



### **Analysing Anti-Fascist Prejudice And Propaganda In Relation To The O9A**

Prejudice is "preconceived opinion not based on reason or actual experience; bias, partiality; unreasoned dislike, hostility; an unreasoning preference or objection; a preliminary or anticipatory judgement."

Propaganda is "the systematic dissemination of information, especially in a biased or misleading way, in order to promote a political cause or point of view." {1}

In respect of the O9A (Order of Nine Angles), a reading of the "O9A" section of a 2019 report issued by a particular anti-fascist organisation is sufficient to (i) reveal that they are spreading disinformation and propaganda, and/or (ii) reveal their ignorance about the O9A, and/or (iii) reveal their prejudice. A revealing evident in their subsequent writings about the O9A.

Why prejudiced? To write or to speak about a matter or about a person or about a group in a reasonable, non-prejudiced way, is to have actual experience of the matter, person or group, or to be probative regarding the matter, person or group: that is, to have actual proof or evidence which validates what is written or said. Valid evidence would be evidence from primary O9A source material {2} and placed into the context of the O9A corpus thus avoiding the common errors of the fallacy of *secundum quid et simpliciter*, the fallacy of *argumentum ad verecundiam*, and the fallacy of Incomplete Evidence, fallacies which some academics commit {3}{4} and which propagandists invariably commit either deliberately or out of ignorance.

In the matter of the O9A, the anti-fascists in question have no actual proof or evidence from primary sources which validates what they have written about the O9A. When they do quote O9A material or alleged O9A material they provide no references to the text, printed or on-line; do not give the author of the original material; often misattribute the quote, and fail to provide context (vis-a-vis the O9A corpus) and thus, either propagandistically or due to ignorance, commit the fallacy of illicit transference. {5}

In respect of their Prejudice and their Propaganda they for example, wrote:

*§ In the 1990s the leadership of the O9A was taken over by Richard Moul*

This reveals a bias because there is no evidence to support the claim that the O9A has or had a “leader” with voluminous O9A texts from the 1980s onwards clearly stating that the O9A has no leader – and thus is a leaderless, non-hierarchical, Occult movement or sub-culture {6} – with the author of most O9A texts, the pseudonymous “Anton Long”, never making any claim regarding his authority and power, and even writing to Michael Aquino of the Temple of Set that in the O9A there is “no acceptance of someone else’s authority” and that “I claim no authority.” {7}

Furthermore, one of the foundational principles of the O9A sub-culture is the anarchist “principle of the authority of individual judgment”, which means that anyone, associating or identifying themselves with the Occult sub-culture that is the O9A, is free to interpret and to manifest O9A Occult philosophy in whatever way they choose. {8} This principle in practice also means:

- (i) that no author, no individual, no nexion, can present or represent the view or the opinion of the entity termed the Order of Nine Angles,
- (ii) that the O9A does not have, never has had, and never will have an “official policy” about anything, and never has, and never will make “official statements” about anything; and
- (iii) that the only authority which is meaningful for the O9A is the individual one which results from the exoteric and esoteric pathēi mathos of each individual who is part of or who associates themselves with the O9A.

In effect, the anti-fascists in question were (i) producing and spreading disinformation – deliberately false information – or (ii) they were revealing their ignorance regarding the Occult philosophy and the praxises of the O9A, or (iii) expressing their prejudice, their partiality, their unreasoned dislike, their hostility, about and regarding the O9A.

If they were spreading disinformation, it reveals their prejudice, their bias. If they were revealing in public their ignorance about the O9A then they were also revealing their prejudice, their unreasoned, ill-informed dislike of the O9A.

In another example they wrote, in respect of Moul and Myatt:

*§ Rather than true conversions, they were following what they themselves describe as “insight” – a deliberate ploy to infiltrate, explore and subvert other organisations and religions, especially those that offer recruits the chance to learn violent skills*

This reveals prejudice, a bias, for three reasons. First, because the anti-fascists provide no evidence for their claim that those “conversions” were not genuine; second, because they provide no evidence for their claim that either Moul or Myatt, in respect of the O9A, named and described something termed “insight”; and third, because the use of the term “insight” by such anti-fascists either (i) reveals that they were spreading disinformation about

the O9A or (ii) reveals their ignorance about the O9A.

For what O9A texts repeatedly mention are *Insight Rôles*, not “insight”, and which rôles form part of the tasks of an External Adept and only last for between one year and eighteen months, after which the person moves on to other tasks. {9}.

Thus, the claim that the decades later “conversions” of Moulton and Myatt were “insight” – that is, Insight Rôles – is nonsensical in the context of the O9A, since no one O9A undertakes Insight Rôles in their later years, as a study of O9A texts would have revealed.

In another example, the anti-fascists wrote:

§ *Myatt has also publicly left the O9A*

This reveals prejudice, a bias, for several reasons. First, they provide no evidence for their claim that Myatt publicly left the O9A. Where are the public texts written by Myatt where he states he has publicly left the O9A? Where are the public texts written by Myatt where he claims to have been O9A? There are no such texts.

Second, even if their defence is the claim that Myatt was the pseudonymous “Anton Long” then neither they nor anyone else has provided any evidence – any facts based on primary sources or documents – to substantiate such a claim, such a malicious allegation. It is thus a preconceived opinion, or disinformation, or the unreasonable repetition of rumours; in all of which cases it amounts to bias, to prejudice, to being unfair.

In addition, they conveniently did not balance their unproven claims about Myatt by mentioning that three academics have expressed doubts about Myatt being the pseudonymous “Anton Long”, with (i) George Sieg writing that he considered it to be “implausible and untenable based on the extent of variance in writing style, personality, and tone” between Myatt and Long’s writings, {10} with (ii) Jeffrey Kaplan stating that Myatt and Long are separate people, {11} and with (iii) Connell Monette writing that it was quite possible that ‘Anton Long’ was a pseudonym used by multiple individuals over the last 30 years. {12}

All people who have claimed or who claim that Myatt was the pseudonymous “Anton Long” present and rely on are two things: (i) forgeries such as the two manuscripts titled *Diablerie* and *Bealuwes Gast* {13} and (ii) the analysis by Senholt in a Master’s thesis, later updated and included as a chapter in the book *The Devil’s Party: Satanism in Modernity* {14} with Myatt in a section of his essay *A Matter Of Honour* sub-titled *The Logical Fallacy of Incomplete Evidence – A Case Study*, {15} having analysed in some detail the claims made by Senholt, concluding that the claims are not tenable. As in the matter of the O9A, no one in the case of Myatt has studied and provided as evidence of involvement primary sources relating to his life {16}.

In another example the anti-fascists wrote:

*§ but again this is highly suspect as Moulton recently admitted that the two remain in regular contact*

This is not a rational statement because they provide no evidence for their claim as to why it is “highly suspect”. Does the fact that two friends are in “regular contact” mean something suspicious or sinister is going on? No, it only means that two friends are in regular contact unless and until there are facts – evidence – to the contrary. Until there are such facts the statement remains either disinformation or prejudicial. In either case it causes or can cause prejudice.

In yet another example they wrote:

*§ the presumption must be that he is still actively involved in the nazi occult organisation he has spent almost 50 years supporting and leading.*

Their bias is obvious in three things. First, that their presumption “must be”. It is unreasonable to claim that a presumption “must be” since a presumption is just a presumption, and thus is “the action of taking for granted or presuming something; assumption, supposition.” This statement that their supposition “must be” is therefore either wilful propaganda or ignorance.

Second, obvious bias in the statement “still actively involved”, because no evidence, no facts based on primary sources, are or have been presented, by that anti-fascist group or by anyone else, that he – Myatt – was ever involved with the O9A in the first place.

Third, obvious bias in the claim that “he has spent almost 50 years supporting and leading” since yet again no evidence, no facts based on primary sources, are or have been presented regarding such supporting and such leading.

On balance, therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the entire statement is biased and misleading propaganda.

While many more examples of their bias and/or of their ignorance could be presented, sufficient have been presented here, and elsewhere {17}, for us to arrive at a reasonable conclusion in the matter of the pronouncements made about the O9A by a particular anti-fascist group.

### **Conclusion**

It seems reasonable to conclude that the anti-fascist group in question is, in regard to the O9A, either deliberately spreading disinformation or is making statements and assumptions which are unreasonable because they are not evidential, that is, not based on a knowledge of the facts, on an unbiased study of primary O9A sources {2} and thus reveal either a basic ignorance of the nature of the O9A sub-culture or an unreasoned, an unethical, dislike; that is, a prejudice.

For a group which prides itself on offering “hope” rather than “hate”, their ignorance about or their bias, their prejudice against the O9A, and their ignorance about or their bias in respect of Mr Moulton and Mr Myatt,

contradicts their claim to champion “hope”. For ignorance, prejudice and disinformation, are often the genesis of hate.

Morena Kapiris  
June 2019

o o o o o

{1} The definitions are taken from the complete Oxford English Dictionary, second edition (20 volumes), Oxford University Press, 1989.

{2} In regard to O9A primary sources, these consist of the O9A corpus - written by “Anton Long” from the 1970s to 2011, and later (2011-2019) by the “inner ONA” - and thus range from the 1980s *Black Book of Satan* to *Naos*, and *The Deofel Quartet*, to post-2011 works such as (i) *The Pagan O9A*, 2015, (ii) *The Esoteric Hermeticism Of The Order Of Nine Angles*, 2016, and (iii) *A Compilation Of Some Recent O9A Texts: 2017 - 2019*.

The O9A corpus amounts to over 5,000 pages of written material. As noted in an academic paper presented at the international conference, *Satanism in the Modern World*, held at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology in Trondheim on the 19-20th of November, 2009,

“the ONA has produced more material on both the practical and theoretical aspects of magic, as well as more ideological texts on Satanism and the Left-Hand Path in general, than larger groups such as the Church of Satan and the Temple of Set has produced in combination [which] makes the ONA an important player in the theoretical discussion of what the Left-Hand Path and Satanism is and should be according to the practitioners.” Archive source: <https://regardingdavidmyatt.files.wordpress.com/2015/09/senholt-the-sinister-tradition.pdf>

{3} A classic example of the fallacy of illicit transference is the 2017 essay about the O9A by Della E. Champion of the University of Washington. See <https://wyrdsister.wordpress.com/2018/04/24/another-academic-misinterpretation-of-the-o9a/>

{4} A classic example of argumentum ad verecundiam - the fallacy of appeal to authority - is the section on the O9A by Massimo Introvigne in his *Satanism: A Social History* published in 2016. He relies on the opinions about the O9A by other authors, such as Goodrick-Clarke and Senholt.

He also commits another common fallacy, that of illicit transference, by arguing from the particular to the general, referencing one O9A item and then claiming that the opinion of the author in that item represents the opinion of the O9A. As we note later on in respect of the principle of the authority of individual judgment, no author, no individual, no nexion, can present or represent the view or the opinion of the entity termed the Order of Nine Angles.

{5} Examples of their misattribution and their committal of logical fallacies

are given in <https://wyrdsister.wordpress.com/2019/02/26/how-to-spread-fake-news>

{6} A fact confirmed by Professor Monette in his book *Mysticism in the 21st Century*. 2013. Sirius Academic Press. p.89

{7} Satanic Letters of Stephen Brown, letter to Michael Aquino, dated 20th October 1990 ev.

{8} In respect of the principle of the authority of individual judgment refer to such texts as (i) <https://omega9alpha.wordpress.com/individual-judgement/> and (ii) <https://omega9alpha.wordpress.com/o9a-authority/>

{9} See for example *A Modern Practical Guide To The O9A Seven Fold Way*, available from <https://omega9alpha.wordpress.com/7fw-a-modern-guide/>

{10} George Sieg. *Angular Momentum: From Traditional to Progressive Satanism in the Order of Nine Angles*. International Journal for the Study of New Religions, volume 4, number 2. 2013. p.257.

{11} Jeffrey Kaplan. *Religiosity and the Radical Right: Toward the Creation of a New Ethnic Identity*, in Jeffrey Kaplan and Tore Bjørge (editors), *Nation and Race: The Developing Euro-American Racist Subculture*. Northeastern University Press. 1998. p.115.

{12} Connell Monette. *Mysticism in the 21st Century*. 2013. Sirius Academic Press. p.92.

{13} Refer to (i) *A Skeptic Reviews Diablerie* by R. Parker, a copy of which is available at <https://regardingdavidmyatt.wordpress.com/2013/01/19/a-sceptics-review-of-diablerie/> and (ii) *Bealuwes Gast: A Study in Forgery*, available at <https://regardingdavidmyatt.wordpress.com/bealuwes-gast/>

{14} *Secret Identities in the Sinister Tradition: Political Esotericism and the Convergence of Radical Islam, Satanism, and National Socialism in the Order of Nine Angles*. "The Devil's Party: Satanism in Modernity". Per Faxneld and Jesper Aagaard Petersen (editors). Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 250-274

{15} <https://davidmyatt.wordpress.com/about/a-matter-of-honour-2/>

{16} Primary sources in regard to Myatt's life would include original documentation relating to his neo-nazi decades (such as criminal proceedings, police interviews), and documentation relating to his decade as a Muslim and his time as a Christian monk.

Primary currently accessible sources regarding both his life and writings include the following post-2011 published works:

- The Numinous Way of Pathei-Mathos.
- Understanding and Rejecting Extremism: A Very Strange Peregrination.
- Religion, Empathy, and Pathei-Mathos.
- Myngath.

- One Vagabond In Exile From The Gods.
- Sarigthersa.
- One Exquisite Silence: Some Autobiographical Poems.
- Such Respectful Wordful Offerings: Selected Essays Of David Myatt.

{17} Refer to <https://wyrdsister.wordpress.com/2019/02/26/how-to-spread-fake-news>

---

### **The Fallacies Of Anti-O9A Propaganda**

As mentioned in previous articles, the propaganda about the Order of Nine Angles (O9A, ONA) written and distributed by a political advocacy group is riddled with errors {1} and reveals the astonishing lack of knowledge about the O9A by that political advocacy group; a lack which is either deliberate - arising from hatred and prejudice - or arising because of a desire to spread propaganda about one of their declared enemies.

The propaganda also reveals the author committing several logical fallacies; either from ignorance or because of hatred and prejudice and/or a desire to spread propaganda about a declared enemy.

Some examples of such fallacies are:

- In respect of the O9A, in their 2019 so-called "State of hate" report, and in their 2020 report, the author commits the logical fallacy of Incomplete Evidence by selectively quoting from some O9A material, ignoring other material which provides context or which contradicts such quotations, and quoting material authored by some of those who associate themselves with the Occult movement that is the O9A.

Thus most of the O9A corpus is ignored, since a study of that corpus (i) would have contradicted their claim that the O9A is neo-nazi, {2} {3} (ii) revealed the context for suggested Insight Roles, which is a short part of the third stage of the decades long Seven Fold Way; (iii) revealed the fundamental O9A principle of individual authority, {4} and (iv) contradicted their claim that the O9A encourage misogyny and rape. {5}

- In the same report the author commits the fallacy of *secundum quid et simpliciter*. Which is the use of particular individual cases to form a general rule to then use that rule to describe, and thence to blame, or to castigate, or to defame a whole group. In many instances this involves quoting from material authored by some of those who associate themselves with the Occult movement that is the O9A.

- In the 2020 report the author commits the fallacy of *argumentum ad verecundiam* - argument from authority - by repeating what certain others have said or written about the O9A, with it being obvious from the errors made in that and the 2019 report and from the committal of the foregoing

two other fallacies, that the author is not an authority on the subject of O9A esoteric theory and praxises.

° In both reports the author commits a fallacy of presumption by making conclusions based on their assumptions and claim; in addition to which the author provides no evidence - nothing probative - for their assumptions and claims, such as in the matter of Mr Myatt being Anton Long, and which assumptions and claims often derive from the foregoing three fallacies.

The propagandistic nature of the reports can thus be seen, for the biased and misleading information they contain has been systematically disseminated in order to promote a political cause.

TWS Nexion  
Oxonia  
March 2020 ev

### *Notes*

{1} See the text titled *Exposing Twelve Basic Errors*, available at <https://omega9alpha.wordpress.com/fake-news/>

For an esoteric understanding of the O9A, refer to the 300 page *Seofonfeald Paeth* trilogy, which is available at <https://omega9alpha.wordpress.com/2019/10/29/seofonfeald-paeth/>

{2} See the chapter *The Alleged National Socialism Of The O9A* in *The Seofonfeald Paeth* trilogy. The article quotes from letters by Anton Long sent to Michael Aquino and others in the early 1990s, letters which were published in 1992.

{3} See also *Order Of Nine Angles: The Deofel Quintet*, included in *Seofonfeald Paeth* trilogy, where it is explained that *The Deofel Quintet* (written between 1976 and the early 1990's) places the neo-nazism aspect into the necessary esoteric perspective, for the novels of the *Deofel Quintet* are non-political.

{4} The principle is explained in the two articles *Authority, Learning, and Culture, In O9A Tradition* (written in 2013) and *The Authority Of Individual Judgement: Interpretation And Meaning* (written in 2014). Both articles are included in *The Seofonfeald Paeth* trilogy.

The axiom of the authority of individual judgement means that each O9A person, nexion, group, or cell, are - with one important exception - free to develop their own interpretation of everything O9A, free to develop and change everything O9A, and that there is no authority above the individual, or beyond each group or collective of groups. No O9A leader, no outer (or inner) 'representative', no council, no 'old guard', who can make pronouncements about or declare what is or is not correct. No 'official' or 'genuine' O9A; no 'heresy'; no proscription of individuals or groups. Furthermore, no consensus is necessary or required among those who are or who associate with the O9A {2}, although naturally a particular O9A nexion



may have or arrive at a particular internal consensus and thus presence a particular interpretation of matters O9A.

{5} The O9A consider rapists as suitable candidates for culling: see for example the text *Culling And The Code of Kindred Honour* (written 2015) available at <https://omega9alpha.files.wordpress.com/2015/12/culling-o9a-code-v3.pdf>

The pro-Sapphic novel *Breaking The Silence Down* - written in 1985 and part of The Deofel Quintet - and the essay *The Anti-Patriarchal O9A Ethos* - written in 2017 and available at <https://omega9alpha.files.wordpress.com/2017/02/o9a-questions-2017-v5b.pdf> - reveals the O9A attitude toward women, with the O9A code of kindred honour embodying respect for women and gender equality.

oooooooo