

The Scroll of Set

Issue Number 90

Volume XIII-3

June 1987

Editor: Constance L. Moffatt IV°

Copyright © 1987 Temple of Set

[1] An Open Letter to the Temple Priesthood

- by George C. Smith II° and Ruth E. Smith I°

How exactly does an Initiate of the Priesthood of Set know that Set is real? We know it isn't "faith", since the Temple subscribes to the use of reason to at least weed out untrue ideas. Our question, more precisely, is whether the reality of Set is a **belief** or **knowledge** supported by experience.

We understand that intuition is involved here, but what leads the Priesthood to assume that this intuition is correct? We can understand how we can propose the existence of an alien intervention creating intelligence in early man. That is a belief which has no evidence to deny it and some evidence to support it. If intuition supported this belief, it still would not be knowledge. [Almost the same steps could describe the beliefs of most UFO cults in the world.]

We have as viewed intuition in this context in the same way we view hypnosis used in police work. Hypnosis, like intuition, can be used to re/uncover useful experiences [like the memory of a license plate]. Then reason can assess this "experience" and determine the extent to which it is valid. ["Sorry, sir, but there is no such license-plate number."]

However - and this is very important - intuition without some means of being verified cannot be distinguished from hallucination and is **not** a valid foundation for knowledge. If you have doubts concerning this, interview a few schizophrenics at a local psychiatric hospital. As you walk out afterwards, recognize the important difference between subjective experience and verifiable knowledge. This question is important because we see some evidence both ways.

First, if communion with Set stems from a rational assumption of an alien intervention in prehistoric human evolution [at least], and the Priesthood are those who carry this **belief** forward through intuitive perception, then we need to recognize this because it means that we need to also test these intuitions to be certain they are "in line" with our reasoned best beliefs concerning Set.

Second, if communion with Set stems from **knowledge** - a rationally-verified communication through an intuitive means with a [truly] extra-

terrestrial [extra-universal!] entity - that's **impressive**.

If the second hypothesis is true, then we wonder how any human being with such knowledge (such as Barrett, Ethel, or Norton) could ever even consider leaving the Temple. Since this has happened in the past, we assume that the first hypothesis is more accurate.

Yet if the first hypothesis is accurate, then how do we know we are in communication/communion with an entity called Set? How do we even that there is such an entity?

As we understand it, we claim to carry on the esoteric inner teachings of the Church of Satan in that we acknowledge the existence of the Prince of Darkness. The exoteric/outer C/S had a comparatively "easy" time of it on this issue, since they simply held the individual as the godhead. We apparently aren't in that position.

There is something here that we just don't understand. If the reality of Set is a belief we then support through intuitive experience, how do we know we are not engaging in sophisticated self-deception? If the reality of Set is a knowledge we can gain through intuitive experiences validated in some testable way, how then could select individuals turn their backs on such knowledge as has happened in the past? Or is there a third alternative we haven't seen?

Please help us here. This is not intended as an attack upon the Temple. Since the Temple is dedicated to a search for the truth, such questions are asked in just that spirit.

[2] Response to Smith Letter (#1)

- by Robert H. Moffatt IV°

The reality of Set is both a belief and a knowledge supported by experiences.

The proportion of belief to knowledge [and experiences] varies among individual Initiates, and knowledge overwhelms their need to believe as they work and Become.

There is an esoteric form of awareness¹ of Set in Temple members generally, consisting of more belief [or faith²] than knowledge. There is an esoteric form of awareness of Set in the Priesthood generally, consisting of more knowledge than belief.

The first main concession remains in all degrees, and that is in embracing³ the *Book of Coming Forth by Night* as a genuine revelation⁴ from Set to Michael Aquino.

It is easy for the average thinker to assume that we are engaging in "sophisticated self-deception", but the quest is far better than accepting existentialism. Reread the relevant sections of *Black Magic* in the *Crystal Tablet*.

Perhaps we are balanced⁵ schizoids. The Temple explores the reality of individual subjective universes.⁶ That's what schizos do. Can I prove that their truths are less valid than mine?

Before I became a Priest of Set, I thought the Temple of Set to be a "religion" for appearances only. I did not want to call the Temple anything more than a "course of exploration" or a "way of life", because I was embarrassed and resentful of the years of my life wasted being inculcated with the great white lie, and I wanted to pursue this Setian thing using the scientific method.

Following the most important event in my life, Becoming a Priest, I thought differently. This was because I realized I had adopted a personal set of attitudes and practices, and that was enough to come under the definition of religion. Importantly the Temple of Set is not a **retreat** from the great white lie but rather an **overrunning** of it - something greater than mere religion.

I turned away from both the scientific and the empirical methods of seeking reality because I found them both lacking. I have solid evidence of my own growth in perception and wakefulness, in the use of the mundane five, the sixth (intuition), and occult senses. I am convinced that the non-natural senses - those which capture the hidden or occult world - are the ones which can discover the greatest measure of reality. This to me is the world of magic.

Such knowledge must be constantly nurtured by work and Remanifestation of the Initiate's being. If it is not - if petty ego-trips, "tree-climbing", frustration, fears, resentments, jealousies, rejections, personality-clashes, and/or closed-mindedness are allowed to becloud the quest, awareness of Set can actually be **forgotten**. To me this explains how anyone of any degree can leave the Temple of Set.

There is nothing new that the Priesthood - as individuals or as a group - know about Set that can be simply relayed. Sorry about that. All we can do is try to "infect" you with eagerness to Become and a sense of anticipation for what may develop.

If this seems to be begging the question, then a certain amount of **trust** [synonym of "faith"] is suggested. Take a chance on being less analytical in conventional ways. Try looking more peripherally and "into the cracks". Try thinking in the other languages you know - including "grokking", of course!

I am not bothered by your direct questioning of the very foundation of the Temple of Set. That's is what "postulancy" is for. I **do** get the impression that you are looking for a short-cut to Setamorphosis. Have you read all of the RL1 books yet? *Black Magic* and the *Book of Coming Forth by Night Analysis & Commentary*? What I have written here is elaborated therein.

Thanks for the opportunity to try to help you.

Notes

1. Or wakefulness. Read #19B on the reading list if you haven't yet.
2. Read Robertt Neilly's "On Faith - A Setian Definition" in *Scroll #VI-2*.
3. Willfully until you have reason to think otherwise. This is not blind, unquestioning faith. To have blind faith is to cease to wonder. How tragic!
4. Definition #3 of "revelation", *Webster's 9th New Collegiate Dictionary*.
5. I can't put my finger on the first written observation that balance is signified in the inverse pentagram by the fact that it stands on one point. [Note by M. Aquino 1994: **This note** is the first as far as I know.]
6. There are undoubtedly more "Setians" out there who have not [yet] found us.

[3] Response to Smith Letter (#2)

- by Michael A. Aquino VI^o

By way of supplemental comment to Magister Moffatt's response:

One can determine the reality of a thing either by the experience of it or by a logical argument in support of its existence. We know that gravity exists not because there is some commandment graven in stone that proclaims that there must be attraction between mass, but rather because we **feel** it - and feel it regularly enough so that we **trust** in its continued existence.

[Nevertheless trust in the senses can be misleading, as an entire corpus of Cartesian philosophy demonstrates. An evening spent with a good stage magician will make the same point.]

Or logically we can conclude that something exists because there are supportive phenomena that necessitate - or at least strongly support - its existence. Astronomers now believe that there is a tenth planet beyond Pluto. It has not yet been seen by telescope, but the gravitational and orbital behavior of the other distant planets in the solar system suggest its pull on them, hence its presence.

Where the Church of Satan was concerned, the existence of Satan began as a sensed phenomenon in ritual which the Priesthood agreed upon but could not logically explain. It was the experience of an "intelligent presence" of something "not oneself" yet somehow linked intimately with oneself. After the especially-strong experience of the *Book of Coming Forth by Night*, I endeavored to propose a factual rationale for the existence of Set which would not depend upon the aforementioned "suprarational" experience.

I call your attention to *Black Magic* in the *Crystal Tablet*, wherein I attempt to logically and factually demonstrate why there is a greater necessity to presume the existence of Set than to presume his non-existence. Acceptance of this argument does not, of course, guarantee an individual a similar personal experience of the Form of Set.

One can put the practical knowledge of the Temple of Set to use, however, without having had such an experience. Interest in and expertise at applying such knowledge are what identify the Setian I° and Adept II° respectively. Setians and Adepts may sense the reality of Set as they exercise this knowledge in GBM workings, but it is precisely the full experience which distinguishes a Priest or Priestess of Set from the I° or II°.

I cannot emphasize too strongly how different the Priesthood of Set is from conventional priesthoods and ministries, which are merely moral(?)-professions in fancy-dress. Again I would call you attention to Plato's "pyramid of thought" concept, in which the "climb" of the psyche through the progressively more logically-rigorous levels of *Pistis* and *Dianoia* ultimately enable it to apprehend Forms - not through continued logic, but through a higher, suprarational level of thought: *Næsis*. It is crucial to this system that *Næsis* be built upon the aforementioned rigorous base; it cannot be "jumped to" by the normal, animalistic mind [existing at the *Eikasia/Pistis* levels alone]. See also #19B on the reading list for an alternative discussion of such "mental levels".

Aleister Crowley once remarked [contemptuously, while speaking of conventional religions] that if one had truly experienced the existence of a God such as Judæo/ Christianity proposed, and if eternal burning in Hell were indeed the punishment for displeasing such a God, one would "go raving about the world" during one's entire Earthly life, trying desperately to please said God and to convince others to do likewise. Jews and Christians obviously do not do this. They endorse their "God" when it is convenient to do so and ignore him when it isn't. It ought to be patently obvious to anyone with an IQ of +2 or more what a sham this is - something right out of Rudyard Kipling's Bander-log in the *Jungle Books*.

The Priesthood of Set, however, has learned that - despite the intensity of the "Set-experience" - it is unwise to speak too emphatically or explicitly about it to those who have not had it. It cannot be logically/factually explained any more than one can explain "red" to a blind man. And the profane do not take kindly to "one-eyed men in the country of the blind" [see the H.G. Wells story in question].

What all this boils down to is that you should be able to use the "machinery" of the Temple of Set at the I°/II° level without feeling that you have to know the metaphysics underlying that machinery. If the machinery works in ways that stimulate and satisfy you, that should be sufficient. I drive a Lotus Esprit and adore it; I become one with the car. Yet I am not a Lotus engineer and could not explain with technical precision why this is a car unlike any other in existence.

If you become an "engineer" of the Temple of Set, i.e. experience That which we Recognize as the Priesthood, you'll know it for what it is. [Then, like other Priests and Priestesses, you'll wonder at the "blindness" of those who do **not** show this special kind of sight.]

This brings me to the second part of your question: Why have persons with such Awareness left the Temple? Either because their experience was spurious to begin with [remember that the Temple Recognizes this experience largely through trust in the individual's affirmation] or because their exhilaration at such an experience became translated into contempt for Setians who had not had it. Barrett, Ethel, and Norton abused the Priesthood in just this way. Incidentally none of them - or any other ex-senior Initiate - disavowed the experience or reality of Set upon leaving [or being expelled from] the Temple. Their problem with the Temple was one of ethics, courtesy, and decency - not metaphysics.

My ultimate prescription is very simple: Do not "believe" in the cosmology of the Temple of Set beyond that which seems sensible to you. [And that cosmology is ever-evolving; remember that we talk in terms of "best premises" rather than dogma.] Rather explore, use, and synthesize the "machinery" of LBM & GBM with which you are comfortable.

Adeptship may well be indefinite - and entirely adequate, as it has been for many Setians who have remained at that level. The Priesthood should not be viewed as just a "next step up a ladder", but rather as something unique which can be **approached** through personal effort but which **cannot be attained** solely through it.

[4] **Sacred Writings, Sacred Cows, and Satanism**

- by Michael A. Aquino VI°

Recently an Adept of the Temple sent me the record of an extensive, original working, asking whether I thought it appropriate for the *Ruby Tablet*. In particular the Adept was concerned about some modifications made to the Enochian words in the Fifth Part of the *Word of Set*. The Adept compared

the *Book of Coming Forth by Night* and the *Diabolicon* to Aleister Crowley's "Class A" publications, which Crowley insisted should be considered sacred writings beyond interpretation or editorial tampering. Should the *Word of Set* be similarly enshrined? The Adept noted:

According to the *Satanic Bible*, the Fifth Enochian Key affirms the Satanic placing of traditional priests and wizards upon the Earth for the purpose of misdirection. The *Word of Set* and the *Book of Coming Forth by Night* offer me a variety of definitions - and all of them valid at the time of my working. I still like Anton LaVey's definition also. The *Word* was modified to suit my magical being.

The working record goes on to integrate many GBM techniques, to include quotations from *Paradise Lost*, *Abra=Melin*, the *Diabolicon*, Crowley's *Liber 89 vel Chanokh*, and my Lovecraftian rituals from the *Satanic Rituals*. It is an impressive synthesis indeed. So what of the modification of the text to the Fifth Part of the *Word of Set*?

Of all the workings I personally have undertaken in the course of my initiation, the ones concerning which I feel most intensely are the *Book of Coming Forth by Night*, the *Word of Set*, the *Diabolicon*, and the *Ninth Solstice Message*. If we were to use Crowley's system of classification, I would consider these four items in the "Class A" category.

This paints me into something of a corner where the "Enochian Keys" are concerned. Back in the Age of Satan I used to enjoy experimenting with the construction and application of the Keys as much as anyone else. After all, they took up half of the *Satanic Bible* and were used to "send" virtually every working that the Church and its Grottos ever performed. You did your ritual and "finished it off" with the most appropriate EK from the descriptions in the *SB*. Even if the rest of the ritual were phrased in straightforward English, the EK could always be relied upon to add the necessary, spooky element of mysterious mumbo-jumbo at the end. [Anton LaVey even had the Mexican extras in *The Devil's Rain* chanting an Enochian phrase over and over again, which he taught them from a blackboard set up in the middle of Durango. In that same movie, Satanic Priest Ernest Borgnine added some random Enochian to the tail end of phrases from my Ceremony of the Nine Angles, again to make his incantation a touch more mysterioso.]

As is well known, the *Book of Coming Forth by Night* incorporates a strong statement to the effect that true Black Magicians need not "scare

themselves" with ritual texts that are *prima facie* meaningless to them. With regard to the Enochian Keys, the *Book of Coming Forth by Night* said, equally bluntly, that it was time to stop dithering with them in their garbled, nonsensical form and seek instead for their true/original meaning, i.e. the *Word of Set*. For one reason or another I wasn't able to undertake this working for several years. When it was undertaken, the astonishing result was that the previously-hodgepodge text of the "Enochian Keys" suddenly turned into a very coherent message (the first eighteen Parts) followed by an operative incantation (the nineteenth Part).

As I now see the *Word of Set*, the restored texts of the nineteen Parts should not be tampered with; the first eighteen Parts are "receivings" (statements to be understood and acted upon), while the nineteenth Part is a "sending" (an operative incantation, which may be modified in thirty different ways with reference to the appropriate æthyr). To this extent I would consider the *Word of Set* "Class A".

Where it ceases to be "Class A" is with reference to what happens when one or more of the æthyrs should be activated by the nineteenth Part. This opens virtually limitless vistas to the magician, the most extensive example of such workings being, of course, Crowley's *The Vision and The Voice*. At some time when I am free to be less preoccupied with the Temple's structural development, I want to "tour the æthyrs" myself. But the results of that working would not be "Class A". They would be at the II°-IV° level, I presume, and [if any good] would most probably head for the *Ruby Tablet*.

One of the curious things about all this is that I am not really sure what an "æthyr" actually is. I know all about the Hebraic/Cabalistic ray/emanation stuff and discount it along with the tooth fairy and the Easter bunny. But I "instinctively" feel that there is **something** to the notion of æthyrs - perhaps more akin to HPL's notions of multidimensional space. Here we are getting very fast into the realm of quantum mechanics - a field which is still somewhat screwed up by passionate Einsteinism. There are physical phenomena which suggest a kind of "Möbius" aspect to space, for example the intense radiation from the Crab Nebula, which could signify a "matter/antimatter gate" there. [Cf. #22B & #22C.]

Now let's back-track a moment and talk about the "old" Enochian Keys. As I have said, I myself cannot/will not go back to them. Does this mean that no other Setian should either?

I hate to say something like that on principle - the principle being that it is fun to fool around with cranky old occultisms. In this sense the Church of Satan was much more fun than the Temple of Set,

because the C/S grabbed anything around - Enochian Keys, HPL, Crowley, you-name-it - and rather ruthlessly used it any way it wanted to. It thought nothing at all of jamming anything handy into Cinderella's glass slipper, to the righteous horror of "orthodox/traditional" occultists and Cabalists.

The irony was that the C/S approach **worked** - and worked almost always better and more smoothly than the so-called "original" approaches. Part of Anton LaVey's genius was to see that **all** ritual magical texts and trappings such as ritual chambers are **all** adjuncts and assists to the **actual** thing, which is a mind/intelligence/psyche-centered process.

This is a big pill to swallow, because it can be extended to embrace **all** sacred cows, including the "Class A" ones, from the Ten Commandments on down to the U.S. Declaration of Independence. In this greatest sense it also embraces the *Book of Coming Forth by Night* and the *Word of Set*, meaning that these things are not sacred just because of the words they include, but rather because of the greater principles they reflect and communicate. Those same principles could conceivably be communicated in any number of different ways.

Hence I am as impatient with traditional occultism as I am with conventional religion. I lump them all together in the rag-bag of "eating the sizzle rather than the steak". A Catholic priest mumbling a mass is no different than a Thelemite mumbling *Liber AL*; both are missing the significance of the forest because they are merely becoming expert at counting trees.

By now I think you can see where all this is leading. You are not violating "sacred turf" when you tinker with the old "Enochian Keys" [although I think that you should then refer to them as such and not as the *Word of Set*, which specifically identifies the working by that name]. Nor are you offending Set if you invoke Satan, or if you refer to yourself as a Satanist rather than a Setian, as long as you know **what** you are doing and **why**. You would be "violating your Initiation" **only** if, after considering what I have discussed here, you were to deliberately "blind yourself" and go plunging back into old, primitive superstitions about the Enochian System, or Satan/Hell/etc.

Another area in which we used to run into problems in the Temple along this line is the Tarot. It is a beautiful piece of symbolism which lends itself all too easily to "worship as an oracle" rather than to employment as a deliberate LBM/GBM tool by the Black Magician. I used to horrify people all the time by saying, "Decide what you want the cards to say and mean, and then make them say it

and mean it. Use stage-magic techniques as an LBM assist to make the proper cards appear." After the cries of "heresy!" and "blasphemy!" subsided, it began to occur to onlookers that this is **precisely what Aleister Crowley did** with his *Book of Thoth* and accompanying deck. Like Moses, who threw out one golden calf merely in order to replace it with another (called the 10 C's), Crowley tossed out previous Tarots and replaced them with his own "to cause change in accordance with his Will". Setians are welcome to use the Crowley Tarot, of course, just as they are welcome to use the "Enochian Keys" - as long as they don't bow down before them. Here's what Anton LaVey had to say about such things, from the September VI *Cloven Hoof*:

It is bad enough to hear of the "great teachings" of Aleister Crowley, who hypocritically called himself by the Christian Devil's number yet steadfastly denied any Satanic connections, who wrote and had published millions of words of Cabalistic mulligatawny, the distilled wisdom of which could have been contained in a single volume of once-popular E. Haldeman Julius' *Little Blue Books* (which sold for a nickel) ... If Crowley were a magician, it was the beauty of his creative art which made him so, not his drug-befuddled callings-up of Choronzon et al.

I get fed up to the stomach-turning point listening to would-be students waxing eloquent over Israel Regardie's *Golden Dawn*, with its ponderous bulk blotched by sigil after sigil of holy esoterica. The very jacket design fairly screams out "Oh, God, how good and light and righteous we are!" with a rayed cross of a magnitude that should have awakened Bela Lugosi back to life out of sheer shock. Mr. Regardie, like his white-light predecessors, rambles through five pounds of accumulated Cabalistic toxemia and burned-out Rosicrucianism before his literary enema yields a few scant pages of today's dinner, namely a watered-down version of the Enochian Keys.

No, I cannot accept the worth of these "masters", who couldn't get off a semi-logical thought without falling victim to what H.G. Wells superbly defines as "big thinks". These works were around when I wrote the *Satanic Bible*. I had even **read** them, as well as Montague Summers, Rollo Ahmed, Ophiel, Bardo, Butler, Hall, etc., who wrote reams of arcane rhetoric and produced plates of pretty symbols, yet couldn't seem to say what they meant nor mean what they said. Somehow an occasional member who has "discovered" an occult

“master’s” writings of the past forgets all about those opening lines in the preface to the *Satanic Bible*, assuming, I guess, that I didn’t know about his new-found bit of esoterica when I took pen in hand.

At the tender age of 12, when I grew disenchanting halfway through the *Albertus Magnus* and a third of the way through the *Sixth and Seventh Books of Moses*, it occurred to me that there must be “deeper stuff”, so I delved. Alas, I found the deeper stuff was deeper, all right - and piled higher as well. For every page of meat it seemed there were a hundred pages of filler, adding up to a pretty, plump, but decidedly ersatz hunk of baloney.

I wrote the *Satanic Bible* because I looked for such a book all my life and, unable to find it, concluded that if I ever expected to read what I was seeking, would have to write it myself. The same principle applied to *The Compleat Witch*.

Summing up: If you **need** to steep yourselves in occult lore, despite this diatribe, by all means do so. But do it as a ritual in itself, i.e. **objectively towards subjective ends!** Read on, **knowing** that you won’t learn a damn thing in principle from Levi, Crowley, Regardie [or Sybil Leek either!] that isn’t extended one-hundredfold in the *Satanic Bible* or *Compleat Witch*, but that you’ll have the spooky fun, ego food, and **involvement** which invariably accompanies a curriculum concerned more with the gathering of ingredients than with the application of principles.

When Anton wrote that bucket of cold water into the *Hoof*, one entire Grotto (the Babylon Grotto of Detroit) disintegrated in protest, and a couple of others (Stygian and Belphegor) were badly shaken. Perhaps Anton said too much, confidently assuming that Satanists have less need for mystery than ordinary mortals. As John Fowles observes so well in his *Aristos*, mankind is hungry for mystery, and the most successful religions have been those that have **recognized** this hunger and exploited it for power and profit. Why do the conventional religions, their myths seemingly long-since punctured by science & archæology, still prosper today? “If no one will write new detective stories,” sighs Fowles, “people will still read the old ones.”

Along this same line, the Temple of Set’s most enduring problem has been, of all things, its **lack** of mystery. It speaks, like Anton above, **too** plainly and clearly for some who then mythologize surrogate mysteries within the Temple, such as *Xem*, or depart altogether in search of something elsewhere which they can regard with awe and reassuring

incomprehension.

I have a lot to say about many things, but I don’t quite know what to say about this! Undeniably mystery - and particularly religious mystery - is alluring. Black Magic hinges upon the principle that you can enjoy this allure without becoming enslaved to it. [The White Magician, by the same token, is an “expert at being a slave”.]

Our goal, it would seem to me, is to focus our need for mystery upon the **real unknowns** of the cosmos, as the best scientists do, rather than to allow ourselves to be spooked by scarecrows. Does this make ritual Workings and GBM ones in particular more difficult? You bet. It is no longer enough just to confuse yourself with gobbledegook from Old Tomes; rather you have to focus your attention and articulate your thoughts towards **real** mysteries. This is risky turf, since the celebrant of such GBM Workings does not have pre-canned answers to offer to awestruck neophyte onlookers. Such GBM Workings rarely yield conclusive answers, but they **do** leave participants with more sharply-focused vision than they entered the chamber with. Later on, when employing that vision, they will **see** things which otherwise they would not have. **That** is GBM at work.

As for having fun with ritual magic, you can still do that too. But what you have to do, in essence, is to use LBM on yourself: to deliberately create the illusion of an “old-time Devil-worship” Working. That’s what I did with the “Ceremony of the Nine Angles” and the “Call to Cthulhu” in the *Satanic Rituals*. They were deliberate LBM constructs to create for practitioners an authentic Lovecraftian environment. Unlike Hollywood rituals, every component of them was carefully fashioned towards this end. Not only did they work excellently within the Church of Satan and Temple of Set, but years later I was still seeing shocked references to them by HPL fans who were terrified to see that such “fiction” as HPL wrote about **actually existed!** Finally I took pity on the fans and wrote an account of the rituals’ creation for *Nyctalops* #13, a leading HPL fanzine.]

Readers of my *Church of Satan* history know that a year elapsed between the time when I accidentally saw Anton LaVey at the premiere of *Rosemary’s Baby* and my decision to join the Church of Satan. During that year I was a Second Lieutenant in the 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, North Carolina - and at Fort Bragg an incident took place that helped to make up my mind for me about Satanism. That incident was a 1968 Hammer film, *The Devil’s Bride*, which played one night at the 82nd’s theater.

The Devil’s Bride is the film version of Dennis Wheatley’s novel *The Devil Rides Out*, and it is

probably the finest “classical Satanism” movie ever made. For some mysterious reason it is screened only rarely on American television and is not available as a videocassette. Christopher Lee stars as the Duc de Richleau, combating Charles Gray as Magister Templi Mocata. Gray has polished his exquisite villainy to near-perfection. When imperiously asked to depart the premises of an ancient English manor where two errant disciples have sought concealment, he pauses, glances politely-but-glacially at his aristocratic hostess, and remarks, “Very well, I shall go, and I will not be back ... but **something** will!”

Now that, I said to myself, is class. [I probably decided to become a Satanist right then and there.]

So if you want to do some “classical Satanism”, there is no better model than Dennis Wheatley. He may have taken some of his terminology from Aleister Crowley, but only the terminology; his plots are old-time Devil worship at its most *la-Bas*. [I got in trouble with Diane LaVey one time for touting Wheatley in the *Cloven Hoof*. “Easy does it,” she said. “We can’t have our members crucifying bats upside-down and such.”] Quite right, and I reemphasize here that Wheatley should be used for **atmosphere**, not for practice.

Want to fight off some Saitii Elementals? Find an old, abandoned house - the more decrepit and isolated the better. Clear everything out of the living room. Go home and fast for 24 hours, then return to the abandoned house at night - **alone**. Draw a TET TRA GRAM MA TON-style magic circle on the floor. Ring it with four tallow candles in antique silver candle-holders. Between them put four silver dishes of holy water. Enter the circle, ritually close it, pray to God and Jesus a few times to protect you, and light those four candles. [No other light sources permitted.] Then wait ... until the shadows begin to move in the weak candlelight ... and after a few hours something enters the room ... over there, while your back was turned ...

[5] More “**Ell Eigh has it All**”

- by Constance L. & Robert H. Moffatt IV^os

As we wrote in April, you will thoroughly enjoy coming to Los Angeles in August for Set-VIII. L.A. is phenomenal. Nowhere in the U.S. can you sea and surf in the hot morning sun and ski snow-covered mountains, two hours away, in the afternoon of the **same** day.

We have had hoarfrost on the early A.M. lawn, marvelous blistering sun mid-day, and violent thunderstorms at night. This is a land of so many exciting variations, that each day can be a thrill. Mind you, many days [particularly in summer] are so similar that the waiting can become humdrum for

the textbook description of our balmy climate for August. [Hint: Magic can work wonders.]

To continue with how to speak “Los Angelish”:

“Austin”: where the “longhorns” are. They are victims of extra-lengthy *aboulias* (dilemmas).

“Cult”: exists only in the minds (?) of most journalists. Any group that strays far to the left or right of the “norm” & rattles the white cages. [See “Into”.]

“Occult”: “What the hell are you hiding in your spare room?”

“Into”: immersed in something daring. You are “into” a “cult”. [See “Occult”.]

“Snow”: what you need chains for, even if it’s 1/4th-inch deep and you wreck your tires. Above 4,000 feet some ski on it. At any level some snort it. You get a red nose either way.

“Cold”: 64°f and lower.

“New England”: a place where leaves fall out of boredom in the autumn.

“Quake”: what a Setian does in a Christian church, or in California a yearly opportunity to get new place settings and replace some weak bridges.

“Aftershocks”: a Christian’s experience upon encountering a Setian.

“Michigan”: frozen tundra thawed only where *Flames from Hell* is published.

“Hat”: head covering unknown in L.A. except to chefs, pilots, baseball fans, Guido Sarducci, and in Johnny Carson jokes.

“Georgia”: a land of sweltering summers, freezing winters, snakes, cats, bogs, and Leviathan.

“Smog”: first noted in the ’20s, tolerated in the ’30s, a crisis in the ’40s & ’50s, technologically treated in the ’60s, still here in the ’80s. Useful for partially hiding all the billboards and franchise eateries.

“Rose Bowl”: Pasadena’s claim to fame. If you aren’t an Ohio or Michigan alumnus, forget it.

“Bus”: something that seldom runs in your direction, and when it does, it will either crash or you will be mugged.

“Freeway”: equivalent to an eastern toll road, but more like the Indy Speedway. Know your exit ramp two miles ahead. Have demolition derby fun.

“Mexico”: California’s southern mecca, where a dollar buys close to a wardrobe and jail is for the guilty until proven innocent.

“Metro System”: a figment of an up-and-coming politician’s imagination.

“Taxi”: forget it, unless you do not mind a mortgage payment for the cabbie’s home.

“Oregon, Washington, British Columbia”: the northwest, where there are continuous showers and out of which welfare-seekers form a never-ending stream to L.A.

“Dodgers”: not a group of tax-evaders, but ex-Brooklyn trolley dodgers, who became L.A.’s championship baseball team. [#1 fan is Magistra Moffatt.]

“Universal City”: Where the Universal Studios Tour is more appealing to sophisticated thrill-seekers than the other Am-parks, unless you dig extreme G-stresses.

“Theater”: local acting troupes until the Broadway companies arrive.

“PTL”: “Piss on The Lowly” [“We’ll screw them all in the name of Christ.”]

“Washington, D.C.”: Where Ronnie, patron saint of our space industry is - and good friends live.

Written in fun. Smile. More of the *lingua Franca* next time. You already know enough to make Set-VIII a must!

[6] The Hidden Source of the Satanic Philosophy, or Who said it Before Anton LaVey?

- by George C. Smith II°

Reading through past issues of the *Scroll of Set*, I came across a statement by Susan Wylie (March/April XVI: “The Devil’s Game”): “One should remember that, prior to I ÆS, there had never been any organization or belief structure similar to the Church of Satan.”

Although this was written several years ago, I must reach across the years and address this serious error. The implications for those of us in the Temple today are no less severe.

I know that I am challenging the cultural tradition of two and a half thousand years.

The speaker was **not** Anton LaVey. The speaker was a novelist, playwright, and philosopher, Ayn Rand. From the springboard of her famous, bestselling novels (*The Fountainhead* in 1943 and *Atlas Shrugged* in 1957) was created the philosophy of Objectivism, which attracted thousands of persons - myself included - who were more than “openly honest regarding what they believed” but studied, wrote, taught, and practiced what they held to be the highest expression of living.

Although like others I now have some obvious points of philosophical disagreement with Objectivism, the legacy of this enormous Satanic break with the past remains a fact of history that is of prime importance to Setians everywhere. To imply or state that the Church of Satan was the first to clearly state the Satanic ethic is to ignore the continuing impact of Ayn Rand and individualists influenced by her work such as Nathaniel Branden

[*The Psychology of Self-Esteem and Honoring the Self*] and Harry Browne [*How I Found Freedom in an Unfree World*]. It would instead benefit us to enrich our understanding of what the Gift of Set has meant and does mean to others who preceded I ÆS.

To illustrate this historical precedent, let us examine the Nine Satanic Statements in view of the Rand work *Atlas Shrugged*:

In Galt’s speech (pages #936-993) is the written source of most of the philosophical ideas expressed in the *Satanic Bible*. Here are the first clear, contemporary statements which led to the glorification of man’s pride and the denouncing of the life-killing concept called altruism. Here also is a vindication of rationality and the inevitable cause of the failure of the Church of Satan to encompass the needs of intelligent and curious minds. Note that the sequential order of these *Atlas Shrugged* quotations parallels the order of the Nine Satanic Statements.

1. LaVey: “Satan represents indulgence instead of abstinence.”

Rand: “A doctrine that gives you, as an ideal, the role of a sacrificial animal seeking slaughter on the altars of others, is giving you death as your standard. By the grace of reality and the nature of life, man - every man - is an end in himself. He exists for his own sake, and the achievement of his own happiness is his highest moral purpose.” (page 940)

2. LaVey: “Satan represents vital existence instead of spiritual pipe dreams.”

Rand: “My morality, the morality of reason, is contained in a single axiom: existence exists - and in a single choice: to live. The rest proceeds from these.” (page 944)

3. LaVey: “Satan represents undefiled wisdom instead of hypocritical self-deceit.”

Rand: “Honesty is not a social duty, not a sacrifice for the sake of others, but the most profoundly selfish virtue man can practice: his refusal to sacrifice the reality of his own existence to the deluded consciousness of others.” (page 945)

4. LaVey: “Satan represents kindness to those who deserve it instead of love wasted on ingrates.”

Rand: “To withhold your contempt from men’s vices is an act of moral counterfeiting, and to withhold your admiration from their virtues is an act of moral embezzlement.” (page 946)

5. LaVey: “Satan represents vengeance instead of turning the other cheek.”

Rand: “When a man attempts to deal with me by force, I answer him by force.” (page 950)

6. LaVey: “Satan represents responsibility to the responsible instead of concern for psychic vampires.”

Rand: “You have been using fear as your weapon, and have been bringing death to man as his

punishment for rejecting your morality. We offer him life as his reward for accepting ours.” (page 950)

7. LaVey: “Satan represents man as just another animal - sometimes better, more often worse than those that walk on all-fours - who, because of his ‘divine spiritual and intellectual development’, has become the most vicious animal of all.”

Rand: “Damnation is the start of your morality; destruction is its purpose, means, and end. Your code begins by damning man as evil, then demands that he practice a good which it defines as impossible for him to practice. It demands, as his first proof of virtue, that he accept his own depravity without proof. It demands that he start not with a standard of value but with a standard of evil, which is himself, by means of which he is then to define the good; the good is that which he is not.” (page 951)

8. LaVey: “Satan represents all of the so-called sins, as they all lead to physical, mental, or emotional gratification.”

Rand: “What is the nature of the guilt that your teachers call his Original Sin? What are the evils man acquired when he fell from a state they consider perfection? Their myth declares that he ate the fruit of the tree of knowledge - he acquired a mind and became a rational being. It was the knowledge of good and evil; he became a moral being. He was sentenced to earn his bread by his labor; he became a productive being. He was sentenced to experience desire; he acquired the capacity of sexual enjoyment. The evils for which they damn him are reason, morality, creativeness, joy - all the cardinal values of his existence.” (page 951)

9. LaVey: “Satan has been the best friend the church has ever had, as he has kept it in business all these years.”

Rand: “And as he now crawls through the wreckage, groping blindly for a way to live, your teachers offer him the help of a morality that proclaims that he’ll find no solution and must seek no fulfillment on Earth. Real existence, they tell him, is that which he cannot perceive, true consciousness is the faculty of perceiving the non-existent - and if he is unable to understand it, that is the proof that his existence is evil and his consciousness impotent.” (page 952)

I think that most careful examinations of the *Satanic Bible* will show how the Nine Satanic Statements acted as an outline for the “Book of Lucifer” essays.

Anton LaVey is the Magus of the Age of Satan, and did Utter a Word and cause a magical restructuring of the universe. As the instrument of the creation of that Age, he is immortalized. At the same time, credit for the source of the philosophy

which he espoused must be given to Ayn Rand.

Please understand that I was an Objectivist prior to joining the Church of Satan. It was the intellectual rigor demanded by Objectivism which enabled me to appreciate the full meaning of the *Satanic Bible*. At the same time I first completed reading it, I said that here I had found Objectivism with an open mind concerning paranormal phenomena.

The importance of all this to Setians is that the foundation for the philosophy of Satanism much more closely embraces the philosophy of the Temple of Set than the reactionary, anti-Christian Church of Satan. Further the Objectivist source for the Satanic philosophy has been carefully researched and elaborated [sometimes refuted in part] in numerous libertarian books and articles.

To my mind, what distinguished the Temple of Set from all other organizations is its non-dogmatic embracing of both the rational and the intuitive, while refusing to allow the rational to be undercut. Those who worked with the “unevolved” Church of Satan prior to X ÆS should know that battles were being waged in open forums against the anti-human forces of altruism in the name of reason prior to I ÆS. These heroic efforts should not be forgotten or ignored, but should be examined for additional aids along our path to *Xeper*.

[7] Poetry

- by Leon Stevens I°

With rhythmic, oblique visions she’s an angle beyond my eyes: neon madonna veiled in moonlight - scintillating echoes of a bygone æon, shadowing promises of unrelenting solitude, Catching the silver strands of forever, you weave them together in your breast, where they form elegant tapestries of pain’s retrograde majesty. Tracing the link between broken hopes of forgotten ancestors, you arrive at the foot of the mountains men call “madness”.

Your tears become mighty icebergs, and your emotions drift out over the endless sea into the sweet, calm oblivion of serenity. But your ground-zero thrusting scales the heights and depths of a sexless passion. Blood-red moons wax and wane, glowing with the smoke pouring off the decaying Martian landscape that we once called home. Seas boil off into fog; clouds pour down an acid rain into the upturned faces of a generation of mutated Scottish giants. Their insane laughter echoes in the halls that once held the proud, free celebrations of the eldritch, thundering herd.

The clanging of their swords landing blows on the heavy battle armor provides uneven counterpart to the racing of your girlish heart.

Now the miles have run behind me, leaving only a shadow of the man I was. In each and every

precious moment flow countless miracles, raining upon my soul beyond the tears and laughter, as the petrifying meditations slowly warm and transform me into a linking-together of man and superman, form and content, forging the steel of yesterday into my face of tomorrow.

She grows as I grow, wild and free - proud of the fact, ashamed of reality; love holds no surprises if you just lie there with the undead. Do you see the tall mountains, where the trees reach up trying to touch the sky? Try to be silent like them, for only then will I know you. Your world is just awakening to find mine.

[8] Poem

- by Nancy K. Flowers III^o

In the time between times, darkness and light, day becomes night, winter and spring on the edge of all things. On a minor key phrase she rode in, from the land of dead birds. From belief's border, riding the dissonance (deadly and daunting and snake-tressed), she brought with her ritual: no time and all time, where all things are possible and no thing exists.

[9] Moon Vision

- by John Gyori II^o

Once again I am awakened, and slowly but surely feel drawn to the window. There, high in the heavens, glowing unnaturally bright, floats the object of my summons, the Moon. The light of that orb sears and excites my brain with waves of strange sensations and emotions. The tumult of these sensations builds to a climax, and suddenly my eyes see/perceive a new landscape. I behold a small and ancient town in a valley, the sinuous architecture familiar but disturbing. As I attempt to make my way to the town, the spell is broken, and I observe the Moon slowly setting.