

Two Contrasting Views of Modern Satanism

Almost every week, usually on some internet blog or on some internet forum, self-described modern satanists - most of whom wouldn't know the difference between sedue and dure ceremonial sorcery without having to look it up via the internet - attack or disparage the Order of Nine Angles (O9A, ONA), protective as they seem to be of what they believe 'satanism' is and annoyed as they certainly appear to be by any positive mention of the O9A.

Almost without exception none of these self-described modern satanists has a detailed knowledge of O9A esotericism just as they invariably, when writing or making pronouncements about the O9A, commit the fallacy of illicit distribution assuming as they do that what two or a few individuals claiming association with the O9A write or say is representative of the O9A as a whole. In addition, perhaps a majority of those self-described modern satanists - usually sooner rather than later - not only use vulgar language in their attacks on and disparagement of the O9A but also commit the fallacy of ignoratio elenchi, usually abusive ad hominem {1}.

What results, and what has resulted for almost a decade, is that there is not and hardly ever has been any rational discussion, among self-described modern satanists, of O9A esotericism {2}, for even when someone occasionally deigns to mention or describes some aspect of O9A tradition in a non-disparaging manner (usually in response to what someone else has written) they then invariably proceed to commit the fallacy of argumentum ad hominem and/or the fallacy of illicit distribution. For example, insulting the author, making assumptions about the character or intent of the author, and assuming what the author wrote represents the O9A and/or that their assumptions about the author are representative of everyone O9A and therefore "proof" of what they believe or assume the O9A is and/or what type of person is O9A.

In a recent example of the fallacy of illicit distribution, someone claimed - on the basis of some polemics written by a few people - that "the ONA now spends all of its time attacking others," oblivious as the person obviously was of, or for propagandistic reasons chose to ignore, (i) the fact that no one person, nor a few persons, nor one group (nexion) represents or can represent the ONA, and (ii) the fact that there are scores of recent O9A texts that deal with esoteric subjects such as ἀρρενόθηλος, alchemy, hermeticism, the etymology of Baphomet, O9A aeonic theory, acausal time, O9A aural tradition (including that aural tradition in the Deofel Quartet), the pagan roots of the ONA, and the history and meaning of the term 'nine angles'. {3}

Recent examples of the fallacy of argumentum ad hominem include the following, with no attempt made by those committing that fallacy to engage in rational discourse about O9A esotericism in general or O9A satanism in particular: "more attention-seeking", "another juvenile rant", "you're a puerile and pretentious brat", "you're a joke", "another ONA fan-boy", "you're exhibiting classic narcissistic neurosis".

Which commission of such fallacies, and which lack of rational discourse about O9A esotericism and O9A satanism, might well be explained by the fundamental difference between what Howard Levey, and those inspired by him, termed satanism and what the pseudonymous Anton Long, through the O9A, described as Satanism.

Satanism

The following is a typical and recent statement by a self-described modern satanist: "The difference between the Satanist and those described as sheep is that most Satanists calculate the benefits and liabilities of following an action, whilst the sheep unthinkingly follow the fashions or trends of where all the other sheep are running to."

Which clichéd generalization exemplifies the unoriginal weltanschauung which Howard Levey called 'satanism', for the term Satanist is here interchangeable with many other terms, such as 'capitalist', or 'self-made man', or 'banker'. Thus: "The difference between the Capitalist and those described as sheep is that most Capitalists calculate the benefits and liabilities of following an action, whilst the sheep unthinkingly follow the fashions or trends of where all the other sheep are running to."

Similarly, Howard Levey's "Nine Satanic Statements", generalized and clichéd and materialistic as they are, can easily be reverted to their source (the egoistic individualism propounded by Ayn Rand, as in the novel Atlas Shrugged) or easily changed to represent some other similar weltanschauung. Thus Levey's "Satan represents all of the so-called sins, as they all lead to physical, mental, or emotional gratification" easily becomes another generalized cliché: "Egoism/solipsism/capitalism represents all of

the so-called sins, as they all lead to physical, mental, or emotional gratification."

If one contrasts the clichéd generalizations of Levey, and those self-described modern satanists inspired by his version of 'satanism' (which is perhaps the majority of modern satanists), with the transgressive Satanism propounded by the Order of Nine Angles then the difference between their versions of modern satanism is obvious.

This O9A Satanism was esoterically propounded in such typewritten texts as were included in the three-volume compilation *Hostia* published in the 1990s, and exoterically summarized in their *Guide To Satanism For Beginners (The Simple ONA Way)*.

As the two following extracts from texts in *Hostia* reveal, the O9A emphasized several things, such as (i) the aim is to develop, to evolve, the individual, and (ii) that their Satanism *in its beginnings* is concerned with making one's 'dark side' conscious, partly through the practical and personal learning that deliberate transgressive (and sometimes genuinely subversive) deeds can engender.

The Tradition of the Sinister Way

The essence of genuine Satanism can be simply stated: it is a way to inner development, the goal of which is a new individual. This way involves three essential stages and these exemplify the spirit of that way and the individuals who follow it.

The first is direct experience, the second is direct practice and the third self-development. The first involves direct experience of both the external 'world' and the inner (or psychic) 'world' through striving to achieve certain goals both practical and magickal. The second involves using 'practical' (or causal) and 'magickal' (or acausal) energies to manipulate others, situations and energies in a practical way - producing changes in accord with certain goals. The third involves beginning the process again but starting from the new level of self-understanding and ability attained - pursuing different (and probably more complex) goals.

A Satanist is an individual explorer - following in the footsteps of others (and perhaps using their guide books) but always seeking further horizons, daring to defy convention (in ideas as well as in morals and attitude) yet part of an evolutionary succession enabling what is experienced to be understood and become beneficial. For this reason, a genuine Satanist understands tradition as important and necessary - the culmination of centuries of insight and experience, a useful guide which enables further progress and exploration: a starting point for that inner and outer journey which is begun by Initiation, as well as a map of the way chosen and followed.

This tradition is not sacrosanct - but it does possess a validity until the individual reaches the stage where the unique genius within each individual has been brought to fruition enabling the creation (from experience and self-insight) of a unique way and a fulfilling of a unique Destiny. In magickal terms, this is the stage of Internal Adept, where that unique Destiny is made known (dis-covered) and where the individual Initiate has developed the talents necessary to fulfil it by a following of the previous stages - a stage reached from between three to five years after Initiation.

The tradition (explicated in the 'seven-fold sinister way') provides only a beginning - it is for the individual to go beyond it, toward the dangers and rewards of the Abyss. It is, however, necessary - since it is, in one sense, a 'short-cut': enabling self-development to be achieved far quicker than would be the case without it as well as fully enabling the explication of individual potential. This does not mean that following it is easy - the path may be shorter, but it is just as

A: Satanism is all about - in its beginnings - making conscious (or liberating) our dark or shadow nature. In the past, certain experiences were often undergone in order to achieve this, and some of those experiences were often frowned on by 'conventional' society. Some might have been 'illegal' at the time as well. But gradually (at least in traditional Satanism) a way was found to 'short-circuit' these evolutionary experiences which enhanced the consciousness and thus wisdom of those undergoing them - if they survived, of course. Thus was Internal Magick evolved. This enabled the experiencing of the dark side, and its integration, as well as made possible what was beyond.

This system had been gradually refined and enhanced, and while it avoids the quicksand of criminality it is still not lacking in danger or difficulty. It offers, in short, the distilled essence of thousands of years of evolutionary understanding - and makes possible the next stage of our evolution as a species: Homo Galactica.

Q: You stress the development of the physical side. Why?
A: Because traditional Satanism aims to develop the whole individual - mind, body and character. We give our novices difficult physical goals to achieve (such as running 20 miles in under 2½ hours - fitter individuals are naturally given more difficult tasks) because the striving for such goals, and their achievement, develops qualities necessary in any Adept. They are tests of determination and character, and sort the serious out from the pathetic. The striving also creates a physical joy, increasing the vitality of the person.

In their *Guide To Satanism For Beginners* the O9A distilled their Satanism - in its beginnings, as an exoteric personal learning experience - to its essence, making that type of Satanism applicable to and available to anyone anywhere, writing that:

To become a Satanist you simply make a pledge of allegiance to Satan and pledge yourself to follow the Satanic way of life:

I am here to seal my Fate with blood.
I accept there is no law, no authority, no justice
Except my own
And that culling is a necessary act of Life.
I believe in one guide, Satan,
And in our right to rule mundanes.

I swear on my sinister-honour as a Satanist that from this day forth I will never surrender, will die fighting rather than submit to anyone, and will always uphold The Code of Sinister-Honour.

The O9A thus provide not only a unique weltanschauung - evident in their detailed, written, 'code of kindred honor' - but also a detailed esoteric (and in essence, satanic) methodology whereby individual change might be achieved through pathai-mathos.

The O9A also, from the beginning, emphasized that the ultimate aim was not self-indulgence, was not physical, mental, or emotional gratification, but rather wisdom, as the following extract from a *Hostia* text makes clear:

The Aim:

Wisdom. And its living, enabling the last stage (into the acausal...). This means self-understanding and supra-personal understanding. An apprehension of the world and its forms as they are - a rational knowing: and what is necessary for change, aeonic and otherwise. This knowledge is sometimes sad, and often born from ordeals and having lived the Abyss. It never confers wealth nor privilege, and seldom imbues one with 'happiness'. It is beyond words, but can sometimes be transmuted into a form enabling some others to apprehend if only in part its essence. This aim takes causal time - usually c. 20 years from Initiation (if the Way is followed) - and lies beyond the Abyss. It is balance, beyond opposites, a new way of being.

Conclusion

That self-described modern satanists have mis-understood the O9A, and O9A Satanism - or have not bothered to study O9A texts - is obvious from their reaction to the O9A, from their failure to engage in

rational discourse about the O9A, and their continued commission of certain logical fallacies.

All of which might well be explained by their desire - for whatever reason and from whatever motive, conscious or otherwise - to defend their version of satanism, derived as that satanism is, for perhaps the majority of self-described modern satanists, from the clichéd dehortations of Howard Levey who simply assigned the symbol 'satan' to those clichéd dehortations.

KS
2016

{1} As someone associated with the O9A wrote a few years ago, in response to some O9A critic giving an internet-found and somewhat misleading definition of argumentum ad hominem:

Ignoratio elenchi is classified as a 'material' fallacy (ἔξω τῆς λέξεως) rather than a strictly logical fallacy, and is when an irrelevant subject or topic is introduced into an argument, and thus deflects attention away from the original subject or topic. Thus, by concentrating on the introduced irrelevancy a conclusion may be arrived at which is irrelevant to the original subject or topic. Argumentum ad hominem belongs to the category ignoratio elenchi. For historical antecedents, qv, Aristotle: Σοφιστικοὶ Ἐλεγχοί [...]

In respect of fallacies in general and Argumentum ad Hominem in particular. Among the variants are circumstantial and abusive ad hominem and ad hominem tu quoque, and whether it is or may be, when used, dialectical or epistemic or pragma-dialectical in nature, although what is often common is implicitness with the discussant (in this case, you) intentionally or otherwise obscuring or detracting from the subject under discussion.

Formally, a fallacy is a violation by a discussant of the rules that have been proposed regarding discussions, such as - in recent times - those of Habermas, van Eemeren, Alexy, et al. There is also an interesting analysis in Freeman's *Argument Structure - Representation and Theory* (Springer, 2011).

Furthermore, you only have to read recent papers such as Freeman's *The Logical Dimension of Argumentation and Its Semantic Appraisal* (Theoria, vol 26, #3, 2011, pp.289-299) to discern how there is a continuing difference of opinion regarding the nature, classification, and structure, of argumentation, and that just googling Argumentum ad Hominem and reading (and then reproducing) a few paragraphs so found on the internet does not indicate, as perhaps you hoped, a satisfactory level of understanding of the matter.

{2} A summary of O9A esotericism is given in the text *The Order Of Nine Angles: An Occult Précis*. An overview of O9A aeonics is given in the text *The Aeonics Theory Of The Order Of Nine Angles*.

{3} A selection of some of these recent O9A texts are included in the pdf compilation *The Esoteric Hermeticism Of The Order Of Nine Angles* (159 pages) available [as of September 2016] at <https://omega9alpha.wordpress.com/2016/03/30/the-esoteric-hermeticism-of-the-order-of-nine-angles/>
