



Who's Afraid Of The O9A?

For over thirty years the Order of Nine Angles (O9A/ONA) has been annoying self-described satanists, and guardians of the LaVey-Aquino interpretation of satanism, making some of them angry and causing others to stridently denounce and attack the O9A for a variety of reasons. As the influence and notoriety of the O9A has grown, so have the denunciations and the attacks and the anger; grown to such an extent that, for example, the internet is awash with people zealously spreading the gospel of the latter-day satanists: that "the O9A is purely an online phenomenon, and/or does not/never has existed and/or is a fake, and/or has ceased to exist." Grown to such an extent that, to give another example, favourable mention of the O9A is now [2014] forbidden on one particular well-known internet 'satanic discussion forum' with everyone there expected to accept their version of that gospel, which is that the O9A is only an "online mutual admiration society", although how the complex esoteric philosophy of the O9A and the mysticism of the seven fold way - with their roots in Hellenic hermeticism and influenced by ancient Arabic and Indic esoteric sources {1} - can be an "online anything" has never been explained by those self-appointed guardians of modern satanism given that discussion there of their variation of the gospel is forbidden. {2}

Why, therefore, are these latter-day satanists annoyed, vexed, angry, and zealously spreading their gospel about the O9A? Is it perhaps because the O9A is now rather notorious but should not be, cannot possibly be, notorious because as their gospel says the O9A is purely an online phenomenon, and/or does not/never has existed and/or is a fake, and/or has ceased to exist? A notoriety mentioned, for instance, by one author who devoted a whole chapter of his university textbook about modern mysticism, published in 2013, to the O9A:

"Today, the ONA can be considered one of the most prominent Left Hand Path groups by virtue of its public presence, evidenced (e.g.) by its inclusion as a signature antagonist in the Nightingale novel series by bestselling British author Stephen Leather." {3}

Or are latter-day satanists annoyed, vexed, angry, and zealously spreading their gospel about the O9A, because of how the iconoclastic O9A has tarnished and is tarnishing - and dissents from - the image of modern satanism that others have laboured to create and maintain over the past forty years? The image propagated by the likes of LaVey and Aquino; of satanism as egoistic hedonism; as embodying the principle of 'might is right'; as adversarial only so long as you do not break any of the laws of the nation-State you live in; of people being able to 'command the powers of the cosmos', and of everything supernatural being merely part of our imagination.

This O9A dissent and iconoclasm was obvious decades ago during the so-called 'satanic panic' in the 1980s. For the O9A inflamed that panic by publishing rituals describing human sacrifice and by issuing texts advocating such sacrifice, given that at the time self-described satanists were doing their best to portray satanism in a positive manner by claiming, for example, that satanists were 'law-abiding', responsible, citizens. This publication of such material led Michael Aquino, of the Temple of Set, to write in a letter to Anton Long dated October 7, XXV:

Given the present climate of witch-hunting hysteria in England, publication of a "Satanic ritual" by an avowedly "Satanic" institution which includes human sacrifice is thoroughly irresponsible [...] If you were presenting that ritual text as an example of Christian hate-propaganda against the Satanic tradition, making clear that it has no basis in fact, that would be one thing. But the ritual which you have published makes no such distinctions, and is thus a dangerous "loaded weapon" to be used by any child (of any age) who picks it up. And of course it plays right into the hands of any anti-Satanic maniac who is looking for "evidence" of "Satanic ritual murder". {4}

Concerning these texts, Anton Long - using the nom-de-plume Stephen Brown - wrote in a letter to Diane Vera dated 28th May 1992:

By making certain material available - on sacrifice, for example - and by writing certain MSS dealing with that and other 'dark' topics, I and others have done two things. First, made it clear that such material is part of my tradition and that it recounts what was/is done. Second, returned to Satanism that darkness and evil which really belongs to it (at least in the novice stage).

I have no desire to give Satanism a 'good name' - on the contrary. I wish it to be seen as I understand it to be - really dangerous and difficult. {5}

Or are latter-day satanists annoyed, vexed, angry, and zealously spreading their gospel about the O9A, because they want to believe - or need to believe - that the O9A doesn't exist because to accept its existence they would have to look within themselves, to their character, and compare their satanism, their occultism, with those of the O9A? After all, they have not - probably could not - spend three months or more alone in the wilderness (as per the O9A rite of internal adept), just as they have not - probably could not - undertake an 'insight role', or do anything that might get them in trouble with the police or the security services. Furthermore, they have not - probably could not - even do the physical tests every O9A initiate is expected to undertake {6}. They certainly would not want to spend a year or so learning Esoteric Chant because who needs to do such stupid stuff anyways? Who needs pathei-mathos, and occult pathworkings, after all? {7} Who needs the self-honesty, the self-insight, the empathy, that the practical seven fold way developes over a decade and more? Who the hell wants to spend ten years or more of their life doing such stuff?

So, it is just so much easier to lambast the O9A, to laugh about it, or announce to the world that it does not, cannot, exist; and that no one, ever, has ever done any of those things anyway because it is - it must be - all talk. And culling, human sacrifice? That is also just talk, bluster, fantasy. It must be, because "we've never heard or read of any O9A person getting caught." Which is why they say, they must say, to themselves and to others: the O9A is not - cannot be - 'sinister' and never was; it is just people playing internet games or writing and distributing MSS.

Thus do these latter-day satanists carry on as they carry on, pleased with themselves and their satanism and their life-style. After all, they really are 'masters of sorcery' and have nothing to prove; for their opinions "are definitive", and they already are knowledgeable and already know themselves. Therefore, "there is nothing more to discuss" and anyone and everyone who claims to be O9A "is either stupid, lying, or a fake".

However, as Anton Long wrote some years ago:

"What these self-important egoistic pretenders do not know, or ignore, is that a real understanding and a real knowing arise - and only arise - from three things. (1) From a participation, of many years, in real life of such an exeatic intensity that it brings pathei-mathos, with all the attendant sadness, joy, ecstasy, anguish, and personal suffering; (2) from a rational reflexion on the foregoing and thus a placing of such personal participation into an Aeonic, a cosmic, perspective; and (3) from a refined and a scholarly study and a seeking of knowledge

spanning at least a decade.

Now, one of the real secrets of the LHP, of satanism, of the sinister, is that it encourages, it provokes, it encompasses, it guides the individual into all of these three, so that it is a way for the individual to acquire, to feel, to know, wisdom, and which knowing and feeling so profoundly affect the person that they are transformed into a new variety of human being." {8}

Kerri Scott
2014

Notes

{1} Regarding these sources, see R. Parker, *Perusing The Seven Fold Way: Historical Origins Of The Septenary System Of The Order of Nine Angles*, and also Monette, Connell. *Mysticism in the 21st Century*, Sirius Academic Press, 2013. pp. 85-122. ISBN 9781940964003

{2} Logically, of course, O9A philosophy and praxeses - written about in books before the advent of the internet, and described by academics in books in recent years - cannot only exist 'online'. Thus, the proponents of the gospel that "the O9A is purely an online phenomenon, and/or does not/never has existed and/or is a fake" are reduced to claiming either that it does not have a philosophy, or if it does then it is not original but derives from or imitates LaVey/Crowley/Aquino or some other modern bod who happens to be their favourite bod of the year.

Both claims are demonstrably false:

(1) In respect of the esoteric philosophy of the O9A, see R. Parker, *The Esoteric Philosophy Of The Order Of Nine Angles An Introduction*.

(2) Regarding originality and ancient traditions, see (a) R. Parker, *Originality, Tradition, And The Order of Nine Angles*; (b) *Perusing The Seven Fold Way*; (c) Monette, op. cit.

See also the 2014 essay *Defining The O9A*. A more polemical overview is given in *O9A Q & A*. Version 1.9 November 2013 ev

{3} Monette, op. cit.

{4} *The Satanic Letters of Stephen Brown*, 2 vols, Thormynd Press, 1992

{5} *The Satanic Letters*, op. cit. For an overview of the public emergence of the O9A in the 1980s, see *Developing The Mythos - The Order of Nine Angles In Perspective* (pdf).

{6} The basic physical challenges are:

For men: (a) walking thirty-two miles, in hilly terrain, in under seven hours while carrying a pack weighing at least 30 lbs; (b) running twenty-six miles in four hours; (c) cycling two hundred or more miles in twelve hours.

For women, the minimum acceptable standards are: (a) walking twenty-seven miles in under seven hours while carrying a pack weighing at least 15 lbs. (b) running twenty-six miles in four and a half hours; (c) cycling one hundred and seventy miles in twelve hours.

{7} "With the watchwords pathei-mathos ('learning through adversity'), the ONA is unique in that it offers an aggressive and elitist spirituality, which pushes its members to find and overcome their mental, physical, and psychic limits in the quest for spiritual ascension. In parallel with gruelling athletic and mental challenges, the ONA acknowledges a pantheon of 'dark gods', along with an occult system designed to introduce the initiate to the acausal or supernatural world of the mystic." Monette, op. cit.

{8} *Pretenders, Frauds, and The Order of Nine Angles*, 121 yf.

o o o o o

Appendix An Indicative Failure

The following extracts from a recent thread about the O9A on the offending well-known internet 'satanic discussion forum' might go some way toward explaining why they've now banned discussion of anything to do with the O9A that doesn't agree with their gospel version. They have also banned the user (KS) who asked difficult and 'heretical' questions. Of particular note, vis-a-vis the extracts, is the failure by the 'true occultists' and 'real satanists' on that forum to answer questions which cast doubt on their party line about the O9A. Notice also the failure to engage in intellectual debate.

1) Perhaps one of the moderators got annoyed because KS asked him some pertinent questions when the anonymous moderator in question gave his 'definitive' opinion about the O9A, on a thread entitled 'ONA Outer Representative', in posts #84947 and #85014.

KS wrote in reply in #85015:

{quote}"Perhaps you could point out just where there is a rational in-depth critique of the septenary system of the O9A and its links to the ancient Corpus Hermeticum. Or perhaps you, like everyone it seems, is just going to ignore the connection? So, it is pointless and boring to rationally discuss an existing esoteric philosophy, especially in relation to ancient texts? So, it is pointless and boring to even consider that they may be more, esoterically, to the O9A than most believe or assume?"

So, you dismiss the link to ancient Arabic cosmogony - and the alchemical symbolism - inherent in the star game, and the fact that it presents a type of occult knowledge, by making such a quip. Perhaps therefore you might explain how Dungeons & Dragons re-presents - as the star game does - falak al-aflak and al-kawakib al-thabitah. Perhaps you might also like to explain just how Dungeons & Dragons is an esoteric language. Do you even know what an esoteric language is?

So, there we have it. You - and so many others - make assumptions about the O9A, and those involved with it, even when the esoteric reality is there for those who have the occult knowledge, the occult ability, and the scholarly ability, to be able to distinguish the exoteric from the esoteric." {/quote}

Furthermore, in reply to the mod's boast that he was "a true occultist", KS replied:

{quote}"Is that so? Then do please - without having to resort to internet search engines - enlighten us as to why you believe there is no link between the Somnium Scipionis, the anados, and the physis magick as described in the O9A text Naos. Can you do that, without cheating? That is, without resorting to searching the internet? Be honest."

Or perhaps your understanding of occultism differs from mine. Mine, BTW, includes hermeticism, alchemy, sorcery, etc. So, according to you, the O9A does not deal with, and does not offer esoteric info about, hermeticism, alchemy, and sorcery?

Or perhaps you define 'true occultists' as those who assume or who believe the O9A is bunk and/or just a bunch of people on the internet?

One further point - why haven't you, and other 'true occultists' ever noticed how the seven fundamental modes of the esoteric chant of the O9A are a modern representation of the ancient occult, hermetic, cosmological harmony manifest in the sequence Lydian, Phrygian, Dorian, and so on. Do you even know - without having to resort to internet search engines - what this cosmic, occult, harmony is?

But of course you and others seem to have already decided that everything O9A is 'pointless and boring' and/or just silly kids playing internet games. " {/quote}

In reply to all these questions, the patronising mod could only manage the following: "we don't need you, and we all think you are a joke, so what's the angle Jr?"

2) The following patronising assumptive post from the same thread is indicative of the general level of discussion about the O9A:

"Enough with the goddamn socket puppets...I am too fed up for this shit. Don't you have some mundanes to cull? Or go paint some tarot cards."

To which KS replied in #85208:

{quote}"So, instead of answering the questions I asked, we get what seems to be the 'party line' about the O9A and making assumptions about the person posting.

Isn't it interesting that no one, here or elsewhere, (a) seems to want to answer the sort of questions I asked (such as about esoteric chant and the Greek modes; and about the connection of the star game symbolism to ancient Arabic cosmogony), and (b) does not deign to provide a rational in-depth critique of the septenary system of the O9A and its links to the ancient Corpus Hermeticum, or similar occult topics. Why not? Could it possibly be that you and others here (a) can't answer them, or engage in a rational debate about such topics, without having to spend time searching the internet; and (b) you've made you mind up about the O9A and so aren't open to reconsidering your opinions and your assumptions.

Now, if you think such topics have been rationally discussed here or anywhere else on the net, do provide links. To my knowledge, they haven't.

The only brief mention of some of the relevant O9A topics is in the recent book about mysticism by Connell Monette.

Silly me for trying to broach the subject of the O9A's occult philosophy and its esoteric connections to ancient mysticism, hermeticism, Arabic cosmogony, and alchemy. For we all know, don't we, that the O9A only exists on the internet, or doesn't really exist, and doesn't have a detailed esoteric philosophy worthy of debate and research, and what it has got it stole from the likes of Aquino, Crowley, Lovecraft, et al. " {/quote}

3) A thread was started regarding O9A esoteric philosophy. Did others respond in a rational, intellectual, manner and discuss the ideas - the philosophy - of the O9A using primary O9A sources and reputable non-O9A sources?

Here's one of the first replies: "Such a little bullshitter like you should try his/her luck working as Putin's propagandist." Another reply was that the questions about O9A philosophy just "added to the din of the rather insistent O9A threads that attempt to demand the attention of individuals here."

One anonymous person - a certain Mr F - did venture forth his opinion in a succinct way: {quote}"O9A is not a philosophy. It has always been a mere "organization" pursuing carnality and the primal side of humanity through a more religious approach by ritualization and initiations." {/quote}

This elicited the response:

{quote} And your evidence for this opinion is what exactly? Do please explain, if it is not a philosophy, how it has (a) a unique ontology; (b) a particular ethics; (c) a unique epistemology; and (d) a particular answer to the question of the meaning of our mortal existence. For it is those things that constitute a philosophy [...]

How exactly is the mystical rite of internal adept - 3 or 6 months living alone in the wilderness - pursuing carnality and the primal side of humanity? How exactly is the mystical Camlad rite of the abyss - a lunar month alone underground or in a dark cave - pursuing carnality and the primal side of humanity? How exactly is the preparation for the rite of the abyss - several years undertaking work, or being employed in an occupation, of a numinous (empathic, compassionate, mystical) nature - pursuing carnality and the primal side of humanity? How exactly is an insight role of being a monk pursuing carnality and the primal side of humanity?{/quote}

The reply of Mr F. was: {quote} Philosophy tends to entail a (meaning one) specific mindset. It isn't the sum of various opinions and views which add up to a (very) loosely defined and culturally variable term. Like I said before, O9A is a mere organization pursuing a "something" which is best not labelled as a mere "philosophy" [...] You made it very obvious you're nothing more than part of the same pretendu-crowd you like to expose. Get lost boy. {/quote} Note the assumptions made at the very end.

To which KS responded:

{quote} Actually, philosophy is "a particular system of ideas or beliefs relating to the general scheme of existence and the universe; a philosophical system or theory... The branch of knowledge that deals with ultimate reality, or with existence and the nature and causes of things...The study of morality; ethics." Source - Complete Oxford English Dictionary, 20 volumes, Oxford, second edition, 1989.

Furthermore, academically, a "philosophical system or theory" is considered to be one in which there is a particular, distinguishing, ontology, and a particular theory of ethics, and a particular epistemology [...]

Since you by your own admission have not undertaken the rite [of internal adept], how can *you* understand?! {/quote}

Reply of Mr F: {quote}you simply copy-pasted and rephrased a few "explanations" from "freedictionary.com" (which gave the most hits) and added the COED-reference in an attempt to sound more credible/educated.{/quote} Note the assumptions made here.

KS response:

{quote} Pathetic, and so typical of those who proffer their opinions via the internet and who use the internet as a first and preferred source of information.

Had you taken the trouble to check - in the real world - before venting forth, you

would not have made such a fatuous claim. Check, like as in going to a library, finding that printed dictionary, and checking. Yes, some of us do use libraries, as some of us do have printed books at home. {/quote}

Mr F: {quote}My words could only be considered dogmatic if I refused any rebuttal [...] only organizations and people can take the proverbial "dibs" (i.e. talk possessively) on ideas. {/quote}

KS reply:

{quote} Perhaps you should have looked up the definition of 'imply' in the complete OED before you ventured forth your opinion? You might have found:

"To involve or comprise as a necessary logical consequence...To signify as much as, to be equivalent to..."

Perhaps you should also have looked up the definition of 'dogmatic' in the complete OED before you ventured forth your opinion? You might have found:

"Concerned with propounding opinions...Of assured opinion, convinced...Of a person, or his or her writing, speech, etc.: that asserts or imposes dogmas or opinions in an authoritative, imperious, or arrogant manner; inclined to lay down principles as undeniably true..." {/quote}

Mr F replied: {quote} "byebye". Unless I secretly start vouching for removal of your senseless drivel{/quote}

Which is what Mr F went on to do - having been bested in an argument, made silly assumptions, and shown up for being pretentious, he slunk away, got childishly angry, and later petulantly locked the thread, preventing any more replies from KS, and banned KS from the forum. Obviously he could "dish it out to others" but couldn't take it himself.

In summary: It's alright for those opposed to the O9A - and for moderators - to be patronizing and make derogatory personal comments (and also ignore the topic of the thread) but when someone who says something positive about the O9A is a little bit patronizing they get banned.
