of outrage against the institutionalized *hypocrisy* present in human society.

All of LaVey’s doctrinal works — the Nine Satanic Statements, the Nine Satanic Sins and the Eleven Rules of the Earth — are essentially documents concerning ethics. They provide the rationale for leading a Satanic life— a counter-morality meant to correct what is seen as an inherently corrupt and unnatural morality dominated by guilt, self-abasement and self-deceit. LaVey does not propose doing “evil” instead of “good.” but like Nietzsche, he

urges the Satanist to go beyond these conventional categories imposed by illegitimate social “norms” and to return to a natural morality innate within the fiber of the carnal ego itself.

The ethical system which emerges from these writings is really a hyper-traditional one— one that harkens back to pre-Christian tribal ethics: You have the right and responsibility to live, thrive and survive. Mind your own business as much as possible. If another challenges you or tries to thwart you in your legitimate efforts to live, thrive and survive— you have the right to destroy him. We owe our allegiances and loyalties to those closest to us— we treat others according to their lesser status. Human relationships should be even give-and-take affairs— there is no such thing as “charity.” Only enter into relationships where this is true.

These are apparently natural ethics— intended to be free of hypocrisy. Other ethical systems are thought to be flawed by the element of self-deceit or dishonesty inevitably built into them.

Some aspects of LaVey’s ethical system seem to have an almost mystical component about them. These are encoded in the Seventh, Eighth and Ninth “Rules of the Earth.” The Seventh Rule involves giving credit to *magic* when you have employed it successfully. For LaVey this seems to go beyond just magic and directly to the symbol or reality of Satan himself. Magic is equated with the method of Satan— to deny magic or Satan seems an act of dishonor to the Black Pope. He often condemns those who “Play the Devil’s game, but deny the Devil’s name.” Honor and loyalty to magic and to its master, Satan, is clearly an ethical principle with LaVey. The Eighth and Ninth “Rules of the Earth” express LaVey’s almost mystical reverence for the life and well-being of children and (non-human) animals— he holds their *essence* in true reverence.

Satanic Immortality

In the left-hand path systems the quest for immortality has always been central. In LaVeyan Satanism the focus is on “vital essence” in this world and in this life— on the imperative to survive, to thrive and to LIVE. But this does not mean that the idea of the survival of death itself is unimportant in the LaVeyan system. This is one of those instances as with the use of magic, in which LaVey radically departs from the materialistic Epicurean and Sadean foundations of his philosophy. Perhaps this is one of the reasons why the possibilities of immortality of the ego are relatively little discussed in LaVey’s published works.

Anton LaVey himself obliquely claims to have found the key to immortality. He boldly claims that he won’t die. His beliefs hinge on an idea of “eternal awareness” based on will. He also hints at belief in reincarnation when he says: “I will come back.” (87)

In chapter X of the “Book of Lucifer” in the *Satanic Bible* entitled “Life after Death through Fulfillment of the Ego” LaVey writes: “It is [the] lust for life which will allow the vital person to live on after the inevitable death of his fleshly shell.”

The implication of this and other statements is that there is some kind of substance or energy not entirely identical to the body itself — which is the “shell” that “houses” it — and that this substance *can* if it is vital enough maintain its existence after corporeal death.

What LaVey is primarily interested in is the continued existence of the self-aware individual ego. there are very few indications of *how* this might be achieved but certain features are clear. *Vitality* of the ego is of the utmost importance. Anyone who would achieve immortality must *live this life* with a high level of intensity. Life is life— incarnate or discarnate. This ego- or self-awareness must be *unique* and readily identifiable. Perhaps it should not be overly complicated in image or content— a concentrated, vital and unique substance has a better chance of survival than a diffuse, weak and ordinary one. the technique of ECI — of attaching one’s vital ego-consciousness to certain scenes or objects — can be of tremendous aid in this process. Also the *fame* of the individual is important. This vital ego should be well known to a wide number of living persons. This can act as a

support system for one's immortal status— but only when consciously combined with other factors.

In part of the Redbeard text, *Might is Right*, selected by LaVey to serve as his “Book of Satan” section in the *Satanic Bible* we find the exhortation:

Make yourself a Terror to your adversary...
Thus shall you make yourself respected in all
walks of life, and your spirit— your immortal
spirit — shall live, not in an intangible
paradise, but in the brains and sinews of those
whose respect you have gained.

In ancient times much of this was part of becoming a divine hero, or being deified in death— the Greeks, Romans, Germans, Slavs and Celts all deified uniquely heroic individuals— in many ways LaVey (actually, of course, Ragnar Redbeard) seems to carry on in their tradition.

Satanic Theology

For the LaVeyan Satanist no “theology” in the usual sense is possible. The theology and the anthropology are virtually identical, and so the question of theology becomes almost superfluous. God is Nature, but Nature is Satan— just as God is Satan: Hail Satan!

Behind these semantic shifts lies a coherent, if sometimes mysterious, view of the true nature of “god” or a “theology.” The roots of this theological view can be seen in Epicurean philosophy over the past two millennia. The Epicurean Roman philosopher and *poet* Lucretius— although an atomic materialist — still spoke of the gods. He scorned as destructive and hypocritical their worship by the masses, but explained these unwholesome beliefs as ignorance of the true nature of the gods. The gods are simply extremely rarified structures existing in absolute tranquility beyond the limits of the world as men know it. They are there, but subject to Nature's laws and impotent to affect affairs on Earth. It is in the patterns and models of Nature herself that the Epicurean finds the true concept of “God.”

“God” as conventionally understood, more akin to the ancients' belief in the gods, is irrelevant to human experience. The complex patterns and models present in the whole of Nature— both in this world and beyond it — is the only thing the LaVeyan Satanist feels is worthy of the title “God.” But because the masses of people who have founded, and been subject to, the religions of mankind have been incapable of knowing this they have based their ideas about “God” on projections of their own fears, guilts and other short-comings.

The true “God” stands in *opposition* to this process— and therefore bears the name “Satan.” this is the coherent complex of patterns and models governing the universe— but not separate from it. Within the individual human being the presence of this coherent complex of patterns is called the *carnal ego*. This is the representation, or the presence, of Satan in the individual. It is *carnal* because it can not be separated from Nature, it is an *ego* because it can be aware of itself and its own actions. It is the *doer* of all that is done— the absolute subject. (The word *ego* is nothing other than the Latin word for the first person singular pronoun: “I.”)

Does Satan then have an independent, or “personal,” objective existence? In the earlier years LaVey remained vague on this particular subject — obliquely referring to “the Man Downstairs,” or to other quaint metaphors — but such a doctrine may have been a *secret* of the Church. However, in later years he has insisted on Satan being “only a ‘symbol’” for Nature itself. What is clear is that there is a model for the objective independent existence of this complex of patterns— but that there is little evidence for its visibility as a “personal deity.” To make it ontologically *personal* would be tantamount to erecting a screen upon

which to project those petty human emotions of fear, guilt, pity and all the rest— thus turning the true *Other* (= Satan) into just another one of the *Same* (= God).

Satanic Magic in Theory and Practice

For LaVey magic is the Satanic method in and of itself. He defines magic generally as “The change in situations or events in accordance with one’s will, which would, using normally accepted methods, be unchangeable.”(88) This definition obviously owes something to Aleister Crowley’s definition.

As noted earlier, LaVey does not like to distinguish between “black” and “white” magic. This is because he discusses the terms on a moral or ethical basis. All true magic involves “ego gratification and personal power as a goal”— and so might be called “black” but for the hypocritical stance taken by those who would call themselves “white magicians” or “white witches.” In the historical sense LaVey is correct here. Since the Middle Ages all *magic* has been considered *de facto* evil because it places (or can place) the will of the individual above that of “God.” As the widely accepted definition of magic always places the *will* of the magician in the central position, this assumption of the validity of individual will over universal will continues to be essential. It is for this reason that all magic might be called “black magic” by those who decry as “evil” efforts to strengthen and fulfill their egos.

Satanic Technologies **The Practice of Greater and Lesser Magic**

The use of magical technologies for personal transformation— what might be called in some traditions “high magic” — is little discussed in the Church of Satan system. This is not because it is unimportant but because it is seen as being such an *objective* matter that no amount of ritual or ritual technology could effect the actual transformation of an individual from a I° to a IV°— or even V° status. Such transformation is only brought about through the coordination and correlation of every aspect of a person’s whole life toward such magical goals.

Lesser Magic

In the *Satanic Bible* Lesser Magic is defined as “non-ritual or manipulative magic” and is further characterized as “the wile and guile obtained through various devices and contrived situations, which when utilized, can create ‘change, in accordance with one’s will.’”(SB, p. 111.) This type of magic has historically been called “fascination” or “glamour”— but on a grander scale it might be called “propaganda” or “advertising.” Lesser Magic works by means of psychological, or psychobiological laws which are known to the magician— but which may be unknown to those upon whom the magic is being worked. This type of magic works, consciously or unconsciously, through the media of the five senses.

Some of LaVey’s theoretical base for his practice of Lesser Magic stems from carnival-type experience. The tricks used by carney fortune tellers, stage hypnotists and others are utilized here. Much of the content of *The Compleat Witch* is an outline of such techniques. Many of these tricks have more recently been “made legit” couched in terms of “body language” and some of the techniques of “Neurolinguistic Programming” (NLP).

Another major source of his theories concerning Lesser Magic is William Mortensen’s *The Command to Look*. (See Appendix B.) Although this is not exactly clear in his discussion on pages 111-113 of the *Satanic Bible*, the magician must first command a subject to *look*, to pay attention to the source of the forthcoming magical message— and *then* the fascination can take place. The command to look is accomplished through a subtle message of fear or danger, the fascination can then be effected by one of three means: sex,

sentiment or wonder. These are the only three things people are enduringly interested in—and so they are the most powerful channels through which they can be influenced.

In the practice of Lesser Magic none of the five senses should be ignored. This is why in the art of fascination, besides the obvious visual imagery, the voice (hearing), perfumes (smell), food (taste), and touch should all be combined in an effective manner.

LaVey himself has been an obvious master of Lesser Magic over the years. He has personally “charmed” most of those who have come into contact with him and has been able to cast his charismatic spell on the world around him. His striking physical appearance, the fact that he is the almost stereotypical image of Satan himself, commands people to look. His stories of magic, curses and other exploits at least *seem* to deliver in the *wonder* category and thus rivet the observers’ attention. Formerly the *sex* category—with his nude altars, topless witches, and so on, was also a greater factor.

Lesser Magic works through the five senses and appeals to primary human emotions in a direct way making use of a wide variety of contemporary mythic symbols. Some might argue that Lesser Magic is “just applied psychology” — which is certainly true. But then again there is nothing really *scientific* about psychology as practiced on this level. The laws are mysterious and shift from person to person and from situation to situation—and so the discovery of methods that work in this field is as elusive as any Grail. Lesser Magic constitutes a kind of meta-rhetoric by which magicians can persuade others to do their will, or hold a certain opinion or feeling for not entirely conscious “reasons.”

Greater Magic

The other category of magic discussed by LaVey is ritual magic which involves a formal ceremony which occurs in a special time and place. “Its main function is to isolate the otherwise dissipated adrenal and other emotionally induced energy, and convert it into dynamically transmittable force.”(89)

In this definition it is clear that LaVey sees Greater Magic as an entirely natural, materially based, process. Its laws may be not entirely known and its application often mysterious and more an art than a science—but its mechanics are entirely material.

An act of Greater Magic is, according to LaVey, to be driven by *emotional* not intellectual concerns. Any intellectual work is done in preparing for the ritual— during the ritual emotion, or chemistry, is in charge.

LaVey isolates five factors which most be taken into account for a successful act of ritual magic:

1. Desire
2. Timing
3. Imagery
4. Direction
5. The Balance Factor

Desire is the first factor: “If you do not truly desire any end result, you should not attempt to perform a working.”(90) A strong desire is necessary to success. *Timing* is a complex factor. The magician must be at a moment of peak efficiency during the working, while those whom he wishes to affect must be receptive to his “sendings.” The sleep cycle may be important to this. LaVey suggests a window at approximately two hours before the object of the sending awakens. But timing is a matter of such factors as biological clocks and sleep cycles rather than mumbo-jumbo about the “hour of Venus” or whatever. *Imagery* — non-verbal signals — is used to focus the emotions of the magician on the object of his working. This could be done with drawings, paintings, sculptures, photographs, articles of clothing, scents, sounds, music or whole scenarios incorporated into the ritual. Imagery is then manipulated according to the aim of the working and is “the very blueprint” which “becomes the formula which leads to reality.” *Direction* involves the accumulation of emotional energy *within* the working and its *release* toward an effective

result. Once the working is done no further expenditure of *emotion* should occur. After this release the magician is free to expend his energies in more productive activities.

The Balance Factor: "One of the magician's greatest weapons is knowing himself; his talents, abilities, physical attractions and detractors, and when, where, and *with whom* to utilize them!" (*SB*, 128) Magic can most easily be used to change things working for the most part in harmony with Nature—making only slight alterations in the right place at the right time to "tip the balance" in one's favor.

As a rule for success the Satanist would never use Greater Magic where the techniques of Lesser Magic could be more easily employed. Greater Magic is reserved for those situations where it *must* be used.

In practice LaVey is the greatest pioneer in the field of what might be called *pragmatic magic*. All the elements in his magical system are there to act as triggers for certain psychological effects—nothing is there because "it's just traditional." The only rule seems to be that "if it works, do it, if it doesn't work, leave it out or find something that does."

The *Satanic Bible* contains the formulas for three basic conjurations: lust (sex), compassion (sentiment), and destruction (wonder)—again the influence of Mortensen's theories are felt. These are the three main motivations for the performance of Greater Magic, according to LaVey. Lust is for gaining a lover, compassion for personal power and destruction for the venting of anger or hate.

Characteristic of modern left-hand path magical systems, there is no standard Satanic ritual which is repeated *ad nauseam* such as the Roman Catholic Mass. Each Satanist is encouraged to create his or her own rites suited to individual or group needs. But there are some pragmatic steps used (especially for group workings) which are designed to ease the ability of the will to trigger the most effective psychological responses.

LaVey outlines 13 steps which are designed first to create an atmosphere isolated from outside influences and charged with emotionally stimulating sounds, symbols, and so on, then to direct all of the accumulated emotional energy toward the desired goal, and then finally to re-enter the atmosphere outside the chamber. All of the prescriptions of specific ritual elements are really in place as *suggestions* on how things might be done—but in individual practice things might be performed in a variety of different ways. There is usually a fairly standard opening sequence involving ringing a bell nine times, invoking the Powers of Darkness, drinking from a chalice (to link the celebrant with the powers invoked), invoking the cardinal points—and a benediction with a phallus. In the space following this sequence comes the *working* itself which may be highly individualized. In conclusion there is another brief closing sequence including the ringing of the bell nine times and the final words: "So it is done!"

Satanic Psychodramatic Magic

The elaborate rituals staged in the Black House until 1972 were for the most part psychodramatic workings of Greater Magic. That is to say, they were not meant to change the outside world so much as they were designed to alter the feelings and attitudes of those participating in the ritual—to free them of detrimental emotions (such as fear, guilt, etc.) or to give expression to forbidden desires, feelings, or thoughts.

The Satanic Rituals is a collection of this type of psychodramatic ceremonies. The "Black Mass" is the premier Satanic psychodrama. But its formula is usually misunderstood by non-Satanists. As LaVey writes in the *Satanic Bible*: "A black mass, today [1969], would consist of the blaspheming of such 'sacred' topics as Eastern mysticism, psychiatry, the psychedelic movement, ultra-liberalism, etc..." (*SB*, p. 101) A "traditional" Black Mass, a direct parody of the Roman Catholic Mass, would only be used as a psychodramatic ritual to help ex-Catholics "deprogram" themselves. (This would be especially valuable for all those who were institutionally abused by the church in their younger years.)

LaVey points out that the whole idea of the “Black Mass” is most certainly first a propagandistic creation of the Church which was then later embellished in literary works for pure shock effects. But this history does not lessen its potential effectiveness for ex-Catholics or others raised in rigid religions to break their psychological ties with their old faith. They are then free to move forward to discover their own religious values apart from those programmed into them by others. The Black Mass is simply a ritual formulation of the antinomian process inherent in the practice of the left-hand path generally.

“The Ceremony of the Stifling Air” is another form of the Black Mass with a pseudo-historical connection to the story of the suppression of the Knights Templar by the king of France (Philip the Fair) and the Pope (in 1331). *Das Tierdrama* (“The Drama of the Beasts”) is a celebration of the Seventh Satanic Statement: “... man is just another animal...” It teaches humans to exult in their animal nature, to embrace and accept it. “The Homage to Tchoth” is LaVey’s celebration of the fleshly and libidinous appetites of his hero G. Y. Rasputin.

These and other psychodramatic rituals practiced — or suggested — by the Church of Satan material are designed in some sense to make subjective changes in the celebrant(s) and/or to teach or illustrate some philosophical or historical idea within the Satanic tradition. That they are sometimes fictional creations — or even *based* on fictional creations (such as the Lovecraft rituals in the *Satanic Rituals*)(91) makes them all the more *Satanic*. The true Satanist is free to create his own “religion” or to accept or reject elements of pre-existing systems according to his needs or will.

Psychodramatic rituals allow the Satanist to do more than just read about strange practices and beliefs. They allow the participants to experience these practices in an active, living way. Such rituals are another form of indulgence in which the participants enter into new and different world views, try them on for size, and take from them what they want or need *from experience*.

Erotic Crystallization Inertia

One of LaVey’s most unique contributions to magical technology is the theory and practice of ECI— Erotic Crystallization Inertia, also known as Emotional Crystallization Inertia. No other concept is more important than ECI to a comprehensive understanding of LaVey’s system.

According to LaVey there are certain moments in life, usually in adolescence or young adulthood, in which we suddenly and vitally become self-aware. These moments are always emotional, and usually erotic in nature. In the glossary of LaVeyan terms given in Blanche Barton’s *Secret Life of a Satanist* ECI is defined as: “The point in time and experience in which a person’s emotional/sexual fetishes are established.” (p. 229) these are *usually visual* stimuli and subsequent memories of them. An ECI moment gives pleasure and joy, and from that joy comes strength and vitality. For this reason, if a magician surrounds himself with things which stimulate his ECI moments or periods in life, he will be more vital and live longer in his vitalized state.

LaVey first wrote about ECI in a 1973 issue of the *Cloven Hoof* in an article entitled “Erotic Crystallization Inertia (E.C.I.): Its Relationship to Longevity.” There he wrote of how older people like to remain in (or move to) environments — small towns, old folks’ homes — where the fashions and visual stimuli tend to remain the way they always were or actually revert to times past. This is actually *stimulating* and invigorating to the old people— the trendy fashions of younger generations would actually be detrimental to their vitality.

In subsequent contributions on the topic of ECI it becomes progressively clearer that LaVey is developing a new category of magical philosophy with ECI.(92) By consciously indulging in ECI-stimuli the magician preserves and maintains his vitality and vigor, his memories and kept intact and thus his longevity is extended— perhaps beyond death. The

ECI magician might build a room or seek out an environment similar to that in which his ECI moments were first generated— he might listen to music associated with them, smell odors, feel textures, taste foods and drink— but most of all re-view his ECI visions. All of these things are imprinted in the mind at moments of strong self-awareness and vital pleasure— this is why we *remember* them so vividly and are inexorably attracted to things that remind us of them. Consciously re-connecting with these stimuli (either physically or in our imaginations) virtually “feeds” our carnal egos with the vital sustenance it needs to thrive.

In a basement room of the Black House LaVey built a replica of a seedy old hotel room (circa 1945): “Outside the single window it is always night and always raining and the intermittent flash of a neon sign pulsates...”(93) This is an ECI ritual chamber for LaVey— perhaps a replica of the room where young Tony had his first sexual encounter? His magical interest in old songs, old cars, and “out-of-date” fashions all stem back to this technique of ECI. He “blasphemes” against such pieces of “conventional wisdom” as: “You’ve got to keep up with the times or life will pass you by,” or “You can’t live in the past.” On the contrary, he says if *you* are to live in any vital way you must remain true to those things which make you vital, which stimulate you in reality— not those newfangled things advertisers want you to buy.

ECI stimuli along with the progressive isolation and distillation of the unique individual ego of a person (perhaps coupled with the creation of a static controlled “society” in the form of androids) form elements in a comprehensive magical approach to longevity and even immortality.

Trapezoidal Magic

No area of LaVey’s magical knowledge has remained more mysterious and perhaps “sinister” than that connected with the symbol of the Trapezoid. We have already discussed his “Law of the Trapezoid” but his use of this symbol goes well beyond that law. The magic connected with the Trapezoid has a unique character, unlike any other school of magic. Little to nothing has been written about it outside the internal documents of the Church of Satan and the Temple of Set.

In theory Trapezoidal magic makes use of geometrical manipulations of the ritual environment (visual and spatial), the creation of certain electromagnetic fields in the chamber (ozonization, ionization, extremely low-frequency [ELF] waves in the atmosphere) and the manipulation of light and sound waves to establish ideal psychophysiological conditions for the focus, concentration and projection of the will of the magician to any part of the universe. To do this often technical apparatus such as Tesla coils, Jacob’s ladders, Van de Graaf generators, strobe lights, ionizers, etc., are used in a ritual context.

The only commercially available example of this kind of ritual is published in LaVey’s *Satanic Rituals* in the form of *Die elektrischen Vorspiele*. The connections between this kind of magical technology and Nazi Germany, as suggested by LaVey in this section of the book, are indirect at best. This type of magic was, however, extensively explored by pre-war occult groups in Germany. Most of what appears in the ritual in question is the product of LaVey’s magical synthesis and imagination.

At present such magical explorations are an ongoing concern and area of expertise in the Order of the Trapezoid within the Temple of Set.

The LaVeyan Vision

Anton Szandor LaVey is a man with a Hell of a Vision. His written works are full of predictions for the future and magical declarations of how he and the Church of Satan have changed or will change the Is-To-Be, as he calls the future. A review of his visions will, however, reveal a growing pessimism in his thought.

During the first ten years of the Church of Satan LaVey held visions of the establishment of publicly institutionalized Satanic Churches— crosses were to be cast down from the steeples and tridents put in their stead. In 1972 LaVey was ready to relegate Christ to the category of “A well-known folk myth” by the year 2000 CE.(94) the Church was to establish “Pleasure Domes” for the practices of the indulgences of its members. After 1975 these grandiose visions for the Church of Satan became much more modest—and with the expected “backlash” of the 1980s such visions seemed far away indeed.

But according to LaVey’s cosmological scheme of Ages this Satanic Age — or Age of Fire — is just underway and will not reach its zenith of power until the year 2695. In these first few Workings (nine year periods) a number of set-backs (due to reactive forces) can be expected. In more recent visions of what the Church of Satan will become, LaVey has seen it more as an “underground” subcultural or *super*-cultural phenomenon— as it will be at the highest levels of the culture but outside the normative mainstream.

LaVey’s most recent vision casting into the Is-To-Be is his Five Point Program of Pentagonal Revisionism:(95)

1. Stratification
2. Taxation of All Churches
3. Return to the Law of the Jungle
4. Development and Promotion of Humanoids
5. Development and Promotion of Total Environments

These are the things LaVey thinks Satanists should be working toward and focusing on in the near future. Notice that all are essentially *social* phenomena— not primarily personal magical ones.

Stratification is a process in society by which the elite, “Satanic cream,” will rise to the top. This is to be accomplished through selective breeding (eugenics), elitist stratification of the social order, re-establishment of polygamy based on eugenic criteria and the eventual establishment of separate communities of Satanists based on these principles.

Churches should and must be taxed like any other corporation. This attitude perhaps stems from the fact that LaVey never incorporated the Church of Satan as an actual legal *church* at all, and has run it as a sole proprietorship for all these years.

The Law of the Jungle — or *Lex Talonis* — as outlined in LaVey’s “Eleven Rules of the Earth” is the true Namral Law and in the Satanic Age there will be a return to this natural form of ethics and morality.

Humanoids — sexual robots — are important to LaVey’s vision of the future because they will be able to satisfy the desires of men and women in the sexual marketplace without or spreading disease or spawning genetically inferior offspring which are now taxing our cultural system to death. The subject of such robots became a dominant theme of LaVey’s writings in the mid-1980s.

“Total Environments” can be construed on the one hand as commercial enterprises — like amusement parks — which create alternative worlds in which like-minded people can live together (for a fee). But on the other hand, they could be seen as the Satanic communities of the future. These are the old “Pleasure Dome” idea at a fuller state of maturity.

LaVey's power of vision, similar to that of Karl Marx, is one part predication or interpretation of historical cycles and one part operative magic— as he nudges events in the predicted (= wished for) direction. Historically LaVey has stood for a eugenic solution to many of our social problems. As time has gone on his conviction in this area seems to have become stronger. The breeding of a New (Satanic) Race is nothing new in the history of thought. Plato suggested it in *The Republic* and National Socialist Germany had had plans for such an undertaking, of course. LaVey's championing of this cause is very much in line with his general philosophy based on the paradoxical balance between *materialism* and *magic*. Eugenics is straightforwardly the magical principle of "causing changes to occur in conformity with will" as applied to the very *material* (DNA) of which the carnal ego is made. Here again the Black Pope blasphemes against yet another of the "sacred cows" of the latter half of the 20th century (though certainly *not* the first half)— that all individuals are somehow genetically equal— and if not, steps should be taken to ensure that they are made equal.

Anton LaVey and the Left-Hand Path

Obviously LaVey and his Church of Satan belong to the left-hand path as it has been defined in this book. He was perhaps the first, and certainly the most vocal, to claim allegiance with the left-hand path in western culture since ancient times. LaVeyan Satanism virtually *defines* the Immanent Branch of the left-hand path as it is practiced in the western world today. Still, whether we speak of the Immanent or the Transcendental Branch, the same criteria of antinomianism and initiatory magical deification of the individual self are valid.

LaVey's philosophy is a perfect example of external antinomianism. He enthusiastically embraces any and all symbols of "consensus evil" — relishing his self-chosen role of the ultimate and absolute Adversary or Opponent: *Satan*. Furthermore, he extends this concept beyond traditional religious contexts into the secular or "real world." This is essential in a modern age in which the former Judeo-Christian symbolism has become increasingly anachronistic.

It is one of the main underlying principles of the Church of Satan doctrines that the individual carnal ego can realize its own "godhead," as LaVey puts it. It seems likely that LaVey's own personal ideas on this essential and implicit point of his over all philosophy have not been fully expressed. The general methods of such self-deification can be deduced as much from LaVey's own personal behavior and history as from what he has written over the years.

Magic is the essential method employed in LaVey's system. His magic as seen in the *Satanic Bible* may seem simplistic when compared to the complex rigmorole found in systems such as that of the Golden Dawn, but this is deceptive. Actually LaVey's system demands that Satanic magicians really *know* themselves and pragmatically apply the principles of the system in ways unique to themselves. In addition, many of the general principles are ones otherwise unknown in the magical traditions of the occult revival— ECI, Law of the Trapezoid, Command to Look systemics, etc. This in fact makes LaVey's magics much more intricate than the recipe-book approach of most others. Magic, for LaVey, is a way for the individual carnal ego to demonstrate its freedom and potency in the world around it— in this life and perhaps beyond it.

The individual is supreme in LaVey's form of Satanism. This may be why it has proved almost impossible to organize and maintain an organization of LaVeyan Satanists. LaVey himself has been far too absorbed in *his own world* to care very much about what is occurring in the outside world beneath the Sigil of Baphomet. If he had had a burning desire to put himself at the center of an adoring mass of followers whose lives he controlled *à la* A. Merritt's Satan he could have done that and his life would have been very different.

But he chose himself and his own world— true to the individualistic essence of his philosophy.

Initiation: the idea that one gains mastery in gradual stages in an idea generally supported by LaVey's system. At one point in the history of the Church (1969-1975) this became formalized, but subsequent to that time less so. A formal system of initiation requires the "recognizing entity" to be intimately knowledgeable and involved with the person being recognized to the various levels of initiation. LaVey is essentially too ego- or self-centered to delegate such authority or to become so involved with the initiation of others at all. Again, this seems consistent with his general system of ideas. LaVey opted for an initiatory system in which his personal intuition and/or factors in the secular, objective world do the work of recognition.

Anton LaVey's principal contribution to the history of the left-hand path in this century is his unequivocal evocation of the very image of the Judeo-Christian Satan as an object of veneration and his own identification with not only that image but that name as well. While playing the Devil's game, he took the Devil's name as his own. He has even gone so far as giving his only begotten son, a child born to him and Blanche Barton on Halloween, 1993, the very name *Satan*.

Many have found that this chapter probably goes too far in providing the LaVeyan philosophy with a coherent *system*. In essence, the philosophy seems to be an eternally adolescent one: "Have fun. Read scary stories. Play music." The rest seems probably to have been created for effect only, or for the sake of image. However, even if it was by accident, the system LaVey created out of the dead parts of half-forgotten books will continue to have a fascinating potential, and it is hoped that this study has done the justice to it which it deserves.

It must also not go unnoted that few other members of the fraternity making up the Lords of the Left-hand Path can be said to have been so *ideologically passive*. It might be said that LaVey is in any ways a chameleon— who takes on the ideas of not only the books which surround him, but also of the members of his entourage. It is tempting to conclude with Lawrence Wright that the LaVey story is one of a "bookish musician" (96) who has taken us all for a ride into not only his dark-side, but to the dark-side of modern American life.

What the legacy of Anton LaVey and the Church of Satan will be in the next century is an open question. Since no organizational or corporate identity exists beyond the personality of the founder of the "Church" it is most likely that various interests will compete for the LaVeyan legacy, and only the fittest will survive that competition.

In as many ways as LaVey seems to be a man born too late— whose true home is in the not-too-distant past — he seems also to be a man born too soon— whose home is in the Is-To-Be.

Notes for Chapter 9

- (1) Robert Wistrich, *Who's Who in Nazi Germany* (New York: Macmillan, 1982), p. 126.
- (2) See Colin Wilson, *Rasputin* (Secaucus, NJ: Citadel, 1964).
- (3) Twain's two works most admired by LaVey are *No. 44, The Mysterious Stranger* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969) and *Letters from the Earth* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1962). Both were severely "edited" (censored) in earlier editions because of the anti-Christian sentiments expressed in them.
- (4) Burton Wolfe, *The Devil's Avenger: A Biography of Anton Szandor LaVey* (New York: Pyramid, 1974), pp. 31-32.
- (5) See Michael Aquino, *The Church of Satan* (San Francisco: Temple of Set, 1989, 2nd ed.), Appendix 19.
- (6) See Aquino, *Church of Satan*, Appendix 11.
- (7) Wolfe, *Devil's Avenger*, p. 27 and Blanche Barton, *The Secret Life of a Satanist* (Los Angeles: Feral House, 1990), p. 23.
- (8) Lawrence Wright, "Sympathy for the Devil" *Rolling Stone* (Sept. 5, 1991), p. 66.
- (9) Wolfe, *Devil's Avenger*, p. 33 ff. and Barton, *Secret Life*, pp. 29-37.
- (10) Wright, "Sympathy for the Devil," p. 67.
- (11) Barton, *Secret Life*, pp. 45-53.
- (12) *Scroll of Set*, XVII:3 (June, 1991), p. 8.
- (13) Wolfe, *Devil's Avenger*, 50 ff. and Barton *Secret Life*, p. 59-60.
- (14) Wright, "Sympathy for the Devil" p. 68.
- (15) *Scroll of Set*, 17:3 (June, 1991), p. 7.
- (16) Barton, *Secret Life*, pp. 93-114.
- (17) *Scroll of Set* 17:3 (June, 1991), p. 8.
- (18) Anton LaVey, *The Compleat Witch* (New York: Dodd and Mead, 1971), pp. 100-101.
- (19) Michael Aquino, "Lovecraftian Ritual" *Nyctalops*, 13 (May, 1977), pp. 13-15.
- (20) All of the Church of Satan Conclaves are reprinted by Aquino, *Church of Satan, passim*.
- (21) See Aquino, *Church of Satan*, A-33 and Anton LaVey [= John M. Kincaid], "An Explanation of the Various Degrees in the Church of Satan" *Cloven Hoof* 2:11 (November, 1970), p. 7.
- (22) = *Cloven Hoof* 8:3 (May/June 1975), p. 1.
- (23) Aquino, *Church of Satan*, p. A-142.
- (24) Aquino, *Church of Satan*, Appendix 143.
- (25) John Fritscher, "Straight from the Witch's Mouth" In: *Popular Witchcraft* (Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1972), pp. 89-90, 107-123.
- (26) See Barton, *Secret Life*, pp. 235-242.
- (27) Barton, *Church of Satan*, 17.
- (28) Randall H. Alfred, "The Church of Satan." In: *The New Religious Consciousness*. Eds. Charles Y. Glock and Robert N. Bellah. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 180-202.
- (29) Marcello Truzzi, "The Occult Revival as Popular Culture" *Sociological Quarterly* 13 (Winter 1972), pp. 16-36.
- (30) See Bartou, *Secret Life*, 235-242.
- (31) LaVey, "An Explanation of the Various Degrees in the Church of Satan" *Cloven Hoof* 2:11 (1970), p. 8.
- (32) Alfred, "The Church of Satan" p. 191.
- (33) Anton LaVey, "The Order of the Trapezoid." *Cloven Hoof* (112) 17:1 (1985), p. 3.
- (34) Anton LaVey, "Untitled Editorial." *Cloven Hoof* 4:3 (March, 1972) p. 12.
- (35) Blanche Barton, *The Church of Satan* (New York: Hell's Kitchen Productions, 1990), p. 122.
- (36) Anton LaVey, "Hoofnotes." *Cloven Hoof* 8:1 (Jan./Feb., 1976), p. 2.
- (37) Anton LaVey, "The C/S, Cosmic Joy Buzzer." *Cloven Hoof* (60) 8:2 (Mar./Apr., 1976), pp. 3-4 and Barton, *Secret Life*, pp. 248-52 and *Church of Satan*, p. 122
- (38) Barton, *Church of Satan*, p. 122.

- (39) Anton LaVey, "Working at Having Fun." *Cloven Hoof* 4:5 (May/June, 1972), p. 20.
- (40) Anton LaVey, *The Satanic Bible* (New York: Avon, 1969), p. 64.
- (41) Anton LaVey, "What's New? Not Much" *Cloven Hoof* (74) 10:4 (July/Aug., 1978), pp. 3-4.
- (42) Anton LaVey, "Don't Recycle Your Brain" *Cloven Hoof* (115) 19:1 (1986), p. 1.
- (43) Anton LaVey, "For the Record" *Cloven Hoof* (122) 20:4 (1987), p. 4.
- (44) Anton LaVey, "Untitled Editorial." *Cloven Hoof* (96) 14:3 (1982), p. 1.
- (45) Abbreviated from an untitled editorial in the *Cloven Hoof* (113) 17:2 (1985), p. 1.
- (46) Anton LaVey, "Satanica." *Cloven Hoof* (117) 19:3 (1986), p. 1.
- (47) Wright, "Sympathy for the Devil" p. 105.
- (48) Anton LaVey, "Misanthropy." *Cloven Hoof* (67) 9:3 (May/June, 1977), p. 3 and "Confessions of a Closet Misogynist." *Cloven Hoof* 75 (1978), p. 4.
- (49) Anton LaVey, "Music for the Ritual Chamber." *Cloven Hoof* 4:7 (1972), 27-30, "Illegal Music" *Cloven Hoof* (118) 19:4 (1986), p. 3 and "Music for the Chamber." *Cloven Hoof* (118) 19:4 (1986), pp. 2-3.
- (50) Anton LaVey, "Rhythm, Cadence, and Meter: The Foundation of Invocation" *Cloven Hoof* (112) 17:1 (1985), p. 1.
- (51) Anton LaVey, "Megarhythm" *Cloven Hoof* (85) 12:4 (1980), pp. 1-2.
- (52) Anton LaVey, "The Law of the Trapezoid" *Cloven Hoof* (64) 8:6 (Nov./Dec., 1976), p. 2.
- (53) Aquino, *Church of Satan*, p. 208.
- (54) Anton LaVey, "The Threat of Peace." *Cloven Hoof* (86) 12:5 (1980), p. 1.
- (55) Anton LaVey, "Today's Madness is Tomorrow's Norm." [Reprinted from *Cloven Hoof* Sept./Oct. (1975)] *Cloven Hoof* (84) (March-June, 1980), p. 1.
- (56) Anton LaVey, "Pentagonal Revisionism: A Five-Point Program." *Cloven Hoof* (124) 21:2 (1988), pp. 1-2 and Barton, *Secret Life*, p. 259.
- (57) Anton LaVey, "Binaric, or Don't Try to Teach a Pig to Sing — It Wastes Your Time and Annoys the Pig." *Cloven Hoof* (121) 20:3 (1987), p. 1.
- (58) LaVey, "Binaric...", p. 1.
- (59) George Orwell "Politics and the English Language." In: *The George Orwell Reader* ed. Richard H. Revere (New York: Harcourt Brace and Javonovitch, 1984).
- (60) LaVey, "Binaric...", p. 1.
- (61) LaVey, *Satanic Bible*, 110ff.
- (62) LaVey, "Don't Recycle Your Brain," p. 1.
- (63) Anton LaVey, "Untitled Editorial." *Cloven Hoof* (93) 13::6 (1981), p. 1.
- (64) LaVey, *Satanic Bible*, pp. 44-45.
- (65) LaVey, *Satanic Bible*, p. 89.
- (66) Anton LaVey, "Curses by the Dozen, or Wholesale Hexes" *Cloven Hoof* (88) 13:1 (1981), p. 2.
- (67) LaVey, "Megarhythm," p. 2.
- (68) Anton LaVey, "The Invisible War" *Cloven Hoof* (116) 19:2 (1986), p. 1.
- (69) Anton LaVey, "Comparisons and Equivalentents...." *Cloven Hoof* (123) 22:1 (1988), pp. 2-4.
- (70) Anton LaVey, "Give the Children a Chance." *Cloven Hoof* (122) 20:4 (1987), p. 2.
- (71) Anton LaVey, "Farewell Trinity and Remember Los Alamos" *Cloven Hoof* (122) 20:4 (1987), p. 1.
- 1.
- (72) Aiden Kelly, *Crafting the Art of Magic* (St. Paul, MN: Llewellyn, 1991), p. 3-4.
- (73) Marquis de Sade, "Dialogue between a Priest and a Dying Man." In: *The Marquis de Sade*, p. 166.
- (74) LaVey, *Compleat Witch*, p. xii.
- (75) LaVey, "The Threat of Peace," p. 4.
- (76) LaVey, "Confessions of a Closet Misogynist," p. 4.
- (77) LaVey, *Compleat Witch*, pp. 21ff.
- (78) Barton, *Secret Life*, pp. 177-14.
- (79) LaVey, "The Threat of Peace," p. 1.
- (80) Barton, *Secret Life*, 182.
- (81) LaVey, "Confessions of a Closet Misogynist," p. 4.
- (82) Barton, *Secret Life*, p. 182.

- (83) Geoffrey Gorer, *The Life and Ideas of the Marquis de Sade* (London: Owen, 1953), p. 187.
- (84) Anton LaVey, "How to Become a Werewolf: The Fundamentals of Lycanthropic Metamorphosis; the Principles of Their Application" *Cloven Hoof* (71) 10:1 Jan./Feb. (1978), 1-4. This is reprinted in Barton's *Secret Life* pp. 253-58.
- (85) LaVey, "How to Become a Werewolf," p. 2.
- (86) Barton, *Secret Life*, p. 183.
- (87) Burton Wolfe, "The Church of Satan." In: Tracy Cabot, ed. *Inside the Cults* (Los Angeles: Holloway House, 1970), p. 223.
- (88) LaVey, *Satanic Bible*, 110.
- (89) LaVey, *Satanic Bible*, 111.
- (90) LaVey, *Satanic Bible*, 121.
- (91) Aquino, *Church of Satan*, pp. 147; 150-151; 212-213 and Appendices 69; 70; 71 and 72.
- (92) The two most important articles by LaVey on the subject of E.C.I. are "Erotic Crystalization Inertia (E.C.I.): Its Relationship to Longevity," *Cloven Hoof* 5:1 (1973), pp. 31-38 and "ECI Relative to Memory Retention: A Reevaluation of the Term Occult" *Cloven Hoof* (88) 13:1 (1981), pp. 3-4.
- (93) Anton LaVey, "Untitled Editorial" *Cloven Hoof* (103) 15:4 (1983), p. 1.
- (94) Anton LaVey, *The Satanic Rituals* (New York: Avon, 1972), p. 53.
- (95) Barton, *Secret Life*, pp. 259-60 and *Church of Satan*, 1-9.
- (16) Wright, "Sympathy for the Devil," p. 106.

Chapter 10
Michael A. Aquino
— The Temple of Set —



**I, Set, am come again to my friends among mankind
— Let my great nobles be brought to me.(1)**

The Temple of Set is ... an association of the Elect to honor Set, exalt his Gift to ourselves, and exercise it with the greatest possible wisdom. As Set is a metaphysical entity, apart from the objective universe, he may be described as a “god” as conventional society employs the term. In this sense the Temple of Set is a religion— not one which is based on irrational faith, but one which derives its core principles from exercise of the evident Gift of its god.(2)

Rarely in this century has a man with such objectively exemplary qualities stepped into the occult theater as Michael Aquino. In a world usually filled with marginal personalities of little accomplishment outside their “occult” field, Aquino is a remarkable exception. The organization which he was instrumental in founding in 1975, the Temple of Set, has assumed some of these same qualities as well.

Aquino is an initiatory product of the Church of Satan and traces his magical roots to the teachings of Anton LaVey— although in the end, as really from the beginning, Aquino showed unique qualities which distinguished his thought from that of LaVey. The Temple of Set is a vital and viable organization with dozens of senior initiates around the world and scores of local groups, called Pylons, in North America, Europe and Australia. It has been

one of Aquino's most remarkable achievements that he has fashioned an organization which is not a "one man operation"— as such affairs usually are. Much more than with the Church of Satan, the shape of the Temple of Set has been influenced by a number of its initiates over the years. At one point the Temple was even headed by someone other than Aquino— a situation unique in the history of such organizations.

Although Aquino is a highly qualified intellectual, holding a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of California, and a man of numerous other accomplishments in the objective universe— he also brings to the pursuit of the goals of the left-hand path those more purely magical qualities characteristic of the Transcendental Branch of the path. In the case of Anton LaVey, for all his drama and bombast, the magic he uses is mostly of a "Lesser" kind. Aquino's practical application of what he calls Greater Black Magic returns the technology of magic to the intellectual levels it enjoyed millennia ago.

The Saga of Ra-en-Set

The life of Michael Aquino is perhaps deceptively open and unmysterious. In sharp contrast to the shady background of his mentor LaVey, many of whose "shadows" have been artificially painted in as in a Caligari set, Aquino's life has been vary public and well documented. The mystery exists where mysteries thrive best— in the hidden interior of the psyche.

— Influences —

Upon reading the short biography to follow the reader will be able to recognize many "institutional" influences on the shaping of Michael Aquino's comprehensive self— from the Boy Scouts, to the stock market, from the Green Berets to the Church of Satan, and from the University of California to the Academy of Magical Arts. From these and other institutions he seems to have gleaned qualities which have found their way into the vision of the Temple of Set.

A list of thinkers and writers who helped shape his inner landscape, such as we have for Anton LaVey, would be interesting. No such synopsis has been published, but through a combination of analysis and conversation a partial body of such influences can be put together.

At the top of such a list would appear the name of Anton LaVey who was Aquino's magical mentor, his "magical father" if you will, from 1968 to 1975— and in many ways beyond that time. LaVey and the Church of Satan acted as a catalyst that put many divergent elements of the still young Michael Aquino's thoughts — existentialism, magic, political science — into a meaningful and practical form. The influence of LaVey on Aquino's ideas is usually quite obvious because Aquino himself is so much aware of it. His own mammoth study of the Church of Satan is a testament to LaVey's philosophy.

Another important "mentor" would be Aleister Crowley, whom Aquino never met, of course, but who has had a direct and profound effect on his magical and philosophical development. Crowley's short-comings, as seen from the Satanic and left-hand path perspective are not glossed over, but Crowley's contributions to the style, philosophy and theory of "Magick" have been digested and synthesized in Aquino's system in ways LaVey was uninterested in doing. Aquino sometimes sees himself in the magical legacy of the Beast, calling himself the Second Beast of Revelation (Rev. 13:11).

Aquino's third mentor died well over 2,000 years ago, but his shadow has been cast over western thought for as many solstices— Plato. The core of Aquino's cosmology is solidly Platonic. In referring to the ancient Hellenic master's ideas he follows in the magical traditions of the Hermetics and Renaissance magicians. Most would-be magicians since the Renaissance have, however, relied on "pre-digested" forms of Platonic thought— which has diluted their precision. Aquino returns to the source for a fresh synthesis— he forges an alloy with the very gold of Plato's sun.

Other influential shapers of his thought would include a number of writers. John Fowles wrote a novel, *The Magus*, which has helped shape Aquino's philosophy and ideas

on initiatory development on many subtle levels. It is a book to which he often refers in his own writings. More romantically, Aquino cites Jules Verne's 20,000 Leagues Under the Sea as an early model for some of his ideas and predilections. Captain Nemo is the near perfect artificial model for the Lord of the Left-hand Path— he is isolated in a world of his own creation (the Nautilus), yet he is free to roam and interact in a seemingly omnipotent way with the worlds around him.

There are, of course, dozens of other thinkers and writers who have had some influence on Aquino's magical philosophy. He fully shares these with initiates of the Temple of Set by means of the Temple's extensive 24 category, nearly 300 title, annotated reading list which is a part of the *Crystal Tablet*. Other writers well-represented on that list include P.D. Ouspensky, Friedrich Nietzsche, Eric Hoffer. H.P. Lovecraft, Thomas Szasz, R.A. Schwaller de Lubicz and John Dee.

This reading list itself shows the breadth of Aquino's Setian interests. It contains topics on ancient Egypt, Satanism, historical and contemporary works on occultism, Aleister Crowley, the Enochian system of John Dee, Pythagoreans, sex in magic, Fascism and magic, cybernetics, good and evil, life and death, magical geometry, parapsychology, space exploration, as well as vampirism and lycanthropy.

The Life of the Second Beast

And I beheld another beast
coming up out of the earth:
and he had two horns like a lamb,
and he spake as a dragon.

(Rev. 13:11)

Michael A. Aquino was born on 16 October 1946. His father, Michael, is a now retired Italian-born investment broker and his mother, Betty Ford, was a brilliant artist who had studied sculpture in the studio of Georg Kolbe in Germany during the 1930s.

Of his own birth Aquino would write in a commentary to the magical text entitled *The Book of Coming Forth by Night*:

Collectors of magical happenstance may take note of the following concerning the persona of Michael Aquino: He was born in 1946, precisely nine months after a Working by Crowley's California disciples to create a homunculus per a secret instruction of Crowley's to the IX degree of his Ordo Templi Orientis. He was also born dead, raising the question of the nature of the force inhabiting his subsequently revived body. On his chest he bears the same whorled swastika of hair born by Crowley and Buddha, and his eyebrows have always naturally curled upward into the horns described in the Biblical Book of Revelation (13:11) ... He has taken the name of the Prince of Darkness as a part of himself: Ra-en-Set "He who Speaks as Set."(3)

Another, perhaps more sinister "magical happenstance," is that Aquino's day of birth is the same date upon which the principal defendants at the Nuremberg tribunal were hanged.

Young Michael spent his early years in San Francisco, but went to high school in Santa Barbara. He was active in the Boy Scouts of America, and in 1965 was named National Commander of the Eagle Scouts.

After high school Aquino took advantage of a number of scholarships to attend the University of California at Santa Barbara. Although he had a nomination to West Point, he decided the UCSB would afford him more freedom in the course of studies he wished to pursue.

In June of 1968 Aquino graduated from the university with a B.A. in political science. Shortly thereafter he was to leave for a year's assignment at Fort Bragg, North Carolina. About a week after graduation he happened upon the premier of the film *Rosemary's Baby* where he just caught a glimpse of Anton LaVey as he left the theater.

Aquino spent his tour of duty in at Fort Bragg with the 82nd Airborne Division as a cavalry officer and then a PSYOP/Special Forces officer with the JFK Special Warfare Center.

While on leave in San Francisco in March of 1969, he attended a lecture and working at the Black House. Upon meeting LaVey, Aquino was struck with the man's charm, sincerity and most of all his engaging smile. The information he gathered on the Church was interesting enough for him to join soon thereafter.

Back at Fort Bragg that Aquino began performing his first Satanic rituals— sometimes with his fellow officers participating.

From the time of his joining to the time of his eventual resignation from the Church of Satan in 1975, Aquino was in almost constant contact with Anton and Diane LaVey, as well as with John Ferro, LaVey's then chief lieutenant.

In June of 1969 Aquino embarked on a tour of duty in Vietnam with the 6th PSYOP Battalion in III Corps Tactical Zone, South Vietnam. In this capacity, among other things, he was engaged in experiments to disorient Vietcong and North Vietnamese soldiers by using amplified sounds — sometimes complete with "demonic screams" — blaring from helicopters flying over their heads.

In the Fall of that year Aquino began work on his first Satanic piece of writing, later published in installments in the *Cloven Hoof* as "The Satanic Ultimatum."(4)

Aquino was elevated to the level of Warlock II° upon the completion of his examinations in February of 1970.

Through his readings of Milton's *Paradise Lost* Aquino felt inspired to write another work entitled *The Diabolicon*. This manuscript was created under the most difficult of combat circumstances. Part of it was even destroyed by enemy fire at one point! For Aquino there was something different about the way *The Diabolicon* was written: "As I wrote sequential passages, I seemed to sense, rather than determine what they should say."(5) By the middle of March the manuscript was finished and sent off to the High Priest. LaVey quickly responded: "I received *The Diabolicon* safely. It is indeed a work which will have a lasting impact. It is done in an ageless manner and with complete awareness. ... [Y]ou may be assured it will assume a meaningful place in the Order." The High Priest used it at once in Workings held at the Black House.

Upon his return from Vietnam, on the night of the summer solstice in June of 1970, Aquino was ordained to the Priesthood of Mendes in the Church of Satan by Anton LaVey in a ceremony held in the ritual chamber of the Central Grotto in San Francisco.

From shortly after his ordination to 1973 Aquino was stationed at Fort Knox in Kentucky. During that time he was deeply involved in the day to day administration of the Church of Satan "in the field." In those days the Church was well populated with enthusiastic, and sometimes "wild," characters. (The section on Satanic sects in the 1970s in chapter 11 gives some indication of the nature their activities.)

In April of 1971 Aquino was asked by LaVey to write a new introduction to the *Satanic Bible* which was about to go into its seventh printing with Avon and about to be published in hardback by University Books. The resulting text appeared in the seventh to eleventh printings of the Bible.(6)

Since the release of *Rosemary's Baby* horror films about the Devil and Satanists were the rage. A small company wanted to do a "Devil worship" film in Louisville, and so made contact with Aquino, by then somewhat known in the area for his unusual religious beliefs, to be a technical advisor. The result was that Aquino rewrote the concluding ritual sequence and lent some of his ritual equipment to give the scene some authenticity. The final product can be seen in *The Asylum of Satan*— a grade-Z horror flick with a grade-A ritual text.

In that same month Aquino assumed the role of editor of the *Cloven Hoof*, which allowed LaVey to concentrate on other matters. Michael Aquino remained the editor of the Hoof until his resignation from the Church in 1975, and was responsible for the bulk of that journal's contents during the time between the end of 1971 and the middle of 1975. He was also chiefly responsible for getting the regional Conclaves together discussed in chapter 9.

Anton LaVey recognized the special contribution Aquino was making to the Church and to Satanic philosophy in general when he named Aquino to the IV^o (Magister Caverni) in a letter written in December of 1971. Along with the letter came a personally prepared certificate, which read in part: "By the authority of Satan, and We, His Exarch on the Terrestrial Plane..." This statement, among others, was clearly indicative to Aquino of LaVey's true attitude toward the character and essence of Satan.

As LaVey was preparing a volume to be entitled the *Satanic Rituals* he asked Aquino to furnish material for a pair of "Lovecraftian" rituals and the "Adult Baptism" to be included in the book. By early in 1972 Aquino was finished with the texts for the forthcoming book. He wrote the introductory sections as well as the rituals themselves—inventing the "Yuggothic language" in a totally artificial way after writing the English versions of the rites. He would later recount the story of the genesis of these rites in the May 1977 issue of the journal *Nyctalops*.(7) It should be noted that Aquino did this as a service to the Church and as a favor to his mentor, and receives no royalties for his contribution.

By mid-1972 Aquino had finished his tour of duty in Kentucky and had moved back into civilian life in Santa Barbara where he began to pursue graduate degrees in political science and to work as an account executive at an investment firm. This also began a period in which he was the chief writer of lengthy articles appearing in the *Cloven Hoof*, which had been expanded from a newsletter to a bound digest format.

In the summer of 1973 Aquino was recognized by LaVey to Magister Templi level of IV^o—the highest level within the Magistry and a level previously unattained by any other member of the Church of Satan.

For the next two years Aquino continued in his role as the editor and chief contributor to the *Cloven Hoof*, and certainly the Church official most responsible for dealing with the sometimes tumultuous membership "in the field."

In the summer of 1975, Aquino received copy from the LaVeys to be included in the upcoming issue of the *Cloven Hoof*. The text clearly stated that degrees in the Church of Satan could be awarded on the basis of financial or other types of contributions to the Church. This was immediately seen as a clear departure from LaVey's previous and exhaustive statements on the nature of the Satanic Priesthood as he had envisioned it previously, and as recorded in chapter 9 of this work. Aquino, assuming it to be some sort of mistake, wrote to the LaVeys, and received the curt command to print the text as they had written it. At that point, Aquino felt that the Infernal Mandate of Anton LaVey, as Exarch of Hell, had been broken. On 10 June 1975 Aquino sent a letter of resignation from the Church of Satan to LaVey. (COS A-235-236)

In an atmosphere of crises, Michael Aquino, using his IV^o prerogative of invoking the Prince of Darkness, called upon him on the night of the summer solstice (June 21-22)—and he came forth. The result of that Working of Greater Black Magic was a text called *The Book of Coming Forth by Night*. In some ways it might be seen as being similar to Crowley's *Book of the Law*, and reference to that book is made in the *Book of Coming Forth by Night*. But in fact the results of Aquino's Working are dissimilar in style and content to that of Crowley. The text has been the object of continual commentary by Aquino in the years since its reception.

In the *Book of Coming Forth by Night* Michael Aquino is named to the V^o as the Magus of the Word *Xeper* (pronounced "kheffer"). *Xeper* is an ancient Egyptian term, the

hieroglyph for which is ☉. It literally means "to become; to be; to come into being." Aquino himself summarizes the magical meaning of the Word as "...the transformation and evolution of the Will from a human to a divine state— by deliberate, conscious, individual force of mind."(8) At the same time the contents of the book provide for the establishment of the Temple of Set and the transference of the "Infernal Mandate" from the Church of Satan to the Temple of Set.

After being informed of these magical developments, about 100 members of the Church of Satan resigned that organization to become the founding body of the Temple of Set. By October of 1975 the Temple had been incorporated as a religious institution in the State of California.

Aquino as High Priest, unlike LaVey, encouraged the widespread development of the organization and the maximal development of individual initiates within the Temple even in ways independent of his own ideas.

The Temple of Set grew steadily through its first five year period as Aquino worked constantly on developing Setian philosophy and encouraging communication among Setian initiates. The Temple's journal, *The Scroll of Set*, was founded and continues today as the main forum for the exchange of Setian ideas.

During this same period between 1975 and 1980, Aquino continued a course of studies in graduate school at the University of California at Santa Barbara which culminated in his receiving of a Ph.D. in political science in 1980.

On the ides of March 1979 Aquino took the oath of the Ipsissimus, VI°. Synchronous with this event a V° member of the Temple of Set, known by the magical name Anubis, was nominated to become the High Priest of Set. This would in effect retire Aquino from the position of head of the organization he had founded in 1975. This step is almost unheard of in the history of "occult" organizations. Usually the leaders of such groups are leaders precisely because they wish to gain and hold on to some kind of power, real or imagined. With this move, Aquino objectively proved that he was different. He had founded an organization and had seen it develop to a point where he felt comfortable handing the reins over to another.

From the middle of 1979 to the middle of 1982 Anubis was the High Priest of the Temple of Set. Many changes were made in the style and tenor of the Temple teachings in that time— which is to be expected when a new titular head of such a group is installed. Most of these changes made the Temple more like other occult groups— with the same foibles (no more no less) than similar groups would have. For example, Anubis instituted a policy by which all present Adepts would have to take a II° exam, similar to the type administered in the Church of Satan, in order to retain their degrees. Future Adepts would have to take the test as well. (It should be pointed out that Scott's book, *The Magicians*, concerns activities of the Temple of Set in the time of the High Priesthood of Anubis.)

The chief contribution made by Anubis to Temple lore is his magical Word *Xem*, "a state of Being," which was supposed to connote the "perfected man," the progressive target(s) or aim(s) of *Xeper*. Some in the Temple of Set today still study the ramifications of *Xem*, while others consider it apocryphal and largely irrelevant to present Temple directions.

In May of 1982 Anubis resigned from the Temple of Set. By the end of the turmoil surrounding this resignation, the membership of the Temple was down to a mere 30-35 initiates.

After Aquino had received his Ph.D. from the UCSB his credentials allowed him to become a lecturer and eventually adjunct professor of political science at Golden Gate University in San Francisco from 1980 to 1986, teaching such courses as Ancient Political Theory, Medieval and Modern Political Theory, United States Foreign Policy, Comparative Political Systems and Dynamics of Western Culture. During this same period he resumed active duty in the US Army and was stationed at the Presidio. This is also the period in which he undertook his encyclopedic work on the history of the Church of Satan.

With the crises of 1982, Aquino was asked to resume his position as High Priest of the Temple of Set— an office he still holds today.

The early 1980s were spent in the slow rebuilding of the Temple. In 1982, while on a trip to Europe, Aquino visited Castle Wewelsburg, which had been the ceremonial headquarters of Himmler's SS. On the night of 19 October he was able to gain private access to the ritual chamber, the Hall of the Slain, in the tower of the castle. There he performed the now famous, or infamous, Wewelsburg Working. As a result of events of that night the Order of the Trapezoid was reinstated as a formal order within the Temple of Set, and Aquino became its second Grand Master (Anton LaVey being its first).

From the middle of the next year Aquino began to produce *Runes*, the journal of the Order of the Trapezoid. This contained much of his magical thought for the period he edited the journal (until 1986).

From the latter part of 1986 to the end of 1987 Aquino was stationed in Washington, DC where he attended the National Defence University and George Washington University where he received a Masters of Public Administration.

— The Tree in the North —

In May of 1986 the ABC news magazine show *20/20* aired a segment on "Satanic crime." This was the first highly visible phenomenon of a growing tide of paranoia sweeping the country concerning "Satanic cults." In so many ways this phenomenon was just the latest manifestation of a tradition going back to the paranoid fantasies of the Romans regarding the Christians and eventually the Christians regarding every one else— especially the Jews and other "heretics." The newly refurbished conservative/medieval values of the American religious right coalesced in an alliance with therapists and marginal police officials to form a new inquisition or witch-hunt. (See the Appendix: The Urban Legend of Satanicism.)

In all this the San Francisco police department seems to have been rather in the hot-seat since that city was the headquarters of the two major Satanic organizations in the country— and the police "weren't doin' anythin' about it!" By October of 1986 the police had collected a false accusation from an army chaplain against Michael Aquino and Lilith that they had molested a child in San Francisco sometime during September or October in 1986. Apparently they did not even check into the facts enough to discover that both Michael and Lilith Aquino were in Washington, DC at that time! But then again, when have witch-hunters worried about facts?

On the evening of 14 August, 1987 a variety of police officials descended on the Aquinos residence in San Francisco and "raided" it— confiscating various Temple documents, video tapes (mostly Disney productions!) and other equipment. It just so happened that the Aquinos were at home that evening, preparing for the upcoming Set VIII Conclave in Hollywood.

This was the beginning of protracted legal dealings with the police and courts. Aquino quickly nicknamed the whole episode "The Tree in the North"— based on a passage in the Tenth Part of the Word of Set which reads: "The threat of your destruction grows as a tree in the north...it poisons the very air with its stench." The final outcome was that no actual charges were ever brought (because there was no evidence) and the police officials involved — at least one of which had touted herself as an "expert on occult crime" — were eventually reprimanded for their "over-zealousness." But that end did not come until years of harassment and thousands of dollars in lawyers' fees later.

But those who tended the Tree in the North for some time got what they wanted— a stench. Just the fact that Aquino had been "investigated" would be constantly used in the media for some time to come.

On another level the police/therapy/church-war on the Temple backfired. The publicity generated by the accusations brought ever increasing media attention to Dr. Aquino and the Temple of Set. Some of the media even allowed something of a balanced view to emerge.

The ultimate result was that the Temple enjoyed a period of unprecedented growth in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

— The Flourishing of the Temple —

In spite of the “Tree in the North” problems the Temple of Set flourished both domestically and abroad. Local Pylons were established in England, Germany, Finland and Australia— and domestically local Pylons grew from a single one functioning in Texas at one time to thirty-five in every part of the country in 1996.

The Orders within the Temple also began to function well during this most recent phase. In 1987 Aquino passed the Grand Mastery of the Order of the Trapezoid on to his associate Polaris. This allowed Aquino, as High Priest, to concentrate more exclusively on Temple-wide concerns for the next several years.

In 1990 he retired from active duty as a Lieutenant Colonel in the US Army and went on inactive duty in the Reserve. At the same time he returned to his home in San Francisco to manage the family estate and to devote himself more intensively to the affairs of the Temple of Set.

Among the most important developments in the Temple of Set in the ensuing years was the proclamation of *Working II* in February 1993. This Working of Greater Black Magic by the High Priest was designed to re-orient the Temple of Set toward the future without the inherited negative baggage from the “Church of Satan days,” and to re-organize the social bodies within the Temple to meet the Initiatory needs of the the members more effectively. Additionally, Aquino has worked tirelessly to bring the Temple of Set into the age of the internet and electronic communications.

On the Spring Equinox 1996, Don Webb was Recognized to the Degree of Magus with the Word *Xeper*— refined as: “I have Come into Being.” Later that same year he was appointed High Priest of Set, and Michael Aquino retired from that office for the second time.

Michael Aquino has become a modern exemplary model for a Lord of the Transcendental Branch of the Left-Hand Path. He is in fact what so many “occult leaders” of the past have aspired to be— an academically trained intellectual who nevertheless is capable of inspired states of consciousness and direct communication with a paeternatural entity. Aquino has proven himself to be a talented and capable organizer and director of Temple affairs, but what sets him apart from many would-be occult leaders of the latter half of the 20th century is the unswerving dedication to the principles according to which he directs his Will. Here it is not a matter of seeming more than one is, but rather indeed Being even more than one seems. This is the most royal, and the most forgotten of all arts and sciences.

Sources for the Study of the Temple of Set

One of the main problems for those outside the Temple in coming to an understanding of what the Temple is all about is the fact that none of its documents have (as yet) been published in a commercial way. All of its official documents, which would be considered as primary, are reserved for the use of its members. However, Dr. Aquino has always been forthcoming with legitimate investigators when asked about certain Temple teachings to provide them with copies of the primary documents for research purposes. The main reason these documents are reserved to members only is to keep their contents flexible. Things can be added, deleted, and updated as needed.

The Jeweled Tablets of Set

For each of the first four degrees within the Temple of Set structure there is a volume of documents. These are collectively known as the Jeweled Tablets of Set. The document all I° Setians receive upon entry into the Temple is the *Crystal Tablet* of Set. It certainly contains all the most important texts of the Temple. The length of its contents exceeds the total of all

four of LaVey's published works. Most of the contents of the *Crystal Tablet* are authored by Michael Aquino. The twin cores of this document are sections entitled "Black Magic in Theory and Practice" and "The Book of Coming Forth by Night: Analysis and Commentary." The first is a sober and straightforward, clearly written introduction to the whole idea of magic and its successful working. The second contains all the inspired texts penned by Aquino's hand. Another part of the *Crystal Tablet* contains the Temple's extensive annotated reading list.

Upon recognition to the II^o the initiate of the Temple may acquire a copy of the *Ruby Tablet* which as a mammoth collection of documents — several hundred pages in length and growing — written by a wide variety of initiates within the Temple.

Available to the Priesthood only is the *Onyx Tablet* which contains some of Aquino's ideas and reflections on the true character of Set's Priesthood, both ancient and modern.

The Magistracy has its *Sapphire Tablet* which is restricted to acquisition by members of the Temple of Set holding the IV^o.

The rationale behind restricting access to the various Tablets is not so much about keeping "degree secrets" as it is about helping initiates remain as focused as possible on the Work of their particular degree. It is rather like not having freshmen physics students ponder the problems of quantum foam or chaos theory. Such exposure is simply thought to be "dangerous" to students' rational development, as essential problems are taken out of sequence— which can end up just frustrating them.

All members of the Temple receive the journal called *The Scroll of Set* bimonthly. This publication has been edited by perhaps a dozen people over its history and contains articles written by Setians of all degrees. It is actually a forum for all Setians to express themselves rather than an organ for the leadership to communicate with the membership. In other words it is not just a sounding board for the High Priest's latest ideas, as the *Cloven Hoof* had often been.

The various orders within the Temple of Set (as discussed in the section on organization below) also have their own journals or newsletters published at different intervals. These are often highly specialized for the Work being done within that particular order and are not automatically made available to all members of the Temple. The most active of these journals are *Trail of the Serpent* published by the Order of Leviathan, *Nightwing* and *The Vampyre Papers* produced by the Order of the Vampyre, and *Runes* generated by the Order of the Trapezoid.

The Inspired Works of Michael Aquino

Besides this voluminous body of work by many authors within the Temple of Set, there are a number of texts which enjoy a special status in Temple teachings. These are the works by Aquino which have had a pronounced noetic component— which seem to have been written with the aid of something other than the mundane mind of Michael Aquino.

The first of these texts is *The Diabolicon* written over a three month period in the war-zones of South Vietnam during Aquino's early Church of Satan days. This text is in the form of prose-poetic statements from eight demonic entities: Satan, Beelzebub, Azazel, Abaddon, Asmodeus, Astaroth, Belial and Leviathan. In this work the Black Flame is first cited as a metaphor for the Gift of the Prince of Darkness— the Promethean fire of divine consciousness. *The Diabolicon* is, of course, in the "Satanic idiom," yet in it the Platonic directions of Aquino's train of thought are already becoming clear. The text of *The Diabolicon* was retained unreleased by Anton LaVey. It only found distribution within the Temple of Set in 1976.

Over a two-month period in the summer of 1974, still in his Church of Satan days, Aquino undertook a Working similar to that of *The Diabolicon*. The result is what came to be called "The Ninth Solstice Message"— which is addressed to Anton LaVey. On one level it is a panegyric to LaVey, but on another it presages an upheaval in the order of the Church of Satan and contains apocalyptic undertones:

My Age has begun, and I am come forth to uphold my boud with mankind.
Yet I shall not illuminate all, uor even many— but a few. I seek the Elect,
who in turn seek me. Man the god shall arise only from the ashes of man the
beast — The blood is the life.

...
Let the institutions of the Church of Satan be discarded. Their time has
passed. Their time is past, and they have served my purposes honorably.
Seek now the Elect, as the darkness draws near. No longer shall all who
approach my Church find welcome — They shall grasp at empty air. Only the
Elect shall find what they seek.

In retrospect this text prefigures the demise of the Church of Satan as it had been in the
early years of its existence and the establishment of the Temple of Set.

Another inspired text referred to directly in the *Book of Coming Forth by Night* is the
Word of Set. This is the body of evocatory magical texts used by the Elizabethan magician
Dr. John Dee, otherwise known as the Enochian Keys. After extensive magical work with
the Enochian Keys, as used by LaVey and others, Aquino determined that it was
impossible to treat the texts as being written in a cipher code or as an artificial language.
Over a period of several years he magically Worked on English “translations” these texts.
He finished this undertaking on 13 April 1981— an anniversary of Dee’s initial Enochian
Working. (9)

Finally, and most importantly, there is the *Book of Coming Forth by Night*. The book
itself is no more than about 1,500 words in length. The chief functions of the book are to
transfer the Infernal Mandate, and to introduce the magical principle of Xeper upon which
the new Temple of Set was to be founded. In the text, written over a two-hour period on
the night of 21-22 June 1975, an entity identifying itself as Set speaks directly to Michael
A. Aquino. In the words of the text many, if uot all, of the basic cosmological and
theological precepts of the Temple of Set are expressed.

The Book of Coming Forth by Night is not thought of as “holy writ” by Aquino
himself— not as the Christian thinks of his Bible, or as the typical Thelemite thinks of
Liber AL. His own assessment is that it is the result of a Working of Greater Black
Magic— the effectiveness of which can be judged by the results it demonstrates.

At this point it should be noted that in general such Workings are the prerogative of
initiates who have attained to the level of the Magistracy — as an objective fact regardless of
their organizational affiliation or lack of same. Such “revelations” through a mind less well-
trained and disciplined are doubtful in the extreme.

Secondary Sources on the Temple

No systematic studies of the Temple of Set have been produced. Perhaps because of its
relative secrecy (as compared to the exposure of the early Church of Satan or cable TV
witches) and its rightly perceived intellectual seriousness, the Temple of Set has daunted
most would-be investigators.

Gini Graham Scott’s supposed sociological study, *The Magicians*, obscures the name
of the Temple in typical sociological style by calling it the “Church of Hu” and making up
names for the various persons she encountered while working “under cover.” This virtually
negates its value as a historical document. It must be noted that the less than flattering
picture she tries to paint of the Temple is one based on observations within the time Anubis
was High Priest.

But beyond that fact Scott’s method is fatally flawed because she, as an admittedly
unsympathetic observer, was actually hermeneutically incapable of understanding the real
meaning of what was happening around her. She could only observe things from the
outside and so any and all of her prejudices were neatly confirmed. This is why the Temple
of Set has maintained the rule that no outsiders be allowed to view actual ceremonial

Workings— the image of what seems to be happening and the reality of what is actually happening are often two different things. Those who see only images understand nothing.

More usually unsystematic treatments of the Temple appear in books which attempt to cover the “Satanic scene” in some complete way. Perhaps because the Temple of Set’s ideology is not widely available, it appears that it has been left open to widespread and obviously consciously contrived misrepresentation.

Two glaring examples of this misrepresentation are found in J. B. Russell’s *Mephistopheles* and Arthur Lyons’ *Satan Wants You*.

Russell, who is a professor of religion at the University of California at Santa Barbara, and a self-confessed apologist for the Roman Catholic Church, had for some time had contact with members of the Temple of Set. Some had attended his lectures and even given guest presentations in his classes. He had ready access to Temple material, such as the General Information Letter. Yet with this and much more information at his disposal, he chose to write in his book:

...A distinction should be made among “Satanic” groups. Some are merely frivolous, like the so-called Temple of Set with its breathless hedonism in occult trappings...

Anton Szandor LaVey founded his Church of Satan in 1966; in 1975 a schism produced the Temple of Set. Their *Satanic Bible* (sic) is a melange of hedonistic maxims and misinformed (!) occultism. Like most groups, LaVey’s claims ancient origins; it pretends to arise from the cult of Set (Seth) in ancient Egypt. (sic) For modern Sethians, [sic] the Devil is no fallen angel but a hidden force in nature...

I reproduce so much obvious misinformation here simply to show the lengths to which even (?) an ivory tower scholar is willing to go to create a false impression of the realities of the left-hand path. Of course, with this passage it is clear that Russell is both confused on the facts as well as willful in his misrepresentation of the character of Temple teachings— Set as a “force in nature”! All of which only casts doubt on the usefulness of all his other books. Faced with these facts, it makes me wonder just who is the true representative of “radical evil” he is so fond of invoking. As we saw in chapter 7, it is not Satan (or Wotan!) who is responsible for the horrors of the Nazi holocaust. If any “god” is to be held accountable it must be that of the Roman Catholics and Lutherans— the only “god” with motive, opportunity and methods to commit the crime. Any other conclusion is simply criminologically untenable.

In the case of Arthur Lyons’ book disinformation about the Temple of Set seems to have been spread by Lyons acting as an agent for his friend and mentor Anton LaVey. His discussion is inaccurate on almost every count. No one can be that misinformed or confused— not even a journalist! The agenda here was simply to make it appear that the Temple was disintegrating, when in fact it was growing faster than it ever had before.

A more direct presentation of the Temple’s philosophy is reflected in Larry Kahaner’s *Cults that Kill* (1988). Although Mr. Kahaner had access to no more of the Temple material than any of the other would-be investigators, he made more objective and direct use of it. He allows the Temple documents to speak for themselves, and form a contrast with the nonsense being spouted by hysterical “experts” as well as with other would-be “Satanists.”

Nevill Drury’s *The Occult Experience* (1989), which is a book based on his research for the documentary film of the same name, contains a few well-balanced pages on the Temple of Set. At least Drury demonstrates that he understood the basic message of Aquino and the Temple of Set. He writes: “Their quest for self-hood and individual growth is undoubtedly a mature spiritual approach which takes man beyond mental crutches and the restrictions of dogma directly into the dark infinity of space...”(10) He goes on to conclude: “Aquino himself is complex, intellectual and self-assured— convinced, in fact,

that his particular type of magical exploration goes beyond the scope of orthodox mysticism and religion. In this respect, he may well be right.”(11)

Such objective treatments have been rare in the past decade. The only plausible reason that the Temple of Set has been left open to so many attempts to misrepresent its true character is that it has not chosen to place before the public an official and generally available statement of that character. In such an environment unprincipled “professors” and journalists seem to feel freer to make up what they want to say about the subject.

The Organizational Principles of the Temple

The true magical authority for the establishment of the Temple of Set is considered to be derived from the mandate given by the Prince of Darkness in the *Book of Coming Forth by Night*. The Temple itself, the collective body of individual initiates (each thought to be a Temple of Set in his or her own right), is a magical body, but to function effectively in this world the soul needs a body. That body is the corporation called “The Temple of Set, Inc.”

In the weeks and months after the magical formation of the Temple of Set in 1975, the founders set about creating a fully functioning legal corporation under the laws of the State of California. It was felt that the “one man rule” of Anton LaVey had been inappropriate for an association of true Black Magicians. The bylaws of the Temple of Set would, for example, provide for the expulsion of the High Priest by a vote of the Council of Nine should he betray the trust of the Temple.

As a fully operational non-profit corporation the Temple of Set is governed by the High Priest, the Chairman of the Council of Nine along with a voting body of nine councilors, and an Executive Director.

The Temple of Set is the only legally recognized Satanic “church” in the United States. It enjoys full IRS tax exemption as any other “church” would. No one is making any money from the activities of the Temple. In fact, its leaders often spend their own personal funds to finance publications of the Temple or its Orders.

As made clear in the General Information letter of the Temple can only accept those over 18 years of age as Initiates. The main reason for this is that before that age most are unable to grasp the intellectual content of the Temple of Set philosophy. Temple members generally think that children before that age should be educated secularly and exposed to religion in a theoretical way only. The part of them, the psyche, is not yet mature enough to be qualified to participate in Setian philosophy or Workings of Greater Black Magic.

The Degree System of the Temple of Set

An initiatory grade system is seen as a tool in the philosophy of the Temple of Set. The criteria for Recognition to the various levels or degrees are clearly defined on one level, yet remain flexible enough that each member of the Priesthood or Magistracy responsible for making Recognitions can develop his or her own personal criteria and philosophy about them. In the Temple of Set initiates are not “initiated” by the Temple or by other members, nor are they “elevated” by means of the authority of those “above” them in the system. Rather it is a matter of potential initiates being given a map and some structural guidelines on how to travel with this map—the magical theories of the Temple and its initiatory system. Potential initiates then travel — Become — and communicate the results of their Becoming to members of the Priesthood.

As a result of the observation of objective changes occurring in initiate in accordance with their Wills, and in accordance with the road-map provided by the theoretical degrees, a member of the Priesthood or Magistracy is able to Recognize the transition from one initiatory state of being to another. It is then the purpose of the institution which is the Temple to certify this Recognition—and make it more objective fact. No ritual can make one become an Adept, Priest or Master— this Work must be undertaken on one’s own and in one’s own unique way. What the Temple does is Recognize these transitions and states of being.

The Setian degree system is based directly on that of the Church of Satan, and indirectly on that of Crowley's A.·A.·. and the G.·D.·. There are six degrees, each with its special purpose and character:

The Setian (I°) is somewhat of a probationer in the Temple. If one applies to the Temple and is accepted — and most are accepted unless their applications display gross misunderstandings of Setian philosophy or indicate the clear unsuitability of the individual to Temple work — there is a two year period before the end of which the individual must have been Recognized to the II°. If this has not happened, the individual will be dropped from the Temple roster. The Setian will receive the *Crystal Tablet* of Set and will have access to other sources and resources within the Temple. There is no established Temple doctrine or ritual the Setian must learn in order to “advance.” The progress and the direction of that progress is entirely up to the individual. The Setian is distinguished by a silver Pentagram of Set on a white background.

The Adept (II°) is one who has been Recognized by a member of the Priesthood (III° and above) as having mastered some forms of magic, as being well-versed in the principles of Setian philosophy, and as being a sane and reliable person who will be an asset to him- or herself as well as to the Temple. Once the Adept has been Recognized to the II° he or she may remain as a permanent member of the Temple with no further official obligations to the Temple. The Adept is free to explore infinitely the depth and breadth of Black Magic. To aid the Adept magician in this, there is the *Ruby Tablet of Set*, which may now be obtained from the Temple. The Adept is distinguished by a silver Pentagram of Set on a red background.

The Priest/Priestess (III°) crosses a threshold of existence— it is a non-natural event that an Adept Comes into Being as a Priest of Set. Such an occurrence can only be Recognized by members of the Magistracy of the Temple (IV° and above). Although different Masters of the Temple may observe different criteria for Recognizing the III° status of an individual, what seems to hold them all together is the idea that the Black Flame — the direct and pure essence of the Prince of Darkness — has been made manifest in their beings, in their essences. This manifestation will, of necessity, lead to certain objective and tangible results in the behavior, life and Work of the nascent Priest or Priestess.

In the III° there begins the transition from a human state to a divine one:

...Priesthood involves the opening of a very special kind of door: the merging of the consciousness, indeed the personality, with that of the Prince of Darkness himself. In this Working the Priest or Priestess in no sense loses personal identity or Self-awareness; rather one's consciousness is augmented, energized, and strengthened by that of Set. [T]he Priest or Priestess ... is something more than human, something more than the individual whose human visage appears before onlookers. [H]e or she is not “possessed,” but is rather become a veritable living Temple indwelt by the presence of Set.(12)

It only takes one Master to Recognize a member of the III°, but this Recognition must also be corroborated by two other members of the Magistracy to make it official. The Priest or Priestess is distinguished by a silver Pentagram of Set on a black background.

Beyond the Priesthood it becomes difficult to speak in this format directly of the criteria for Recognition. Aquino writes in the *Crystal Tablet*:

As the Priesthood constitutes a merging of the individual soul with that of Set, so the Magistracy constitutes an expansion of that merger to a full apprehension of the Aeon of Set. The Master knows not only the consciousness of Set, but the reach of that consciousness and the resultant view of creation and existence it embraces. All particular phenomena are

evaluated, placed and balanced within the continuum of the Aeon by the Master, and such adjustments in events as the Master makes are for Aeonic purposes... [T]he IV^o is neither just an administrative promotion nor a reward for distinguished service; it is an initiatory state of being in itself.(13)

Aquino, from a left-hand path perspective, rejects Crowley's hypothesis that upon attaining the grade of Magister Temple the initiate would undergo an "annihilation of the personality" and "absorption in the Universal consciousness."

In the Temple a Master can only be Recognized upon the nomination of the High Priest and confirmation by a majority vote by the Council of Nine. The Magister or Magistra is distinguished by a silver Pentagram of Set against a royal blue background.

The degree of Magus (V^o) has only been attained by a handful of initiates in the Church of Satan/Temple of Set tradition. A Magus is a Master of the Temple who has stepped outside the totality of the Aeonic current to alter or modify it in an evolutionary way— this is done by means of a Working Formula, a Word. Theoretically, this could inaugurate a new Aeon, or improve or strengthen the existing one. In any case, the changes will be ones counter to preexisting values and will therefore be met with resistance. The implementation of the changes is spoken of as the Task of the Magus, that the Work must proceed against prevailing inertia is the Curse of the Magus.

In the Temple a Magus can only be Recognized upon the nomination of the High Priest and confirmation by a unanimous vote by the Council of Nine. The Magus is distinguished by a silver Pentagram of Set against a purple background.

The Ipsissimus (VI^o) — a Latin word which means "his very utmost self" — can be described as a "successful Magus"— one whose Task has been completed.

Inherent in such completion is a unique perception of the new Aeonic inertia which has resulted, placing the Ipsissimus at once within and without the Aeon itself. To function as a Ipsissimus he must work to perfect and harmonize not only the created or modified Aeon, but also its entire relationship with preexisting and potential Aeons.(14)

The Magus is best suited to determine for himself when he is ready to take the Oath of the Ipsissimus and be Recognized to that grade. Initiates of that grade are distinguished by a silver Pentagram of Set against a gold background.

In practice this system seems to have worked more or less effectively over the years. It is not yet perfect. As with everything else truly conscious, it is evolving. What is perhaps most remarkable about it is the level of responsibility "delegated" to the III^o Priesthood and to the Magistracy for the Recognition of Adepts and members of the Priesthood respectively.

There are few "hangers-on" in the Temple. The two year time limit on the I^o is one that is enforced. Extensions have been known to be granted, but they must be warranted. As there is no set curriculum in the Temple, Recognition must of necessity be based on individual work and initiative. In order to be aware of work of this kind members of the Priesthood must have the time and energy to interact with individual Setians. An unlimited number of I^o members of the Temple would soon overburden the system.

One of the most effective tools of Setian initiation are the Pylons. These are local groups of Setians, usually led by a member of the Priesthood, who interact with one another both formally and informally and occasionally hold group Workings. The leader of the Pylon is called a Sentinel, who may also be a senior Adept sponsored by a member of the Magistracy.

It is clear that the Temple of Set, with its system of degrees, is a tool for initiation, not an organization which tries to recruit and retain as many members on its rolls as possible.

Orders within the Temple of Set

A prerogative of the grade of Magister Templi, Crowley had earlier pointed out that they could form their own orders in harmony with the prevailing Aeonian current. In this spirit, Aquino urged the IV^o initiates of the Temple to form their own orders. These were presented at the Set V International Conclave held in Santa Cruz, California in 1984.

Space prevents me from discussing all of the Orders within the Temple of Set, but as their functioning is an important part of the over all workings of the Temple of Set, they must be mentioned only briefly.

The Orders are for the most part expressions of the personal Works of the Magister or Magistra Templi who is the Order's Grand Master. The presence of the order system provides for a potentially infinite number of Working environments for individual Initiates in the Temple. As a general policy Setians may only join an order after they have been Recognized to the degree of Adept. This would indicate that their general Work in the Temple is at least nominally finished, and that they are ready to specialize in some area of magical study within the Orders.

The Order of the Trapezoid officially enjoys no special status, yet has such by virtue of its heritage and destiny. The order was reconstituted as a part of the Temple of Set by Michael Aquino during his now famous Wewelsburg Working, held in the Castle Wewelsburg in Westphalia, Germany in 1982. Prior to that time it had been a designation for the Council of Nine both within the Church of Satan and the Temple of Set. But with the Wewelsburg Working the order embarked on its own true mission: The Quest for the Grail of Life.

The Order of the Vampyre holds a special interest among Romantic Setians: Fans of the Bram Stoker novel will remember that Count Dracula did not become a vampire in the "usual" way—it was as a result of his initiation into a Satanic sect—or as Stoker put it: "dealings with the Evil One," and "learning his secrets in the Scholomance." (15)

The Order of Leviathan took as its original guiding principle the first part of the "Statement of Leviathan" in *The Diabolicon*, which reads: "Before God or Angel, Daimon or man, there was Leviathan alone, principle of continuity and ageless existence. By relation and time I have oft been sought, but Leviathan shall yield to none other than the final master of the Universe." (16)

The Order of the Sepulcher of the Obsidian Masque concentrates on the performance of the Dromenon or psychosomatic/ritual theater productions through which the Initiate manifests a process which can be effected through symbolic death/life initiatory experience.

Other orders in the Temple of Set, as of 1997, were: The Order of Amn, the Order of Anpu, the Order of Horus, the Order of Kronos, the Order of Merlin, the Order of Nephthys, the Order of Nietzsche, the Order of the Python, the Order of Setne Kamuast, the Order of Shuti, and the Order of Xepera.

— The Black Magical Universe — Setian Cosmology

Individual Setian thought begins with logical suppositions and proceeds from them to more magical conclusions based on experience. Aquino states that the world views of other religions have perhaps been "aesthetically and/or emotionally attractive" to many in the past, but that "does not make any one of them true— merely popular." It is one of Aquino's essential operating principles that the Setian solution to fundamental problems of cosmology, theology, anthropology and magic is the only correct one— "after having considered and dismissed the alternatives as untrue in whole or in part." (17) The Setian cosmology is posited as the best possible answer to fundamental philosophical and magical questions given the data available— it remains, however, open to evolution should any fallacy be identified or further data become known.

The application of Ockham's razor is one of the great principles of Setian philosophy— "what can be explained by assuming fewer things should not be explained by assuming

more.” Too often students in magical schools of thought are off trying to scale “Jacob’s Ladder” before they even know how to walk. The science of Setian Initiation tries to avoid this situation.

The first assumption is that there exists a Universe, defined as “the totality of existence, both known and unknown by humanity.”(18) Within this internally consistent framework exists the objective universe, which is defined as “the vast expanses of space and the masses of animate and inanimate matter and energy occupying it.”(19) This latter concept is what humans perceive as “the (natural) universe,” and its laws are the “laws of nature.” Beyond this there exists the subjective universe — the psyche distinguished from the objective universe — which is “both apprehensive (reaching beyond the limits of the objective universe) and creative (enabling one to generate meaning, to initiate existence).”(20) More will be said on this component in the sections below. These are the three assumptions needed to act as building blocks for the Black Magical theory of the Universe.

The discerning student of the history of ideas will see the influence of the cosmology of both Pythagoras and Plato on those of Aquino in many areas. It should be pointed out too that Aquino believes many of the ideas of Pythagoras and Plato have been derived, directly or indirectly, from those of Egypt.

The clearest, simplest, and yet most profound symbol of the Setian cosmology is provided by the Pentagram of Set. Aquino discusses this symbol in Appendix 1 of the *Crystal Tablet*. The perfect circle (which is a mathematical function of pi) around the pentagram represents the “mathematical order of the objective universe.” While the pentagram itself can be seen as representing the consciousness and rationality inherent in the subjective universe. Its points do not touch the circle “signifying that the Powers of Darkness are not derived from or dependent upon” the natural order. The pentagram is shown with two points upward “to imply change and movement in place of stasis and rest, and also to proclaim the evolutionary dialectic of thesis combined with antithesis to produce synthesis— instead of a foreordained and unavoidable absolute standard.”

It should also be noted that ancient Pythagorean depictions of the pentagram showed it most often in the so-called “inverse” position. This was because it was originally seen not as a “star” but as a geometrical figure resulting from the extension of the lines of a perfect pentagon.

In this cosmology it will be noted there is an inherent “dualism” between nature and “non-nature” which echoes the ancient Greek distinction between physis (nature) and psyche (intellect). This is not the hostile dualism of the Gnostics, but is rather more based on the fundamental existentialist distinction between self and not-self.

This distinction is also projected into the Universe as a whole, positing that the objective universe and the subjective universe(s) exist in reality, although we, as human beings may indeed be unable to perceive the objective universe directly— without the medium of the subjective universe.

One thing that is striking about Setian philosophy, beginning with its cosmology, is that one does not have to resort immediately to an “arcane” vocabulary (of the Kabbalah, Magick, Alchemy, etc) to understand its premises. The Setian can discuss his philosophy with secular philosophers and be perfectly comfortable, if he so wishes. The more arcane concepts are reserved for when they are more rightly used— at the highest levels of magical Work.

Basic Setian cosmology provides a theoretical framework sufficient for basic and essential Black Magical initiatory work— further complications or elaborations are the work of individuals of Orders with some specific need for them.

Also essential to the Setian view of cosmic order is the ancient theory of Aeons. Some of this is drawn from the work of Aleister Crowley on the subject, but other ideas have also gravitated toward the Setian philosophy of Aeons as well. *The Book of Coming Forth by Night* clearly establishes the idea that the year 1966 was the beginning of a New Aeon—

which superseded that which began in 1904 at Crowley's Cairo Working which resulted in the Book of the Law. The Age of Satan lasted only ten years, as an inaugural period leading to the full establishment of the Aeon of Set. In purely Setian terms the Age of Satan (1966-1975) was the time of Set-HarWer, when Set and his "Opposite Self" could not be seen as fully articulated from one another. HarWer is Horus of the Crowleyan system. (See below.)

So on one level the Setian theory of Aeous is in full accord with Crowley's linear model. But on another level, and based on more research on the tradition of Aeons as used in ancient Hellenistic philosophy, the Setian view becomes less linear, and more "synchronous." The Aeous exist beyond time as we know it, and so do not unfold in a linear fashion like a story book. But that is the way we usually perceive them in the objective universe.

— Behold the Majesty of Set —
Setian Theology

The topic of Setian theology is again a relatively streamlined one— nothing is posited which is not necessary but everything responsible for the phenomenon in question is accounted for. Theology is seen to coalesce with cosmology in the Setian system in that to apprehend in any accurate way the true character of the god Set, or any other supposed "god" one ultimately must be able to apprehend the impersonal first forms — or Principles — upon which all such constructs are dependent. The Temple of Set is not a neo-Egyptian religion attempting to revive the cultic forms of the ancient worship of the Khemite deity called Set:

In Khem I remain no longer, for I am forgotten
there, and my house at PaMat-et is dust.(21)

But this form of the entity in question is undoubtedly the oldest such historical image. (See chapter 3.)

The image of the god Set in ancient Egyptian iconography is that of an unknown (perhaps "imaginary") animal. In this he is unique. All other god-forms, if they have zoomorphic attributes, have ones of well-known animals— the hawk, the hippopotamus, the ibis, the jackal, and so on. But the so-called Set-animal is otherwise unknown. This leads us to conclude that perhaps it is a creation of the very faculty which that god gives to mankind— the power to create forms and apprehend that which lies beyond the natural universe

In the *Book of Coming Forth by Night* Set states:

I am the ageless Intelligence of this Universe. I created HarWer [Horus] that I might define my Self. All other gods of all other times and nations have been created by men. This you know ... from my manifest semblance, which alone is not of Earth.

Here it becomes clear that Set is Intelligence, de-fined, made finite and given shape, by the objective universe (= HarWer) which it created to provide that shape and definition. Aquino himself comments on this passage:

The Universe as a whole is mechanically consistent, but it does not possess a "God" personality that favors one of its components— such as mankind — above others. The Set-entity, however, is finite intelligence within the Universe and can draw such distinctions. Set is a being operating in disregard of the order of the Universe, not in enforced concert with it.(22)

The image of the principle, first form, of intelligence surrounded by a sea of darkness is the underlying esoteric rationale behind the title "Prince of Darkness"

Aquino also holds that historically the name "Satan" was ultimately derived from a special honorific title of Set: Set-hen, which in Egyptian means "the Majesty of Set."(23)

An important and profound difference exists between Aquino's understanding of Set and LaVey's conception of Satan. In many ways this difference is the same as that between the Transcendental and Immanent Branches of the Left-hand Path. As Aquino pointed out in early Temple of Set writings(24) in "conventional Satanism" (i.e. that of LaVey and others) there exists a "Satanic paradox" which arises from the conception of Satan as "a force of nature." Satan is somehow derived from or dependent upon God/Nature for his existence, and so remains ultimately subordinate to him/her. The Setian philosophy liberates the Prince of Darkness from those particular constraints by observing that intelligence is something apart and separate from the mechanical and organic laws of the Universe.

It will be recalled from chapter 3 that in the ancient Middle Eastern tradition reflected in the Book of Genesis demonic forces were seen to have two aspects— one carnal (hence orthodoxy's abhorrence of the physical) and one intellectual (the Forbidden Fruit). In the esoteric tradition this Fruit is symbolized as a "Dark Fire in the West," derived from a reading of I Enoch (23).(25)

It must be said that within the Temple of Set, even at the senior levels of initiation, there is a variety of views on the character of the Set-entity. Some do in fact seem to see him as the ancient Egyptian god-form who has survived and been Remanifested in the Temple. Others may see him as a personal god-form, who takes some interest on a regular basis in the affairs of his Temple. While some see the image of Set as a convenient symbol for the Self, useful in the formulation of magical Workings and for philosophical purposes. Ultimately, however, the view of Set as the first form of the Self— the principle of isolate intelligence seems the simplest and most direct apprehension of the entity. Set in this sense, is ontologically real. If we know we are because we think, i.e. are self-aware, there must necessarily be a first form of intelligence from which each of our individual "intelligences" is derived. Set is the general Principle, the individual psyche of a member of the Elect is the specific manifestation.

The left-hand path is the path of separation, of non-union. The first model necessary for this formulation is that of a separate entity which is distinguished from all that surrounds it. Without this man is without awareness— even of his "animal-ness" as Anton LaVey or others of the Immanent Branch of the path would have it.

In the passage of the *Book of Coming Forth by Night* cited just above HarWer is mentioned as the entity by which, or against which, the Set-entity defines itself as an act of its own Will. Originally in Egyptian theology, the gods Horus and Set were one entity: the Hrwyfy— "the one with two faces." Here Set declares that the separation was a Willful act of Self-definition. The separate HarWer-entity is one which retains some of the self-awareness of the Set-entity, but which is equally a part of the objective universe. This conflicted nature makes HarWer — the Opposite Self of Set — "a strange and fitful presence," whose words are "tinged with ... inconsistency and irrationality."(26)

The HarWer-entity is supposedly that which dictated the Book of the Law to Aleister Crowley in 1904. (See chapter 8.) It is for this reason that Crowley's book is so full of apparent inconsistencies and emotionalism.

The "separation process" between Set and HarWer, described here as being internal to the Set-HarWer entity, is the theological or cosmological equivalent of the rebellion of the angels in heaven in the Judeo-Christian system. The implications are, of course, also quite different. In the Setian view the "conflict" is implicit and a matter of essence, not explicit and a matter of "morality."

The same passage in the *Book of Coming Forth by Night* cited above states that “other gods” have been created by humanity, or actually by the principle of isolate intelligence incarnate in humanity. Aquino comments on this by saying:

[O]ther gods, whether Egyptian or foreign, are derivative of Set or of the human mind. (This does not imply they are “imaginary” in the vulgar sense. The mind is capable of substantive creation; it can give life to stereotypical, archetypical or unique gods or daemons.(27)

This has the net effect of elevating humans to the level of continuing co-creators with Set—which is consistent with the ancient view of humanity, revived in the western Renaissance.

Although the theology and cosmology of the Temple of Set are extremely important because they provide the road map for initiatory Work, it is in the human psyche, in the individual or microcosmic manifestation of these macrocosmic and theological principles, where the real Work begins and ends. Ultimately, the Temple of Set does not constitute a theocentric religion, but rather a psychecentric one. This is in the great tradition of the daimon-centered systems of ancient Greece or the *fylgja*-centered ones of the eldritch north.

— The Children of Set — Setian Anthropology

Setian philosophy is a psychecentric one—that is, it focuses the attention of the subject (actor) of any act of Will back upon the subject or one doing the action. The structure of this subject is called, among other names, the psyche, intellect, soul, ba (in Egyptian), and so on. Aquino prefers not to split hairs on the analysis of this structure at this stage. Initially it is sufficient for general purposes to realize the distinction between the part of man which partakes of the objective universe and is ultimately subject to its internally consistent mechanical and organic laws, and which part constitutes a subjective universe not necessarily constrained by Universal laws. This realization must come first. It must then be exercised in the form of acts of Will—or magic.

The Black Flame

The human being is seen as possessing a non-natural component, the psyche, which is logically of non-natural origin. Consciousness, it is logical to assume, did not arise from non-consciousness. Aquino also objects to Darwinian theory which have the species evolve slowly over a period of several million years. His objection to this is largely on the grounds that it cannot reasonably account for the rapid development of consciousness in the species.(28) This non-natural component is referred to as the “Gift of Set.” Previously in the *Diabolicon* Aquino had identified it as the Gift of Satan/Lucifer. The pure essence of this Gift, and the means by which it was given to human beings, is called the Black Flame. This formula was also first mentioned in the *Diabolicon* transcribed by Michael Aquino during the initial phase of his Church of Satan career. This Aquino-inspired phrase was even later used as a title of a Church of Satan journal.

The Elect of the Temple of Set

In technical Setian terms the “Elect” refers specifically to initiates in the Temple of Set of the II° and above.(29) However, in more general terms this can refer to those who have realized their separateness from the Universal order—and who have thus been selected out by the Prince of Darkness. It is as a tool or instrument for this process that the Temple of Set exists.

The concept of elitism in the Temple of Set was to some extent inherited from the Church of Satan. But Aquino’s philosophy has refined the concept further and made it more objective. The very idea of elitism is an antinomian one in our current political climate, in the US at least. Everyone is supposed to be created equal—which is a patently absurd notion.

In the Temple of Set the initiate can learn to function in an environment which is at least to some extent an artificially elite one (in the sense that it is created by the subjective universe). Through this experience the initiate can learn how to function more objectively in the “World of Horrors”— or the non-initiated outside the Temple. True elitism can be recognized, and the lack of it seen clearly wherever its lack is apparent. Such recognitions are essential to objective work in the world.

The Temple of Set is not an ersatz society for misfits the way so many “occult societies,” orders, covens, and so on, are for those who gravitate toward them. The degree system, often criticized by LaVey and others for rewarding behavior within the institution while ignoring “worldly accomplishments,” is not an end in itself but a magical instrument or tool. The instrument is then to be used, as initiates Will, in “worldly accomplishments,” or any other accomplishments desired.

One of the most often heard metaphors for the Temple of Set’s degree system is the university degree system. Indeed a Ph.D. does not make someone a great scholar in the objective sense, it is merely recognition by a group of qualified individuals that the person in question has the “equipment” to become a great scholar in the objective sense. This does not invalidate or negate the authority of universities to grant such degrees— but it does put that authority in perspective objectively.

It is not the purpose of this book to sink to the level of a “sociological study” — but I will note the following from the perspective of one who knows — that the senior initiates of the Temple of Set are almost without exception persons of significant “worldly accomplishments.” This is not because there is a direct link between “advancement” in the degree system and such accomplishments, but rather because those who have worked with the instrument correctly have been able to use it according to their own Wills to create the situations in life they desire.

The Grail of Life beyond Death

The question of the possibility for immortality is a central one in the magical Setian philosophy of Michael Aquino. His work in this area also goes back to his days in the old Church of Satan. In a 1973 issue of the *Cloven Hoof* he wrote an article entitled “The Secrets of Life and Death,” which used as a starting point Alan Harrington’s book *The Immortalist*. There the trail ended with Harrington’s technological answer involving cryonics.(30)

This article was followed up a decade later in a contribution to *Runes*, the journal of the Order of the Trapezoid, entitled “The Secrets of Life and Death: Part II.” In this article Aquino comments:

The “scientific” argument for the authenticity of the *Book of Coming Forth by Night* hinges upon the notion that the consciousness is conceptually a violation of nature. The Wewelsburg Working goes one step further and asserts that life is conceptually contrary to nature. At first this assertion seems outrageous; after all there is quite a bit of life going on “in nature” as we see it on Earth. But have we found evidence of any life anywhere else? We have not; and the odds against life (as we understand it) evolving in any given part of the cosmos are billions and billions to one. Even on Earth, life is a delicate, temporary phenomenon which will cease altogether in another 500 million years.(31)

He further remarks that our own bodies have a rapid rate of cell-death, and that our physical vehicles are replaced many times over in our “natural” life-spans. This and, other factors, lead him to conclude that life, like consciousness, is not in fact dependent on the physical body. This liberates the rational Black Magician to seek immortality according non-natural technologies.

This interest in the continuance of self-awareness after death is shared by all schools of the left-hand path. One entire reading list category in the *Crystal Tablet* is dedicated to this topic. However, within the Temple there is no dogmatic belief or conclusion about the means of attaining, or the character of, any *post mortem* state.

Besides the Order of the Trapezoid, several Orders within the Temple, including those of the Vampyre and Leviathan, have as central features the quest for the continuance of self-awareness— or immortality.

Aquino's philosophy is largely consistent at the level of verbal discussion on the question of immortality. LaVey claims that "man is just another animal" (a statement with its own logical problems) and entirely natural or carnal. But then when he speaks of immortality words such as "shell" are ascribed to the body, which clearly implies something other than the carnal is the essence of the Satanist. This problem is non-existent with Setian philosophy as the basic distinction between *soma* (body) and *psyche* (soul) is recognized as a logical and intuitive fact.

Interestingly this distinction has led to institutionalized practice of neither asceticism nor libertinage, which we came to expect from Gnostic-derived schools emphasizing the body/soul dichotomy. Setian practice seems to reflect the older, more balanced and individualized attitudes of Hellenic synthesis, harmony and moderation. A key to this is that the Setian attitude toward the dichotomy is not hostile or moralistic— it is merely realized as fact as a starting point for further Work. It is not an end in itself, nor is the eradication of one or the other a goal. Again this seems to reflect the most ancient view untouched by the moralistic dualism of the Zoroastrians and Judeo-Christians.

— Setian Magical Technology — Black Magic in Theory and Practice

Those who tread the left-hand path do so using magical technology—the operations of their own Wills. In the Setian tradition of Michael Aquino magic, like everything else, is treated to a thorough analysis, and noetic apprehension. Aquino's precise definitions and discussions of magical theory reject over-generalizations such as might be found in the works of Aleister Crowley, who defined "Magick" as "the Science and Art of causing Change to occur in conformity with Will."(32) The real differences between what Aquino defines as White Magic and Black Magic, and between lesser and greater aspects of these methods, make it necessary to keep each type distinct.

The chief problem with Crowley's definition from a Setian point of view would seem to be the definition of "Will." Often times the Will of an individual is more illusion, or the result of "mass hypnosis" than many would care to admit.

According to Aquino's analysis presented in *Black Magic in Theory and Practice* there are two approaches (natural and non-natural) to the two universes (objective and subjective).(33)

The natural approach to the objective universe is an effort to blend with that universe, to become one with Nature or God. Humans feel themselves to be apart from the natural order (which they are). But usually respond to it by feeling "sinful" or "out of harmony"— and proceed to attempt to integrate themselves into the perceived order. This is the essence of the highest purpose of White Magic— whether performed by monotheists or "Nature worshippers." This is what one might call conventional religion— after all the Latin word *religio* means "re-connection."

The natural approach to the subjective universe is that of the atheistic objectivists, materialists, or positivists. For them the subjective universe has no reality except as a source for entertaining (and often profitable) products of the imagination. In this view the subjective universe is in fact an illusion or unreality. The only value it serves is to provide emotional pleasure (entertainment) or to illustrate the "realities" of the objective universe. Epicureans, Sadeans, Marxists and to some extent LaVeyans fall into this category.

The non-natural approach to the objective universe is that of those who has realized that they indeed stand apart from the objective universe and that attempts to merge with it are pointless and illusory. At that juncture comes the understanding that the objective universe, and things in it, can be used as a tool of the subjective universe. This knowledge allows them to develop techniques for the control (or strong influencing) of entities and phenomena in the objective universe in accordance with their Will. It is this type of magic at which LaVeyan Satanism excels. This is what Aquino calls Lesser Black Magic. The wise application of these principles requires rigorous ethical training and standards.

The non-natural approach to the subjective universe is the purview of Greater Black Magic. It is the direct focusing of “the Will of the creative self to adjust features of the subjective universes (personal and others’) to the desired state, which may or may not be ‘real’ in the objective universe.” By this method it is possible to transform the content of the subjective universe and influence patterns and events in the objective universe, neither of which is easy to master.

Essentially White Magic is the submission of the subjective universe to the inherent mechanical or organic patterns of the objective universe, while Black Magic is the exercise of the subjective universe’s (the psyche’s) Will to Power.

Aquino sums up the various approaches to the universes with the words:

One is taught to become expert in natural approaches to the objective universe through conventional education in the social and physical sciences, and in natural approaches to the subjective universe through the arts. The Church of Satan taught the theory and practice of Lesser Black magic, and the Temple of Set adds to that the theory and practice of Greater Black Magic.(34)

Setian White Magic

Paradoxical as it might seem, true Black Magicians may freely use White Magic— at least for pragmatic acts of sorcery, and as long as it is done with awareness and understanding. This is a practical form of White Magic, not a philosophically consistent one. That is, it is not practiced as a part of a right hand-path philosophy. Furthermore, it is the kind of magic practiced by most “conventional” magicians— whether they are Christians, Pagans, Thelemites, Chaotics, or even LaVeyan Satanists.

White Magic is a highly concentrated form of conventional religious ritual. The practitioner seeks to focus his awareness and powers of concentration via an extreme degree of autohypnosis. The technique may be used simply for meditation or entertainment through mental imagery (“astral travel”). Or it may be used to focus the will towards a desired end— a cure, curse, etc. To accomplish this, the magician envisions a god or daemon with the power to achieve the objective, then concentrates his will into an appeal. The god or daemon then carries out the appeal, more or less effectively— depending on the strength of the magician’s subconscious mind to sustain it as a functioning entity.(35)

In practice this kind of White Magic can be put to any use, and have virtually any configuration. Angels or gods, daemons or spirits could be conjured by the psyche and used as a focus of the will for a variety of purposes. The difference between the committed White Magician and the Black Magician who on occasion uses White Magical techniques for practical ends is that the White Magician has as his ultimate goal the fusion of his self-awareness with the mechanisms of the Universe, while the Black Magician merely uses the technique for temporary, critical and pragmatic ends. White Magic is simply easier and more flexible to use than Black Magic, and requires less training and a lower level of essential Being to operate.

It was Anton LaVey's acceptance of the assumption that "black magic" was either "evil" magic, or magic using "demons" instead of angels, or the like, which led him to conclude that there is no difference between "black" and "white" magic.

At the highest level of Understanding of the Will— all magic is Black Magic because the fully articulated and aware Will (or psyche) will neither desire nor need techniques which lead it, even temporarily into a state of illusory "union" with the objective universe.

The Practice of Lesser Black Magic

As a general rule of practice, the Setian, like the LaVeyan Satanist, will not use Greater (Black) Magic when Lesser means could be more rationally employed to gain the same ends. (Magic itself should in fact only be used when natural means are not sufficient.) Aquino defines Lesser Black Magic as "the influencing of beings, processes, or objects in the objective universe by the application of obscure physical or behavioral laws." (36)

Perhaps the key to understanding the practice of Lesser Black Magic is the fact that it works entirely through instruments in the objective universe, which must be perceived by any targeted subjective universes (the minds of others) through their five sense organs. Lesser Black Magic works largely in and through the world of five senses and three dimensions.

On one level this is little more than the "trivial pursuits" of grammar, rhetoric and logic as taught by the ancients— it is a way of effectively communicating your desires to others that they will wish to harmonize their wills with yours. It can be seen as the art and practice of "winning friends and influencing people"— but what keeps it a Black Magical category is the level of consciousness or Self-awareness the magician brings to the operation. Without the awareness of the dichotomy between the subjective universe of the operator and the objective universe in which the operator is working, the Black Magical perspective or focus can be lost.

Almost the entirety of the previous chapter on the Church of Satan and the philosophy of Anton LaVey is a treatise on the development and practice of a system of Lesser Black Magic.

The Practice of Greater Black Magic

In the *Black Magic in Theory and Practice* Greater Black Magic is defined as "the causing of change to occur in the subjective universe in accordance with Will. This change in the subjective universe will cause a similar and proportionate change in the objective universe." (37) In contrast to White Magic, according to Setian theory: "Black Magic involves no autohypnosis or conditioning of the mind to make it receptive to subconscious imagery. Rather it is a deliberate and conscious effort to force the mind outward— to impact upon and alter the 'laws' of the mechanical Universe." (38)

Black Magic is the function or technique for those philosophically aligned with the aims of the left-hand path. It might be said that Black Magic (as defined by Aquino) is synonymous with the practice of the left-hand path itself.

In the *Book of Coming Forth by Night* it is written: "Now let the Setian shun all recitation, for the text of another is an affront to the Self." (39) This points up the enigmatic — viewed from the outside — character of true Black Magic. Such operations can not be "seen," nor can they be reduced to recipes, formulas and rituals— they are beyond the mechanical parameters implied by these categories. True Black Magic requires no props or symbols, no ritual or invocations— although certain things may be used to bring the subjective universe (= psyche) into a state of isolation in preparation for a true Working of Greater Black Magic.

The psyche is the god, or the closest thing to a god, to which most Setians have direct access. It is primarily for this reason that the Setian also shuns the use of drugs or narcotics of any kind. Such substances hinder and limit the capacity of the very thing the Setian is supposedly attempting to strengthen and develop. Clearly drugs hinder the capacity of the Will, and so true Setian magic cannot be enhanced by their use.

As in LaVeyan Satanism there is no established ritual, but there is a basic formula used as a framework for Workings of Greater Black Magic outlined in the *Crystal Tablet*. In many respects this has been derived from the formula given in LaVey's *Satanic Bible*. Important differences include the lighting of a fire upon the altar—chemically treated to make the flame with a blue-black color — to symbolize the Black Flame and to open a gateway of communication between the celebrant(s) and the Prince of Darkness.

Another factor is the wording of an Invocation to Set written by Aquino—in principle this is used in most Setian group rituals. It is a verbal symbol which connects all Setians in those times/places where magical work is done.

Setian ritual symbolism is also sexually neutral—there are no nude altars, phalli, and so on. These are not forbidden, but merely thought to be inappropriate to most working aims—and therefore unnecessary. The presence of animals — unless essential to the symbolism of the working — is discouraged.

Perhaps most importantly the Temple expressly forbids the presence of non-members at workings. No tourists, “observers,” and so on who merely “want to see what’s going on with those weird Black Magicians.” Filming or photographing actual rituals is also strongly discouraged. Non-participants can never fully comprehend what actually occurs in such an environment. If Catholicism were not so well established and familiar more people might think all that bell clanging, genuflecting, and censer swinging by guys in dresses wearing pointy caps was pretty strange too. But the believing Catholic feels himself to participate in the Passion of his Savior through this formula. This unseen aspect is even stronger in Setian Workings, which actually take place in a non-natural realm.

One whole important category of the practice of Setian Greater Black Magic is that which involves the direct communication with the Set-entity. This is a difficult task to accomplish in reality, and one that is generally thought to require at least a level of initiation equal to that of the Priesthood of Set (III^o). First the very act of consciously setting one’s Self apart from the laws of the Universe is a step in this direction, because in doing so the Setian commits “the same crime against God (= the Universe) as did the Set-entity.”(40) This then would be an act in imitation of the original rebellion of consciousness against the Universal order—whether in the mythology of the Egyptians (= Set), or of the Greeks (= first Zeus then Prometheus), or the Germanics (= Odin), and so on. The next step is the actual communication with the Set-entity as an independent being—which is an even more profound violation of the natural order. Reliable contact of this kind is only thought to be possible for Masters of the Temple.

— Xeper —

Initiatory Black Magic

The central magical Work of a Setian Black Magician is his or her own Xeper. This is the “Great Work” upon which the Will must be focused. As outlined on pages 000 above, the Temple of Set initiatory degree system is a map or guiding instrument for the general parameters of that Xeper-process. Transformations which take place in the essence or Being of the individual during this process are “objective” ones in the sense that they are real and permanent—although the effects of magical Work can be undone through negligence and subsequent laziness.

In many respects the initiatory system of the Temple is based on a framework similar to that employed by Plato when describing the levels of knowledge and being students in his academy would undergo in their quests to become Philosopher-Kings. (See chapter 3.) This same structure underlies most western “occult systems”—although many try to obscure this fact. It is a system which has its objective criteria, and is founded in reality, and hence it forms a useful instrument for personal initiation.

In this system the initiate moves from a state of relative guess-work to one of objective certainty based upon knowledge (or Understanding) which comes from direct apprehension of the First Forms lying at the root of all phenomena in the objective and subjective universes. This comes only after sufficient “scientific” training in the observation of, and

interaction with, the objective world has been successfully undertaken. This is one of the things which seems to distinguish the Transcendental from the Immanent Branches of the Left-Hand Path. The Transcendental Branch assumes the transformations taking place in the subjective universe are real and require work, as does the transformation of any real thing. While the Immanent Branch, as exemplified by the latter-day philosophy of LaVey, assumes that the subjective universe (such as it exists) is a relatively static thing— one must merely “realize one’s innate godhood”— rather than work to transmute the “substance” of the subjective universe into a divine state.

— Ultima Futura —

The Vision of the Temple of Set

There is no more forward looking, or “future oriented,” school of the left-hand path than the Temple of Set. One of its reading list categories is called “The Future,” and another is devoted to space exploration and scientific frontiers.

In the early years of the Temple there was a strong apocalyptic, almost millenarian, aspect to it. This was perhaps first based on a passage in the *Book of Coming Forth by Night* which says:

I seek my Elect and none other, for mankind now hastens toward an annihilation which none but the Elect may hope to avoid. And alone I cannot preserve my Elect, but I would teach them and strengthen their Will against the coming peril, that their blood may endure. To do this I must give further of my own Essence to my Elect, and, should they fail, the Majesty of Set shall fade and be ended. (p. 22)

There was for a while in the late 1970s even somewhat of a survivalist mentality among some members of the Temple as these words in the *Book of Coming Forth by Night* were taken more literally than they have been in more recent years. In his 1985 commentary on this passage in the text Aquino wrote:

During the first several years of the Aeon, I was inclined to interpret the warning of this passage in terms of the general ecological crisis confronting the human race as a whole during the next century. While factors presaging that crisis remain, it is increasingly obvious that the Temple of Set is far too selective in scope and interests to be a significant factor in confronting it. It seems more probable that Set’s warning is meant to alert the Elect to the general fear which profane humans feel concerning Initiates of the Black Art, and in particular their tendency to search out scapegoats during times of stress, confusion, and crisis. (*BCFBN*, p. 22.)

More recently the tenor of the Temple’s orientation has been more toward the individual and more academic, in the Platonic sense. Initiates, engaged in the affairs of the world, but magically isolated at Will from what Aquino has dubbed “the World of Horrors” (uninitiated society), seem to be most likely to survive any upheavals in that world. As this “World of Horrors” perhaps becomes progressively more stupid and brutish, ever more narrow and simple-minded, the Temple of Set expects to have its resources for initiation called upon more and more as “refugees” from that uninitiated realm seek sustenance in a rational and rigorous system.

The Orders within the Temple of Set are projected to grow and give the Temple an increasingly multidimensional aspect. These will develop more and more sophisticated and specialized magical disciplines and techniques, each with its own contribution to what the future holds for the Temple as a whole.

As far as the "World of Horrors" is concerned, it seems clear that it will go on more or less as it has always been. The only way the Temple of Set will have an impact upon its quality is by facilitating the true Initiation of individuals into the essence of the left-hand path. The influence of those individual Black Magicians will then make impact on the World of Horrors as it fulfills the unique Wills of those individuals. And so is done the Will of Set.

Michael Aquino and the Left-Hand Path

It is clear that what Michael Aquino has done with the Temple of Set is quite different from what Anton LaVey did with his Church of Satan. They have differing philosophies but both are equally part of the left-hand path. In fact each exemplify the essence of the Transcendental and Immanent Branches of that Path, as I have defined them.

LaVeyan Satanism accepts and revels in the role of the eternal adversary. Its theoretical mandate is to oppose every norm. Setian philosophy is based on an elitist and hierarchized theory, but is not necessarily adversarial. Set is seen as something opposed to a certain thing (Nature), but not systemically opposed to any and everything. This distinction is inherent in the mythic systems from which their respective philosophical ideas are drawn: Satanism from an anti-establishment mythology (Satan's rebellion against God), Setian religion from a previously established super- or extraordinary system (the ancient cult of Set). Satanism poses a head to head, or lateral, opposition, whereas Setian thought poses a vertical opposition.

In the greater historical perspective, LaVeyan Satanism accepts (or came to accept) the matter/spirit dichotomy of the ancient Gnostics— but declares its allegiance with the demiurge — the creator of matter and the flesh — as the "good god." In the ancient system this would have been Yahweh/Iao! But even in LaVey's system he must refer to something which separates man from "the other animals" (for better or worse) and to something else when addressing the issue of the possibility of immortality.

In the Setian philosophy of Michael Aquino these contradictions are cleared away rationally by seeking and finding that which does separate man from the rest of the Universe. This opposition then becomes the core of the philosophy. Humanity, and most especially the Elect, stand apart from the "laws of the Universe/God."

This Setian equation between the Judeo-Christian God and Nature is one most troubling to modern would-be Nature-worshippers— because they usually like to think of themselves as being somehow on the opposite side from old "Jehovah"— he being somehow "supernatural" while they are "natural." But Setian philosophy is practiced on a level beyond these concerns, although they can be explained historically. Adherents of orthodox religions who have sought a "God" who created "heaven and earth" simply have misinterpreted the more subtle laws of nature as "the laws of God." In fact, according to Setian ideas, these are both aspects of the static regularity or internal consistency of the objective universe. Ultimately it is not a question of core importance to the Setian.

The Setian steps back and observes the picture from a new angle and sees the true distinction between Intelligence and non-intelligence in the Universe. Intelligence "opposes" stasis and regularity — both in "God" and "Nature" — which are both marked by their static and inflexible laws.

The magical Setian philosophy of Michael Aquino exemplifies the Transcendental Branch of the Left-Hand Path it is philosophically antinomian — violating cosmic law — and in times of social stress has shown itself ready and willing to become a symbol of conventional antinomianism as well. Curiously, when it was still relatively comfortable to call one's self a "Satanist" most Setians did not manifest a "Satanic" image, but as the social climate became more intolerant, the Setian philosophical antinomianism was activated and the "Satanic" imagery resurfaced— as an apparent act of cosmic and philosophical defiance against the ignorance and stupidity that drove the intolerance.

The ultimate aim of Setian philosophy is an active, aware and potent state of relative immortality for the isolate, individual psyche. This is achieved through a system of magic which must of necessity be to a great extent the unique invention of the psyche of the subject of the transformation or metamorphosis. It seems essential to the process, however, that it be a matter of Will, and that it be undertaken in grades or stages only as quickly as the conscious mind is able to absorb and understand the process it is undergoing.

The magical philosophy of Michael Aquino is certainly the most sophisticated theory of its kind to be expounded in modern times. This discussion can only provide the outlines of the system, of course. The future will hold more Mysteries and more unfoldings of the Word of the Aeon.



Xepera Xeper Xeperu

Notes for Chapter 10

- (1) Michael A. Aquino, *The Book of Coming Forth by Night: Analysis and Commentary* (San Francisco: Temple of Set, 1985), p. 20.
- (2) Michael A. Aquino, "Black Magic in Theory and Practice" [= *Crystal Tablet*, pp. 1-61] (San Francisco: The Temple of Set, [various dates]), p. 13.
- (3) Aquino, *Book of Coming Forth by Night*, p. 20.
- (4) Michael A. Aquino, *The Church of Satan* (San Francisco: The Temple of Set, 1989), Appendix 9.
- (5) Aquino, *The Church of Satan*, p. 45.
- (6) Aquino, *The Church of Satan*, Appendix 10.
- (7) Aquino, *The Church of Satan*, Appendix 72.
- (8) Aquino, *Book of Coming Forth by Night*, p. 26.
- (9) Aquino, *Book of Coming Forth by Night*, p. 9.
- (10) Nevill Drury, *The Occult Experience* (Garden City Park, NY: Avery, 1989), p. 114)
- (11) Drury, *The Occult Experience*, p. 119-120.
- (12) Aquino, "Black Magic in Theory and Practice," p. 59.
- (13) Aquino, "Black Magic in Theory and Practice," p. 60.
- (14) Aquino, "Black Magic in Theory and Practice," p. 61.
- (15) Bram Stoker, *Dracula*. New York: Signet, 1965 [1897], p. 246.
- (16) Aquino, *Book of Coming Forth by Night*, Appedix 2, p.15.
- (17) Aquino, "Black Magic in Theory and Practice," p. 3.
- (18) Aquino, "Black Magic in Theory and Practice," p. 3.
- (19) Aquino, "Black Magic in Theory and Practice," p. 3.
- (20) Aquino, "Black Magic in Theory and Practice," p. 7.
- (21) Aquino, *Book of Coming Forth by Night*, p. 20.
- (22) Aquino, *Book of Coming Forth by Night*, p. 10.
- (23) Aquino, *Book of Coming Forth by Night*, p. 5.
- (24) Aquino, Michael A. Genesis III. (= Letter to the Priesthood of Set, September 29, [1975]).
- (25) Aquino, *Book of Coming Forth by Night*, p. 7.)
- (26) Aquino, *Book of Coming Forth by Night*, pp. 15; 17.
- (27) Aquino, *Book of Coming Forth by Night*, p. 10.
- (28) Aquino, Genesis III.
- (29) Aquino, *Book of Coming Forth by Night*, p. 22.
- (30) Michael A. Aquino, "The Secrets of Life and Death." *Cloven Hoof* 5:1 (Jan./Feb. 1973), pp. 1-10.
- (31) Michael A. Aquino, "The Secrets of Life and Death II." *Runes* I:2 (Sept., 1983), p. 3.
- (32) Aleister Crowley, *Magick* (New York: Weiser, 1973), p. 131.
- (33) Aquino, "Black Magic in Theory and Practice," pp. 14-20.
- (34) Aquino, "Black Magic in Theory and Practice," p. 19.
- (35) Aquino, *Book of Coming Forth by Night*, p. 23.
- (36) Aquino, "Black Magic in Theory and Practice," p. 21.
- (37) Aquino, "Black Magic in Theory and Practice," p. 28.
- (38) Aquino, *Book of Coming Forth by Night*, pp. 23-24.
- (39) Aquino, *Book of Coming Forth by Night*, p. 23.
- (40) Aquino, *Book of Coming Forth by Night*, p. 24.

Appendix

The Urban Legend of Satanism

Much of the impetus for writing this book came from the need to demonstrate to an intelligent reading public the true character of the left-hand path. This was necessitated, I felt, by the monstrous emergence of rabid and irrational hatreds and fears manifesting themselves in western culture especially during late 1980s.

What the people fear and hate is not so much the left-hand path and Satanism as it actually is, and as it is actually practiced, as it is their own inner idea or notion of what it is *or must be*. This fantastic phenomenon, this mythic form of "Satanism" which seems to exist in no reality other than the subjective one of its creators, I chose to call by the neologism "Satanicism." This is done to keep the term Satanism uncontaminated by fictional creations of right-hand path paranoia.

The best explanation of the "Satan scare" phenomena of the late 1980s is to be found in the complex world of urban legends or myths. This is not to dismiss the importance or danger of such mythologizing, or to reject the whole phenomenon as "pure fantasy." There is something *real* going on—it's just not what it *seems* to be.

An urban legend is most often encountered in the form of wild, usually weird, stories that range from "Lady of the Lake" ghost tales, to exploding poodle-dogs in microwave ovens. Cases of urban legends have been collected and studied by University of Utah folklorist Jan Harold Brunvand in several volumes such as *The Vanishing Hitchhiker* (1981) and *The Choking Doberman* (1984). Urban legends almost always start with: "A friend of a friend of mine said that..." They are always close enough or specific enough to be effective, yet far away enough to be beyond confirmation. It is essential to the effectiveness of an urban legend that it not be subjected to verification. All those which have been so studied have been shown to be purely fictional creations.

These urban legend *do* have dramatic effects on society, however. Not one confirmed case of strangers putting poison, glass or razor blades in kids' candy at Halloween has been confirmed. All such cases were either faked by attention-seeking kids—or were the results of abuse inflicted on the children by their own parents. In spite of this, "trick or treat" customs have been disrupted, and hospitals even offer free x-raying of Halloween candy!

Two popular urban legends that have affected major US corporations are that MacDonald's sent a portion of their profits to the Church of Satan and that the (old) Proctor and Gamble logo was a Satanic symbol—a man in the moon and some stars. Both of these legends are, of course, fictitious. However, Proctor and Gamble eventually changed their logo due to unrelenting public pressure.

Two investigators who have looked at the "Satan scare" from the viewpoint of the urban legend or depth psychology are Arthur Lyons in his *Satan Wants You* and Chas Clifton in an article for *Gnosis* magazine. Both have concluded that most, if not all, of the tales of "Satanic day-care centers," "breeder cults," and so on *ad nauseam*, are the stuff of either urban legend or disturbed minds.

Recent History

When we look at this most recent phenomenon, which reached its peak with the Geraldo Rivera special in October 1988 on “Satanic crime,” we discover a definite historical trend stretching back approximately 30 years.

Around 1975 reports of cattle mutilations swept the western United States— these were all said to be the work of a well-organized Satanic cult. Official investigations showed them to be the work of predators. But in the anxiety ridden, post-Watergate, US Satanic cults seemed to be more the preferred “popular” answer.

In 1980 there appeared one of the first commercial exploitations of the new wave of cult anxiety. This came in the form of a collaboration between a certain “Michelle Smith” and a psychiatrist, Dr. Lawrence Pazder. Together they produced a book called *Michelle Remembers* based on “memories” Michelle was able to produce while being treated by Dr. Pazder. In this book “Michelle” recounts the horrible cultic abuse she suffered at the hands of her family and strangers— complete with the depiction of the sacrifice and eating of infants. These accounts and others produced in the 1980s are remarkably similar to those produced by the Roman and Christian commentators many centuries ago. (See chapter 5.) No hard evidence was ever found to corroborate Michelle’s story, but it continues to be accepted as true by those who need to believe. Dr. Pazder was so impressed he married “Michelle.”

The anxiety and malaise of the mid- and late-1970s was combined with the ideology of the religious right in the Reagan-dominated 1980s and the “Satan scare” was poised for development. Soon, bolstered by the pattern of Dr. Pazder and Michelle, there was a whole circuit of patients and their therapists traveling about like so many snake-oil salesmen hawking their wares of fear and dread to any who would listen— and pay their fees.

Another twist in the story arose in the early 1980s — the theme of the “Satanic Day-Care Center.” This came to its nauseating zenith in the famous McMartin day-care center case. A mentally disturbed, suicidal mother of one of the children accused the school of abusing her child. Therapists (inquisitors) were brought in to question the children. After being subjected to their therapy the children began to come up with stories of rituals, devils, bunny-sacrifices, subterranean chambers with lions in cages, and flights to far away cities to attend unspeakable rites, and so on. The ensuing trial was the most expensive in California history— most charges were finally dropped, and in the end no one was convicted of anything. But many lives, both of the owners and staff of the school as well as of the children and concerned parents, were destroyed or seriously damaged. The only ones to benefit were the therapists (they got paid, their reputations, at least temporarily, were enhanced) and the lawyers and other legal professionals. The telling question of “Who gains?” can be applied here with enlightening effect.

The McMartin case was just the beginning of a massive wave of similar cases. Investigations were undertaken by law enforcement officials all over the country, some of whom began to “specialize” in “occult crime.” Amateur and professional theologians and their possessed and abused “ex-cultists” produced books and went on talk shows. “The devil made me do it” becomes a legal defence for crimes great and small.

By the late 1980s “Satanic crime” was the hottest selling topic on the talk show circuit. False acquisitions made against the High Priest of the Temple of Set, Michael Aquino brought “philosophical Satanism” to center stage for the first time— which was the beginning of the end of the “Satanic scare.” This is because the High Priest was able to fight back against the falsehoods about Satanism and eventually the truth began to emerge. But the “scare” would continue for several years to come.

Perhaps the crest of the wave of public paranoia came with the Geraldo special in October of 1988. The media — electronic and print — was full of accounts of “Satanic” or ritual crime and abuse. Case after case was heard of people (mainly women— perhaps because they are the chief consumers of this material) ritually abused as children who “suddenly remember” it all under therapy, or in some cases due to religious conversions (shades of Diana Vaughn!).

Habeas corpus!

Finally the shocking, yet simple and rational questions began to be *heard*: Who did this (name some names), where are the bodies, were the police informed? Questions like this had been “asked” all along, but the public was not ready to hear the question or the actual answers. The crushing answers began to come in late 1989 and early 1990.

In October of 1989 the National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime at the FBI Academy in Quantico, Virginia issued a paper by Kenneth V. Lanning. It is an detailed analysis of all the charges of “satanic” or ritual crime brought in the US over the previous decade. The paper concludes in part: “After the hype and hysteria is put aside, the realization sets in that most satanic/occult activity involves the commission of NO crimes, and that which does usually involves the commission of relatively minor crimes...”

Later that same year Shawn Carlson and Gerald Larue issued *Satanism in America: How the Devil Got Much More Than His Due* as a final report for the Committee for the Scientific Examination of Religion. This work systematically dismantles the scam perpetrated by some law enforcement officials in conjunction with modern day free-lance witch-hunters. In their Abstract of the book the authors summarize their findings:

A great hoax is being perpetrated on the American public. A small group of religious fanatics, political extremists, bereaved parents, and the mentally ill, as well as a few well-intentioned individuals, are appearing on talk shows at police training seminars, at criminal trials and in newspaper interviews as “expert” witnesses with an alarming message: Satanism is rampant in America; Devil-worshippers are killing millions of children; Satanism is seducing teens into suicide pacts and driving our youth to violence. ... These experts have gone virtually unchallenged ... until now. As a result, lives have been destroyed, the practice of legitimate minority religions has been infringed and many millions of dollars have been wasted chasing the Devil’s tail.

The allegations of large scale Satanic conspiracies are totally without foundation. In fact, the available evidence leaves only one reasonable conclusion: *they do not exist!*(p. v.)

They go on to chronicle the real violence and sickness practiced by the letter-day witch-hunters themselves— as always in the name of God and Jesus. Some are seen to be mentally disturbed on one level of another, while others are following an extremist Christian political agenda.

In February of 1990 a rational voice was heard from a surprising, yet welcome, corner: the Christian media. Gretchen and Bob Passantino and Jon Trott published an article in the Christian magazine *Cornerstone*. This was an expose of the book *Satan’s Underground* by Lauren Stratford (Laurel Wilson) with help and promotion from Johanna Michaelson. Apparently even the rational Christians had heard about all they could stand by this time. Closer investigation into the life of Laurel showed a pathetically disturbed hysteric whose accusations of abuse began when she was a teenager— and were for years first directed against family members and pastors of churches. It wasn’t until 1985 that “satanism” became a part of her stories. She had been caught up in the then profitable business of the “Satan scare.”

In 1991 the book *In Pursuit of Satan* by Robert D. Hicks finished the job of blowing the lid off of the law-enforcement/ psychotherapy/ fundamentalism cabal showing, from an objective point of view, how unscrupulous police, therapists and activists of various stripes, have gotten together to *invent* the whole “Satan scare” to bolster their own positions and causes.

Both *Satanism in America* and *In Pursuit of Satan* approach the “Satan scare” from the perspective of an urban legend.

These beginnings of rationality have not quelled the hysteria completely, of course. More books and more tabloid-type media presentations would appear, but the rational law enforcement officials as well as established religious leaders had begun to see the light. The “scare” moved more and more to the fringes. But there is no reason to conclude that ignorance and stupidity will remain down for long...

So what, if anything, is happening out there in America to make people believe that satanic cults are abducting their children, breeding babies for sacrifice and lurking behind every bush in suburbia? There is a phenomenon here, but it is not what it seems. The roots of the phenomenon are not in the groups and individuals this book is about— they are in the minds of those whose vague fears and narrow world views make them ripe for belief in monstrous conspiracies of evil forces all around them. These are the people who need to believe in these urban legends because of their non-specific anxieties and fears, and who have the burning *desire* to believe in order to alleviate their grinding boredom and sense of insignificance. The “Satan scare” of the 1980s was in many ways an attempt by bored individuals to make life interesting and exiting— it was more fun to believe that such evil conspiracies existed than to believe they did not exist. Most people believe what it gives them pleasure to believe, or what they need to believe because of their own inner fears.

America’s first “witch scare,” 300 years ago in Salem, and its latest have much in common. The Salem witch trials were carried out by Puritans with an extremely narrow world view— which allowed for little variation or personal freedom. Things which were different from the “norm” were looked upon with suspicion. At the same time, many of the parents of Salem had to work hard all day long, just to be able to survive in the harsh new land. In 1692 taxes were high, war raged about them and smallpox was in the land. They entrusted the care of their children to servants. One in particular was a West Indian woman named Tituba. When a group of pubescent girls for whom Tituba cared exhibited strange behavior and fits (probably first brought on by accidental ergot poisoning) the adults thought it must be witchcraft. The children were put to the question by the reverend folk and began at first to accuse social misfits— the slave Tituba, the beggar Sarah Good and the cripple Sarah Osborne. But before it was over many, including one of the reverends himself, were either hanged or pressed to death for witchcraft.

Our society today is under similar, in some cases more subtle, and in some cases more profound, strains and stresses. Society is in many ways breaking down completely— the cultural norms that brought us up from the stone age are disintegrating. In two generations we have gone from multigenerational households — with children, parents and often grandparents, great aunts and uncles, and so on — to nuclear families — with children and parents — to a time when most children are either in single parent households or in households where both parents must work to meet (at least perceived) economic needs. The upshot of this is that most kids are raised by a combination of television, other kids and hired help (school teachers and day-care workers). There is a tremendous amount of archetypal stress put on a culture when such transformations occur.

These sociological factors explain a good deal of the specifics with regard to “Satanistic” phenomena: children exhibit “strange” behaviors (strange to the parents because they hardly see the kids), the whole world seems to be falling apart, parents can’t make enough money to acquire the things they want, preachers and therapists abound telling them that demons or organized cults of child molesters are lurking invisibly all around. It is always most effective to cast such paranoid suspicion on things that simply do not exist— that way the lack of objective evidence will: 1) make the evil seem all the more sinister, and 2) ensure that no positive objective counter-evidence can be produced. It is not long before there is a general “scare.” Of course, to the credit of the American people, such scares are not really taken *too* seriously— because on *some* level everybody knows it’s show-biz. But this is little consolation to the victims of the scare such as the McMartin workers or hundreds of others accused in this manner.

There is a deeper interpretation. What is responsible for the *need* to believe in these fearsome things— even when there is no evidence for them? The answer may be found in depth psychology. Another phenomenon on the increase about the same time as stories of “Satanicism” were tales of UFO abductees. These two phenomena have certain things in common: powerful, usually invisible, conspirators; sexual overtones or dominant themes (probing of the body, “breeding experiments,” etc.), and both are commonly things the victims “remember” after being subjected to “therapy.” The “survivors” of UFOs and Satanic cults can explain their present unhappiness and maladjustments in terms of what some evil villain has done to them in the past. Perhaps this is some emerging, and truly Satanic, twist of the myth of “original sin.” Now it is not the human who is responsible — and the sinner — it is an external force. Man can now say: “Hey, it’s not *my* fault!”

Those who suffer from deep-seated fears will inevitably project images of those fears into their environment. They will fear and detest that which they see around them which is at the same time a reflection of those things within themselves they fear and loathe. They fear and hate themselves, but instead of coming to terms with that, which is unacceptable, they project it onto convenient scapegoats. In extreme cases these may be served by Satanic cults or extraterrestrial invaders.

Another factor which can not go unmentioned when trying to explain the “Satanic scare” is that of its recreational dimension. It is fun to believe in for some people. It is a commodity, like rock n’ roll or Freddy Kruger. Mr. Kruger is a good illustration of this phenomenon. The reason why there are so few “Hell-fire and brimstone” sermons in the churches anymore is because we have folks like Mr. Kruger or Jason taking up the slack. Those old sermons didn’t *really* scare anybody— they were sensationalistic entertainment. Now we have Clive Barker, we don’t need the reverend Joe-Bob Billy-Bob to do that any more. But some of the “reverends” have simply tried to make their “Hell-fire and brimstone” more believable by packaging it a bit differently. It’s still entertainment, and it still sells. It’s also great fun for the sellers of this material. They get to tell all the lurid details of their lives in the pornographic-orgiastic-homicidal-breeder cult, while testifying all the while to their born-again status today. Many a “wolf” would love to have a suit of *those* “sheep’s clothing!” Just as it is with drugs, as long as there is a market for this kind of stuff, there will be providers of it.

The modern-day witch-hunters have followed in the free-lancing footsteps of Matthew Hopkins and others of the Protestant tradition who took the *Malleus Malificarium* as their handbook (today an “occult crime seminar,” or a “best-selling” book on the subject) and went to work hunting heretics, Satan-worshippers for fun and profit. Any one who can create a “scare” has done his work— and then he appears with the antidote: more seminars, more books, more television exposes...

It seems clear that the vast majority of the horror stories of Satanic cults circulated over the past two decades should must be relegated to the “urban legend file.” Does this mean the whole episode has been harmless? Or that we can forget it? Not in the least. Because it will come back, as all such phenomena do. And it does do harm: millions, if not billions of tax dollars are wasted on therapists, police investigations, and trials (!); the already epidemic anxiety is only exacerbated; fraud is committed by ex-cultists prying even more hard-earned money out of the hands of a fearful populace, *and worst of all attention is deflected from the real problems of the break-down of the family and child abuse* (which is rarely the act of strangers in “Satanistic” cults and almost always the work of other members of the child’s own family). This latter point is perhaps what has been the driving motivation behind much of this phenomenon— the family itself is morally sick and bankrupt and the “Satanistic cult” is the imaginary scapegoat.

All we can do is call for rationality to be exercised not in a passive way, but in an active one: Meet the problem where it actually is (in the minds of the accusers and in their own families), ask the hard questions (who, what, where, when, how?), and when the answers are found, act to bring light to the subject.

Terminus Viae

Afterword

The left-hand path is the way of the hero—the path of those who would dare breach the gates of eternity, to eat of the tree of life eternal having understood their own individual divinities. To stand against the inertia and ignorance of the whole of the universe—to strive against that which would thwart all intelligence and life—and to prevail against it, is the aim of the path sinister.

The left-hand path is simply the *way of non-union*, of individuation, of independence. The right hand path by contrast is the way of union, of collectivization, of dependence. What the left-hand path is *not* is “evil.” In fact, those who follow the left-hand path (by any name) today most closely approximate the ancient ideal of seeking the *agathôn*—“the Good.” On the left-hand path initiates seek to develop the Self to the point of divinity—this heightened sense of Self, once sufficiently developed, prevents any acts of true evil on the part of initiates because they have come to *know* and *understand* the Good.

The *via sinistra* is the path of sovereigns—those who would exercise sovereign power over themselves and their environments. Historical evidence for the presence of a true left-hand path is only obvious in cultures originally shaped by Indo-European ideology (Egypt being the only possible exception). The extremely ancient sovereign values of eternal life and unlimited power of the Self are reflected in the philosophy of the left-hand path.

I have shown that there are two distinct approaches to the left-hand path: the Transcendental Branch and the Immanent Branch. The Transcendental Branch of the Left-Hand Path makes use of an uncompromisingly subjective approach to the extant subjective universe—and thereby ultimately realizes the full reality and sovereignty of the Self. The Immanent Branch of the Left-Hand Path takes an indirect route. Those who go this way focus on their independent carnal existences and travel through images in the objective universe to arrive at a mysterious, often verbally indefinable state of being beyond the images. The branches terminate in a similar state, but their appearances are different.

The world needs to come to understand something of the left-hand path at this point in history as never before. This is because the world is now largely operating under a left-hand path paradigm. It is clear that the motivations for most (post-)modern individuals revolve around the extension of life, independence, freedom, knowledge, power and pleasure—we live in a Faustian, or Mephistophelean Age. The sooner the true character of the Age is recognized, the sooner those who live in it will be able to move about with some sense of confidence. This Age has *taken* an Age to arrive—but if we look to the older Age, and to those isolated individuals within the Age just passing, we will see examples of those who have mastered the path, who are Lords of the Left-Hand Path.

A Lord of the Left-Hand Path is one who has prevailed against the laws of the mechanical universe—the laws of stupidity, blind obedience to brute force, and eternal death of the intelligence—and created from substance of the self by means of Will immortal identity which is in and of itself the greatest defiance against the universe. Such a one stands alone amidst the storms and stresses all about—yet is not alone. For across the abysmal seas of the World of Horrors such a one will see and come to know other dark stars hovering over the waters. By knowing them the star of the singular self is made to burn with a brilliance of darkness unto the glory of desire.

Should there come a point in which all the individual intelligences scattered about the vastness beyond the borders of time and space are extinguished by force of Necessity— it is their glory which will give the greatest brilliance to the whole which, even if for only a fleeting moment, comes into being.

The only true enemy of the left-hand path is ignorance: the grinding human condition born of fear and expressed in vehement hatred. But this resistance too can be turned to strength by the power of the Will which belongs to the left-hand path to command. Where such ignorance is found, the Lord of the path will transform them into an illustration and illumination of the principles which distinguish his brilliance and intelligence from the obscurity and gloom which surrounds him. The left-hand path can break the bounds of time and reach back to discover moments which give strength to his purpose of will and which form the resistance which gives shape and direction to his power. In this way he defies the compulsions and coercions of the past— thwarting beyond time his eternal enemies who have embodied ignorance— and endow those moments with limitless possibilities for the future.

Salem, Massachusetts
31 October 1992ce

Reyn til Rúna!

Glossary

- antinomian:** Derived from the Greek *anti-nomos*, “against the law (*nomos*).” Here against the laws of God, the mechanical/organic universe, and especially irrational psychological or social compulsion, convention or habit.
- Black Magic:** A methodology for the exercise of independence from the universe and pursuit of self-oriented aims as defined by the left-hand path.
- Devil, the:** From the Greek *diabolos*, “slanderer, enemy,” see the Prince of Darkness
- duotheism:** The idea that there are two objectively separate forms of divinity arranged along sexually polarized lines—the God and the Goddess. Prevalent in both Indian tantrism (Shiva/Shakti) and modern Wicca, or witchcraft.
- evil:** Term used to characterize unconscious acts of criminality and cruelty among humans. Conscious evil is impossible. Often used by right-hand path fanatics to designate followers of the left-hand path. See good.
- good:** Term used to characterize objects or acts which either demonstrate or promote consciousness and self-realization or knowledge. Often inconsistently used by right-hand path fanatics to designate things for which they have a sentimental attachment. See evil.
- heretic:** From Greek *hairetikos*, “one who is able to choose.” Used to designate those who hold rebellious, unorthodox views or beliefs. A heretic practices heresy—which is often a punishable offence where right-hand path fanatics control society. See heterodox.
- heterodox:** From Greek *heterodoxos*, “differing in opinion.” Used to designate a heretic, or one who has opinions different from those accepted by the norms of society. See heretic.
- Immanent Branch:** The branch of the left-hand path by which the initiate seeks the left-hand path goals of self-deification (through initiatory magic), immortality and freedom from culturally and mechanically imposed norms by means of an objective (carnal) approach to the universe through external symbols and behaviors. Exemplified by the philosophy of Anton LaVey.
- initiation:** A gradual, rationally designated evolution of the essence of a person from one state of being to another.
- left-hand path:** The path of non-union with the objective universe, the way of isolating consciousness within the subjective universe and, in a state of self-imposed psychic solitude, refining the soul or psyche to increasingly perfect levels. The objective universe is then made to harmonize itself with the will of the individual psyche. Originally translated from Sanskrit *vamamarga*, “left-way.”
- Lord of the Left-Hand Path:** One who is capable of rejecting forms of conventional “good” and embracing those of conventional “evil,” and practicing antinomianism, as part of an effort to gain a permanent, independent, enlightened and empowered level of being.
- Lucifer,** Latin name meaning literally: “bearer of the light,” also a name for the Morning Star, see the Prince of Darkness.
- magic:** The willed application of symbolic methods to cause or prevent changes in the universe by means of symbolic acts of communication with paranormal factors. These factors could be inside or outside the subjective universe of the operator. Magic is a way to cause things to happen that would not happen naturally.
- objective universe:** The part of existence which can be sensed and quantified. It is the mechanical/organic cosmic order characterized by its regularity and predictability, by the presence of *laws*.

orthodox: From Greek *orthodoxos*, “correct in opinion.” Can be used to designate any kind of thought which has a rigid standard of “correctness,” especially ones which rely on arbitrary opinions or subjective criteria to establish such standards. Monotheistic religions, i.e. Judaism, Christianity and Islam, are best known for this, but it can be secularized in forms of “political correctness.”

Prince of Darkness: The first form or general principle of isolate intelligence from which all the particular manifestations of individual consciousness (or subjective universes) are derived — the ultimate deity of the left-hand path. An element of the non-natural universe objectively within the universe itself, therefore an independent sentient being in the objective sense because it is the very *principle* of that quality within the cosmos. Because of its categorical *separateness*, it is seen as rebellious and “evil” from the right-hand path perspective. More culturally neutral term for the same entity known in various left-hand path schools as Satan, Lucifer, Set, and so on.

religion: From Latin *re-ligio*, “reconnection.” Largely synonymous with the purposes of the right-hand path, to “re-connect,” to unify the self (or soul) of the individual with some larger whole, e.g. God, Nature, the Absolute, the Tao.

right-hand path: The path of union with universal reality (God or Nature). When this union is completed the individual self is annihilated, the individual will become one with the divine or natural order. Originally translated from Sanskrit *dakshinamarga*, “right-way.”

Satan: From the Hebrew *satán*, “opponent, adversary.” Used as a historical and conventional label by modern Satanists as an expression of antinomian practice. The “Satan” is that which *opposes* the status quo in principle. See the Prince of Darkness.

satanicism: A neologism meant to indicate not true Satanism but rather the ideas, patterns and fantasies projected by the fears of superstitious and fearful non-initiates these fantasies eventually surface as modern urban legends.

Satanism: The practice of the left-hand path as defined in terms of Judeo-Christian based terminology. It does not denote the “worship” of Satan, but rather the practice of the left-hand path in some form.

subjective universe: The “world” of any sentient entity within the universe. There are as many subjective universes as there are sentient beings, each is the particularized manifestation of consciousness within the universe.

tantrism: A philosophical and religious tradition found in both Hinduism and Buddhism. Characterized by antinomian practice, the worship of the Goddess (a *contra*-sexual deity), and by sexual symbolism. Tantrism is a tradition methodology and can serve either right-hand path or left-hand path aims.

Transcendental Branch: The branch of the left-hand path by which the initiate seeks the left-hand path goals of self-deification (through initiatory magic), immortality and freedom from culturally and mechanically imposed norms by means of a subjective (intellectual) approach to the subjective universe. Exemplified by the modern Temple of Set.

universe: The totality of existence, known and unknown.

White Magic: A psychological methodology for the promotion of *union* with the universe and pursuing aims in harmony with the laws of the (objective) universe.

General Bibliography

- Ach, Manfred and Clemens Pentrop. *Hitlers Religion*. Munich: Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Religions- und Weltanschauungsfragen, 1977.
- Alfred, Randall H. "The Church of Satan." In: *The New Religious Consciousness*. Eds. Charles Y. Glock and Robert N. Bellah. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.
- Angebort, Jean-Michel. *The Occult and the Third Reich*. New York: Macmillan, 1974.
- Aquino, Michael A. "Revelation of the Beast: Aleister Crowley." *CH* II (1970) (= *The Church of Satan* Appendix 19).
- (Aquino, Michael A.) "Official Degrees of the Church of Satan." *CH* IV:3 (March, 1972), pp. 6-8.
- Aquino, Michael A. "Interview with the Founder of the Church of Satan." (= *Black Pyramid* pp. 1-3) *Scroll of Set* XVII:3 (June, 1991), pp. 7-9.
- Aquino, Michael A. "Sheep in Wolves' Clothing—Introducing the Process." *CH* IV:5 (1972), pp. 15-16.
- Aquino, Michael A. *Black Magic in Theory and Practice*. San Francisco: The Temple of Set, 1987.
- Aquino, Michael A. *Book of Coming forth by Night: Analysis and Commentary*. San Francisco: Temple of Set, various dates.
- Aquino, Michael A. *The Church of Satan*. San Francisco: The Temple of Set, 1983; 1989, 2nd ed; 1992, 3rd ed.
- Armstrong, A. H. *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Aurelius, Marcus. *Meditations*. trans. Maxwell Staniforth. Baltimore: Penguin, 1964.
- Bachoffen, Johann Jakob. *Myth, Religion and Mother Right*. trans. R. Manheim. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967 [1848].
- Bacon, Francis. *Advancement of Learning and Novum Organum*. New York: Colonial, 1900.
- Bainbridge, William S. *Satan's Power: A Deviant Psychotherapy Cult*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1978.
- Bakunin, Michael. *God and the State*. New York: Dover, 1970.
- Barton, Blanche. *The Secret Life of a Satanist: The Authorized Biography of Anton Szandor LaVey*. Los Angeles: Feral House, 1990.
- Barton, Blanche. *The Church of Satan*. New York: Hell's Kitchen Productions, 1990.
- Baudelaire, Charles. *Les Fleurs du Mal*. trans. R. Howard. Boston: David R. Godine, 1982.
- Berlin, Isaiah. *Karl Marx*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Bhattacharyya, N. N. *History of the Tantric Religion*. New Dehli: Manohar, 1982.
- Blackett-Ord, Mark. *Hell-Fire Duke: The Life of the Duke of Wharton*. Windsor Forest, UK: Kensal Press, 1982.
- Blavatsky, Helena P. *Voice of the Silence*. Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1971.
- *The Secret Doctrine*. Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1974, 2 vols.
- *Isis Unveiled*. Pasadena, CA: Theosophical University Press, 1972, 2 vols.
- Blakney, Raymond B. *Meister Eckhart: A New Translation*. New York: Harper and Row, 1941.
- Bonnet, Hans. *Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1952.
- Boyce, Mary. *Zoroastrians: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Brick, Hans. *The Nature of the Beast*. New York: Crown, 1960.
- Brennan, J. H. *The Occult Reich*. New York: Signet, 1974.

- Brunvand, Jan Harold. *The Vanishing Hitchhiker*. New York: Norton, 1981.
----- *The Choking Doberman*. New York: Norton, 1984.
- Budge, E. A. Wallis. *Egyptian Language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958
- Burkert, Walter. *Ancient Mystery Cults*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Burns, Thomas S. *A History of the Ostrogoths*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- Campbell, Bruce. *Ancient Wisdom Revived: A History of the Theosophical Movement*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
- Carlson, Shawn and Gerald Larue. *Satanism in America: How the Devil Got Much More Than His Due*. El Cerrito, CA: Gaia Press, 1989.
- Cassirer, Ernst, et al. eds. *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Chamberlin, E. R. *The Bad Popes*. New York: Dorset, 1969.
- Clifton, Chas S. "The Three Faces of Satanism." *Gnosis* 12 (Summer, 1989), pp. 9-18.
- Cohn, Norman. *In Pursuit of the Millennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961, 2nd ed.
- Cohn, Norman. *Europe's Inner Demons*. NY: Basic Books, 1975.
- Colquhoun, Ithell. *Sword of Wisdom*. New York: Putnam, 1975.
- Conze, Edward. *Buddhism*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1961
- Cornford, Francis M, trans. and ed. *The Republic of Plato*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1941.
- Crowley, Aleister. *The Book of the Law*. New York: Magickal Child, 1990 [1938].
----- *The Book of Lies*. New York: Samuel Weiser, 1972 [1913].
----- *The Book of Thoth*. New York: Samuel Weiser, 1969 [1944].
----- *Confessions*. London: Arkana, 1979 [1930].
----- *Eight Lectures on Yoga*. Dallas, TX: Sangreal, 1972 [1939].
----- *The Equinox of the Gods*. Phoenix, AZ: Falcon, 1991 [1937].
----- *The Law is for All*. Phoenix, AZ: Falcon Press, 1975.
----- *Liber Aleph: The Book of Wisdom or Folly*. San Francisco: Level Press, 1974 [1961].
----- *The Magical Record of the Beast 666*. London: Duckworth, 1972.
----- *The Magical Diaries of Aleister Crowley*. York Beach, ME: Samuel Weiser, 1979.
----- *Magick*. York Beach, ME: Samuel Weiser, 1973 [1929].
----- *Magick without Tears*. St. Paul, MN: Llewellyn, 1973.
----- *The Vision and the Voice*. Dallas, TX: Sangreal, 1972.
- Cumont, Franz. *The Mysteries of Mithras*. New York: Dover, 1956.
- Daim, Wilfried. *Der Mann, der Hitler die Ideen gab*. Munich: Isar, 1958.
- Davies, Stevan et al. "The Kabbalah of the Nations: Anglicization of Jewish Kabbalah." *Studia Mystica* 3:3 (Fall, 1980), 34-47.
- Descartes, Rene. *Meditations on First Philosophy*. trans. L. Lafleur. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1951.
- DeGrimston, Robert. *Humanity is the Devil*. [?]: The Process, 1968.
- Doresse, Jean. *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*. Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 1986.
- Dragomanov, M. P. *Notes on the Slavic Religio-Ethical Legends: The Dualistic Creation of the World*. trans. E.W. Count. (= Russian and East European Series 23) Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1961.
- Eisler, Robert. *Man into Wolf*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1951.
- Eliade, Mircea. *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom*. trans. W. Trask. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969, 2nd ed.

- Eliade, Mircea. *History of Religious Ideas*. trans. W. Trask, A. Hildebeitel and D. Apastolos-Cappadona. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978-1985, 3 vols.
- , *Patterns in Comparative Religion*. trans. R. Sheed. New York: Meridian, 1963.
- , *The Two and the One*. trans. J. Cohen. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Fleming, William. *Arts and Ideas*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1986, 7th ed.
- Flowers, Stephen E. "Toward an Archaic Germanic Psychology," *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 11:1-2 (1983), pp. 117-138.
- , *Runes and Magic: Magical Formulaic Elements in the Older Runic Tradition*. New York: Lang, 1986
- , *Fire and Ice*. St. Paul, MN: Llewellyn, 1990.
- , *Black Rûna*. Smithville, Texas: Rûna-Raven, 1995.
- Forsyth, *Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth*. Princeton: University of Princeton Press, 1989.
- Frankfort, Henri. *Kingship and the Gods*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Frater U., D.. *Practical Sigil Magic*. St. Paul, MN: Llewellyn, 1990.
- Fritscher, John. *Popular Witchcraft*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1972.
- Fülöp-Miller, René. *The Mind and Face of Bolshevism: An Examination of Cultural Life in Soviet Russia*. London: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1927.
- Gardner, Gerald. *High Magic's Aid*. London: Michael Houghton, 1949.
- Gardner, Gerald. *Witchcraft Today*. Secaucus, NJ: Citadel, 1973 [1954].
- Gardner, Gerald. *The Meaning of Witchcraft*. New York: Magical Child, 1988 [1959].
- Godwin, Joscelyn. *Arktos: The Polar Myth*. Grand Rapids, MI: Phanes, 1993.
- Godwin, Joscelyn, Christian Chanel and John P. Deveney, eds. *The Hermetic Brotherhood of Luxor*. York Beach, ME: Samuel Weiser, 1995.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Faust*. trans. and ed. Charles Passage. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs and Merrill, 1965.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Faust: Eine Tragödie*. Erich Trunz, ed. Munich: Beck, 1976.
- Goodrick-Clarke, Nicholas. *The Occult Roots of Nazism*. Wellingborough, UK: Aquarian, 1985.
- Gorer, Geoffrey. *The Life and Ideas of the Marquis de Sade*. London: Peter Owen, 1953, 2nd ed.
- Grant, Kenneth. *Images and Oracles of Austin Osman Spare*. London: Muller, 1975.
- Grimm, Jacob. *Teutonic Mythology*. S. Stallybrass. New York: Dover, 1966, 4 vols.
- Guaita, Stanislas de. *Le serpent de la Genese*. Paris: Libraire du Marveilleux, 191-97, 2 vols.
- Guest, John S. *The Yezidis: A Study in Survival*. London: KPI, 1987.
- Gurdjieff, G. I. *Herald of the Coming Good*. New York: Samuel Weiser, 1970 [1933].
- , *Beelzebub's Tales to His Grandson*. New York: Dutton, 1973 [1949].
- , *Meetings with Remarkable Men*. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1963.
- , *Views from the Real World*. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1973.
- , *Life Is Only Real Then, When "I Am."* New York: E.P. Dutton, 1975.
- Guthrie, Kenneth S., ed. *The Pythagorean Sourcebook and Library*. Grand Rapids, MI: Phanes, 1987.
- Guthrie, William K. C. *Orpheus and Greek Religion*. New York: Norton, 1966, 2nd ed.
- Hamilton, Edith and Huntington Cairns. *Plato: The Collected Dialogues*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- Harden, Grant. "Satanism's Gone Underground, but It's Alive and Flourishing." *San Jose Mercury-News*. Oct. 29, 1978. (= COS Appendix 142).
- Heffner, R-M. S., et al. eds. *Goethe's Faust*. Lexington, MA: Heath, 1954.

- Helck, Wolfgang and Eberhard Otto, eds. *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1972-
- Herodotus. *The Persian Wars*. George Rawlinson ed. New York: Random House, 1942.
- Hesiod. *Theogony*. trans. N. O. Brown. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill, 1953.
- Hicks, Robert D. *In Pursuit of Satan*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus, 1991
- Hooke, S.H. *Middle Eastern Mythology*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963.
- Hornung, Erik. *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt: The One and the Many*. tr. John Baines. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982.
- Howe, Ellic. *The Magicians of the Golden Dawn*. York Beach, ME: Weiser, 1975.
- Hugo, Victor. *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*. New York, Signet, 1964 [1831].
- Hume, Robert E. *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads*. London: Oxford U.P., 1931, 2nd ed.
- Hunger, Ulrich. *Runenkunde im Dritten Reich*. Berne: Lang, 1984.
- Hymenaeus Beta, ed. *The Equinox* Vol. III No.10. New York: Thelema, 1986.
- Jordan, Paul. *Egypt: The Black Land*. Oxford: Phaidon, 1976.
- Karl Marx Friedrich Engels Gesamtausgabe*. Günter Heyden, et al., eds. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1975, 5 vols.
- Kater, Michael. *Das "Ahnenerbe" der SS: 1935-1945*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1974.
- Kelly, Aiden. *Crafting the Art of Magic*. St. Paul, MN: Llewellyn, 1991.
- King, Francis, ed. *The Secret Rituals of the O.T.O*. New York: Weiser, 1973.
- King, Francis. *Satan and Swastika*. Frogmore, UK: Mayflower, 1976.
- *Tantra for Westerners*. New York: Destiny, 1986.
- Klapp, Orrin. *Heroes, Villains and Fools*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Printice Hall, 1962.
- Klapp, Orrin. *The Collective Search for Identity*. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1969.
- Kramer, Samuel N. *The Sumerians*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.
- Lewin, Moshe. *The Making of the Soviet System*. New York: Putnam, 1985.
- Lanning, Kenneth V. *Satanic, Occult, Ritualistic Crime: A Law Enforcement Perspective*. Quantico, VA: National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime, 1989
- Lautreamont, Comte de. *Maldoror and Poems*. trans. Paul Knight. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1978 [1868].
- LaVey, Anton Szandor. *The Satanic Bible*. New York: Avon, 1969.
- [writing as John M. Kincaid] "An Explanation of the Various Degrees in the C/S." *CH* 2:11 (November, 1970), pp. 7-8.
- *The Compleat Witch: or What to do When Virtue Fails*. New York: Dodd and Mead, 1971.
- "What is a Satanic Master." *CH* III:9 (September, 1971), pp. 1-2.
- *The Satanic Rituals*. New York: Avon, 1972.
- "Untitled Editorial." *CH* IV:3 (March, 1972) pp. 11-12.
- "Working at Having Fun." *CH* IV:5 (May/June, 1972) pp. 18-20.
- "Music for the Ritual Chamber." *CH* IV:7 (1972), 27-30.
- "Erotic Crystalization Inertia (E.C.I.): Its Relationship to Longevity." *CH* V:1 (1973), 31-38.
- "Today's Madness is Tomorrow's Norm." *CH* Sept./Oct. (1975), [reprt. *CH* 84 (1980), pp. 1-3]
- "Utopia, Unity and Other Pleasant Diversions." *CH* May/June (1975)[reprt. *CH* 84 (1980), pp. 5-6.]
- "Hoofnotes." *CH* 8:1 Jan./Feb. (1976), pp. 2-3.
- "The C/S, Cosmic Joy Buzzer." *CH* (60) 8:2 Mar./Apr. (1976), pp. 3-4.
- "The Law of the Trapezoid." *CH* (64) 8:6 Nov./Dec. (1976), pp. 1-4.

- LaVey, Anton Szandor. "Brains for Sale Cheap." *CH* (65) 9:1 Jan./Dec. (1977), p. 4.
- "Misanthropia." *CH* (67) 9:3 May/June (1977), pp. 2-4.
- "How to Become a Werewolf: The Fundamentals of Lycanthropic Metamorphosis; the Principles of Their Application." *CH* (71) 10:1 Jan./Feb. (1978), 1-4.
- "What's New? Not Much." *CH* (74) 10:4 July/Aug. (1978), pp. 3-4.
- "Confessions of a Closet Misogynist." *CH* (75) Sept/Oct. (1978), p. 4.
- "Today's Madness is Tomorrow's Norm." [Reprint from *CH* Sept./Oct. (1975)] *CH* (84) March-June (1980), 1-4.
- "Megarhythm." *CH* (85) XII:4 (1980), pp. 1-2.
- "Power Through Alienation." *CH* (85) XII:4 (1980), pp. 2-3.
- "The Threat of Peace." *CH* (86) XII:5 (1980), pp. 1-3.
- "Eustress, Vampires and Vicariousness Revisited." *CH* (87) XII:6 (1980), 1-2.
- "Curses by the Dozen, or Wholesale Hexes." *CH* (88) XIII:1 (1981), pp. 1-3.
- "ECI Relative to Memory Retention: A Reevaluation of the Term *Occult*." *CH* (88) XIII:1 (1981), pp. 3-4.
- "Untitled Editorial." *CH* (93) XIII:6 (1981), p. 1.
- "Untitled Editorial." *CH* (96) XIV:3 (1982), p. 1.
- "Untitled Editorial." *CH* (103) XV:4 (1983), p. 1.
- "Untitled Editorial." *CH* (105) XV:6 (1983), p. 1.
- "Untitled Editorial." *CH* (106) XVI:1 (1984), p. 1.
- "Rhythm, Cadence, and Meter: The Foundation of Invocation." *CH* (112) XVII:1 (1985), p. 1.
- "The Order of the Trapezoid." *CH* (112) XVII:1 (1985), p. 3.
- "How to be God (or the Devil)." *CH* (113) XVII:2 (1985), p. 1.
- "Untitled Editorial." *CH* (113) XVII:2 (1985), p. 1.
- "Don't Recycle Your Brain." *CH* (115) XIX:1 (1986), p. 1.
- "The Invisible War." *CH* (116) XIX:2 (1986), pp. 1-3.
- "Satanica." *CH* (117) XIX:3 (1986), pp. 1-2.
- "Music for the Chamber." *CH* (118) XIX:4 (1986), pp. 2-3.
- "Illegal Music." *CH* (118) XIX:4 (1986), p. 3.
- "Binaric, or Don't Try to Teach a Pig to Sing — It Wastes Your Time and Annoys the Pig." *CH* (121) XX:3 (1987), 1-2.
- "Farewell Trinity and Remember Los Alamos." *CH* (122) XX:4 (1987), pp. 1-2.
- "Give the Children a Chance." *CH* (122) XX:4 (1987), pp. 2-4.
- "For the Record." *CH* (122) XX:4 (1987), p. 4.
- "Comparisons and Equivalents...." *CH* (123) XXII:1 (1988), pp. 1-4.
- "Pentagonal Revisionism: A Five-Point Program." *CH* (124) XXI:2 (1988), pp. 1-4.
- *The Satanic Witch*. [= reprint of *The Compleat Witch*] Los Angeles: Feral House, 1989.
- *The Devil's Notebook*. Los Angeles: Feral House, 1992.
- Lea, Henry C. *History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages*. New York: Macmillan, 1888.
- Lefebure, Charles. *The Blood Cults*. New York: Ace, 1969.
- Liebenfels, Jörg Lanz von. *Theozoologie*. Vienna: Moderner Verlag, 1905.
- Littleton, C. Scott. *The New Comparative Mythology*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

- Lother, Helmut. *Neuermanische Religion und Christentum*. Gutersloh: Bertelsmann, 1934.
- Lucretius. *On the Nature of the Universe*. trans. R. Latham. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1951.
- Lyons, Arthur. *The Second Coming: Satanism in America*. New York: Award, 1972.
- , *Satan Wants You: The Cult of Devil Worship in America*. New York: Mysterious Press, 1988.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Prince*. trans. T. G. Bergin. Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson, 1947.
- Mallory, J. P. *In Serach of the Indo-Europeans*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1989.
- Merritt, A. *Seven Footprints to Satan*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1928.
- Mettrie, Julien Offray de la. *The System of Epicurus*. [1764].
- , *Man a Machine*. Trans. G. C. Bussey et al. La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1912. [1748]
- Milton, John. *The Complete Poems*. London: Dent, 1980.
- Moody, Edward J. "Urban Witches." In: *Conformity and Conflict: Readings in Cultural Anthropology*. Eds: James P. Spradly and David W. McCurdy. New York: Little, Brown and Company, 1971.
- Moody, Edward J. "Magical Therapy: An Anthropological Investigation of Contemporary Satanism." In: *Religious Movements in Contemporary America*. Eds: Irving I. Zaretsky and Mark P. Leone. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974.
- Mookojee, Ajit and Madhu Khana. *The Tantric Way*. Bioston: New York Graphic Society, 1977.
- Mortensen, William. *The Command to Look*. San Francisco: Camera Craft, 1937.
- Nicholson, Reynold A. *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967, 2nd ed.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Birth of Tragedy*. trans. W. Kaufman. New York: Vintage, 1967 [1872].
- Newton, Issac. *Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*. trans. A. Motte. London: Motte, 1729.
- North, Robert. *The New Flesh Palladium: Magia Erotica*. Smithville, TX: Rûna-Raven, 1996.
- Nott, C.S. *Teachings of Gurdjieff*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961.
- O'Flaherty, Wendy Donniger. *The Rig Veda*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1981.
- Orwell, George. "Politics and the English Language." In: *The George Orwell Reader*. ed. Richard H. Revere. New York: Harcourt Brace and Javonovitch, 1984.
- , 1984. New York: Harcourt and Brace 1949.
- Ouspensky, P. D. *The Fourth Way*. New York: Vintage, 1971 [1957].
- , *A New Model of the Universe*. New York: Vintage, 1971 [1931].
- , *The Psychology of Man's Possible Evolution*. New York: Bantam, 1968 [1947].
- , *In Search of the Miraculous*. New York: Harvest, 1949 [1939].
- Paine, Thomas *The Age of Reason*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus, 1984. [1794-1795]
- Passantino, Gretchen and Bob and Jon Trott. "Satan's Sideshow." *Cornerstone* 90 (January, 1990), pp. 3-8.
- Pauwels, Louis. *Gurdjieff*. New York: Weiser, 1972.
- Pauwels, Louis and Jaques Bergier. *The Morning of the Magicians*. New York: Avon, 1968 [1960].
- Pennick, Nigel. *Hitler's Secret Sciences*. Sudbury, UK: Neville Spearman, 1981.
- Pausanias. *Description of Greece*. trans. W.H.S. Jones. London: Heinemann, 1918-1935, 4 vols.
- Peladan, Josephin. *La vice supreme*. Paris: Dentu, 1892.
- Pipkin, Paul. "The Ritual Chamber at Roissy." *Cloven Hoof* (73) X:3 (1977), pp. 1-3.

- Polomé, Edgar C. "Some Comments on *Völuspá* Stanzas 17-18." In: Polomé, E.C. ed. *Old Norse Literature and Mythology: A Symposium*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1969, pp. 265-290.
- Pritchard, J.B. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955, 2nd ed.
- Rand, Ayn. *Atlas Shrugged*. New York: Signet. [1957].
- Randolph, Paschal Beverly. *Sexual Magic*. trans. Robert North. New York: Magickal Child, 1988.
- Rauschnig, Hermann. *Voice of Destruction. (Gespräche mit Hitler)*. New York: Putnam, 1940.
- Ravenscroft, Trevor. *The Spear of Destiny*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1973.
- Redbeard, Ragnar. *Might Is Right*. Port Townsend, WA: Loompanics Unlimited, [1896].
- Regardie, Israel. *The Eye in the Triangle*. St. Paul, MN: Llewellyn, 1970.
- Renou, Louis, ed. *Hinduism*. New York: George Braziller, 1961.
- Rhode, Erwin. *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality Among the Greeks*. trans. W. B. Hillis. Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1972.
- Rhodes, Henry T.F. *The Satanic Mass*. Secaucus, NJ: Citadel, [1954].
- Riemer, Neal. *Karl Marx and Prophetic Politics*. New York: Praeger, 1987.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Confessions*. trans. W. C. Mallory. New York: Tudor, 1935.
- Romer, John. *Ancient Lives: Daily Life in Egypt of the Pharaohs*. New York: Henry Holt, 1984.
- Russell, Dick. "Anton LaVey: The Satanist Who Wants to Rule the World." *Argosy* (June, 1975).
- Russell, Jeffery B. *The Devil*. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- *History of Witchcraft*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1980.
- *Mephistopheles*. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986.
- Rusten, Rudolf, ed. *Was tut not?: Ein Führer durch die gesamte Literatur der Deutschbewegung*. Leipzig: Hedler, 1914.
- Sade, Marquis de. *The Marquis de Sade: The Complete Justine, Philosophy in the Bedroom and other writings*. trans. R. Seaver and A. Wainhouse. New York: Grove, 1966.
- *Juliette*. New York: Grove, 1968.
- Saunders, Jason L. *Greek and Roman Philosophy after Aristotle*. New York: Free Press, 1966.
- Scheible, J. *Das Kloster*. Stuttgart: [private], 1846.
- Scholem, Gershom. *Kabbalah*. New York: New American Library, 1978.
- Sethe, Kurt. *Die ägyptischen Pyramidentexte*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1960 [1908-22], 4 vols.
- Seznec, Jean. *The Survival of the Pagan Gods*. trans. B. Sessions. New York: Harper and Row, 1953.
- Singer, June. *The Unholy Bible*. New York: Putnam, 1970.
- Spare, Austin Osman. *Earth: Inferno*. London: The Author [1905].
- *Book of Pleasure (Self-Love)*. Toronto: 93 Publishing, 1975 [1913].
- *The Focus of Life*. Seattle, WA: Axil Press, 1984 [1921].
- Speeth, Kathleen R. *The Gurdjieff Work*. New York: Pocket, 1976.
- Sprenger, H. and J. Kramer (Institoris). *Malleus Malificarum*. trans. M. Summers. London: Pushkin, 1928.
- Stratford, Lauren. *Satan's Underground*. Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 1988.
- Stutley, Margaret and James. *Harper's Dictionary of Hinduism*. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.
- Symonds, John. *The Great Beast: The Life and Magick of Aleister Crowley*. Frogmore, UK: Mayflower, 1972.

- Terry, Maury. *The Ultimate Evil*. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Thorsson, Edred (= S. E. Flowers). *Rune Might*. St. Paul, MN: Llewellyn, 1989.
- Thorsson, Edred (= S. E. Flowers). *The Book of Ogham*. St. Paul, MN: Llewellyn, 1992.
- Towers, Eric. *Dashwood: The Man and the Myth*. Wellingborough, UK: Crucible, 1986
- Truzzi, Marcello. "The Occult Revival as Popular Culture." *Sociological Quarterly* 13 (Winter 1972), pp. 16-36.
- Turville-Petre, E.O.G. *Myth and Religion of the North*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Twain, Mark. *No. 44, The Mysterious Stranger*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982 [1969].
- Twain, Mark. *Letters from the Earth*. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1962.
- Valiente, Doreen. *The Rebirth of Witchcraft*. Custer, WA: Phoenix, 1989.
- Vondung, Klaus. *Magie und Manipulation: Ideologischer Kult und politische Religion des Nationalsozialismus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
- Vries, Jan de. *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1956-1957, 2 vols.
- . *Keltische Religion*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1961.
- Walker, Benjamin. *Tantrism*. Wellingborough, UK: Aquarian Press, 1982.
- Walker, Benjamin. *Gnosticism: Its History and Influence*. Wellingborough, UK: Aquarian Press, 1983.
- Waterfield, Robin, trans. *Theology of Arithmetic*. Grand Rapids, MI: Phanes, 1988.
- Webb, James. *The Occult Underground*. La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1974.
- . *The Harmonious Circle*. New York: Putnam, 1980.
- Widengren, Geo. *Die Religionen Irans*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1965
- Wilson, Colin. *G. I. Gurdjieff: The War Against Sleep*. Wellingborough, UK: Aquarian, 1986.
- . *The Nature of the Beast*. Wellingborough, UK: Aquarian, 1987.
- Wilson, Peter Lamborn. *Scandal: Essays in Islamic Heresy*. New York: Automedia, 1988.
- Wistrich, Robert. *Who's Who in Nazi Germany*. New York: Macmillan, 1982.
- Wolfe, Burton. "The Church of Satan." In: Tracy Cabot, ed. *Inside the Cults*. Los Angeles: Holloway House, 1970, pp. 207-223.
- Wolfe, Burton. *The Devil's Avenger: A Biography of Anton Szandor LaVey*. New York: Pyramid, 1974.
- Wright, Lawrence. "Sympathy for the Devil." *Rolling Stone*. (Sept. 5, 1991), pp. 62-68; 105-106.

Periodicals

- The Cloven Hoof* 1969-1988 (Editor: Anton LaVey 1969-1972; 1975-1988 and Michael Aquino 1972-1975)
- The Equinox* Aleister Crowley, ed. (vol. I nos. 1-10, 1909-1913).
- Scroll of Set* various editors. 1975-present

Titles of Related Interest from Rûna-Raven

Black Rûna Stephen Edred Flowers

This contains articles written for *Runes*, the journal of the Order of the Trapezoid, which have been found to be of general interest. This work will go a long way toward demonstrating the character of symbolic and magical work within the Order, and will fill in some "gaps" in the public's knowledge concerning the works of Edred Thorsson. This strictly limited collectors edition reveals for the first time some of the inner documents of the Order of the Trapezoid. The Introduction includes biographical data and material from the *Lords of the Left-Hand Path* manuscript.

(Edition limited to 504 copies) \$31.00

Carnal Alchemy: A Sado-Magical Exploration of Pleasure, Pain and Self-Transformation Crystal Dawn and Stephen Flowers

This text re-introduces a powerful philosophy and magical technology to the contemporary world of western sexual magic. Sado-masochistic sexuality is among the least understood aspects of sexual expression. It is tinged with overtones of the mysterious and forbidden — these things, as well as physiological facts about it — make it a powerful form of sexuality to be combined with spiritual or magical aims.

\$13.00

The New Flesh Palladium Robert North

This is the long-awaited manifesto of the New Flesh Palladium, a sex-magical order headed by Robert North, the translator of Paschal Beverly Randolph's infamous *Sexual Magic*. The author traces the development of the idea of the New Flesh through the intellectual worlds of the 17th through 20th centuries— exploring the ideas of Swedenborg, Sade, Thomas Lake Harris, Randolph, Crowley, Spare and Wilhelm Reich. This first Rûna-Raven edition is limited to 245 numbered copies.

\$16.00

Rûnarmál I Stephen Edred Flowers

The title means "Sayings of the Rune." This is a compilation of 11 essays based on a series of talks given by Edred over the course of the spring and summer of 1991ev. Their intent was to explore the concept underlying the Runes— *Rûna*. As such the work is a study in the operative formula hidden within the present Runic stream. Most of the contents of these essays have, until now, only been available as oral teachings. This is the most significant work to appear in years in the Runic Tradition— and provides a key to other works.

\$13.00

The Seven Faces of Darkness: Practical Typhonian Magic Don Webb

Here is a book which penetrates to the core of the Typhonian current active in the world today— and does so by returning to the very fountainheads of Setian practice and philosophy. Never before has anyone made the true Typhonian current more plain and objective, in practice or in theory.

\$16.00

To order any of the books above, send the price plus \$1.50 for the first book, \$1.00 for additional books to: Rûna-Raven, Post Office Box 557, Smithville, Texas 78957