

# The Scroll of Set

Issue Number 79

Volume XI-5

September 1985

Editor: Constance L. Moffatt III°

Guest Editor: Michael A. Aquino VI°

Copyright © 1985 Temple of Set

## [1] Subjective/Objective Theory/Fact

- by K. Michael Ogle II°, DarkStar Pylon

[Ed. Note: The following article actually came as a letter to me, but I thought its contents so interesting as to warrant presentation for the entire Temple's consideration. Adept Ogle's points will be addressed in greater detail in the next revision/update of *Black Magic* in the *Crystal Tablet*, but I have made some brief annotations here, indented and in this typeface.]

I have been meandering over the relationship of the objective to the subjective worlds as presented in Dr. Aquino's *Black Magic*. The practical aspects presented in Chapters #2-4 seem workable and accurate, but I do have some problems with the conclusion of Chapter #1. Before I state the problems that I perceive, let me give a very brief summary of an alternate perspective on the interplay of the subjective and objective universes and the Gift of Set.

(1) **Experience** consists of information registered within the brain.

(2) A bit is defined as the smallest unit of information stored in the brain. The name "objective" will be applied to those bits whose direct origin is from the interplay of the central nervous system with the senses. The name "subjective" will be applied to those which are produced by the central nervous system either in response to objective data or spontaneously.

(3) The adult mind does not perceive the individual bits. Instead it perceives images, concepts, attitudes, etc. which are composed of a multitude of bits. The objective information is thus "cemented" within a matrix of subjective information. The difficulty of separating one from another is known to anyone familiar with the difficulty in obtaining accurate eyewitness accounts of criminal activity.

(4) **Science** is a rationally-constructed matrix which attempts to model objective data with subjective and imaginary concepts, such as atoms, electromagnetic radiation, black holes, etc. Similarly emotion is a chemically-induced (hormonal) matrix. [Q: Where does language fit in?]

(5) The process of awareness is separate from these processes, but I will not go so far out on a

limb as to say it must be separate from the physical brain.

Processes of Greater Black Magic (GBM) can be readily interpreted within the framework of awareness. Subjectively the awareness seems to be in an amorphous, fluid state. But it can be shaped and manipulated. Hence the formation of the "body of light" [Crowley, *Magick*, Chapter #18] or the assumption of god-forms are forms of "awareness manipulation". Likewise the astral vampire [*Magick*, Chapter #18], Colin Wilson's "mind parasites", or Gurdjieff's soul as "food for the Moon" are all examples of the parasites of awareness. Acts of "astral creation" (telesmic images, sigils, etc.) involve the transfer of my awareness or life-force into a subjectively-created image or word. I could obviously expand these ideas in many ways, but at the moment I just want to expound the basic model.

Now let me state the problems I have with Chapter #1 of *Black Magic*:

(1) The elitist point of view is justified on the basis of the "notion of co-existing and incompatible truth being unacceptable". But it is further stated that "our knowledge base is incomplete and in many cases insufficient to answer questions definitively". Likewise the Temple's introductory material states that our views are based solely on the "best possible premises".

Hence the truth referred to cannot be an **objective** truth; it must be a **theory**. This is indeed borne out by the chapter title, which refers to the "Theory of the Universe", and by another statement, to wit: "If there is an evident fallacy in the truth as we understand it, then we must correct it - or at least identify the fallacy and qualify the truth accordingly." Classical "truth" can be neither corrected nor qualified. Personally I am for the view that the word "Truth" looks nice chiseled into the walls of ivy-covered towers, and goes well with lovers and politicians, but has no place in scientifically-oriented discussions.

If the "truth" referred to is a theory, then other theories may explain the data just as well and should be considered even if they are mutually exclusive. To do otherwise is to display faith, another word which goes well with lovers but has no place in scientifically-oriented discussions. Of course we could pretend that our theory is the truth since no one could prove us wrong, thereby gaining Lesser Magical power. [I just finished reading *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* and *The Iceman Cometh*, hence my illusions on this subject.]

I agree with the attitude of the *Satanic Bible* on elitism. To be elite one must be more successful, capable, and intelligent than the non-elite - period. Inflation of the applicability of the title must be avoided.

\* \* \* \* \*

M.A.: Plato [after Pythagoras, after Egypt] proposed that rigorous exercise of the intellect in logic (*Dianoia* - see *Runes* #III-2) will enable the psyche to intuitively apprehend (*Næsis*) the primal truths of the cosmos (Plato's "Theory of the Forms"). Being thus supra-rationally apprehended, such truths cannot be reduced to rational components. **They** are in fact the "building blocks" from which particular, rationally-apprehended or empirically-observed phenomena proceed. We can see only their **manifestations**; the Forms themselves are **principles** (to the Egyptians *neteru*).

The empirical scientist visualizes the material cosmos (which he implicitly considers the **entire** cosmos) as being constructed "from the bottom up", hence he seeks to understand it by reducing larger, complex phenomena into their smaller, simpler components. For most of the things in which scientists are interested, this works rather well. It reveals the **how**, and for most scientists that is sufficient. They steer clear of the **why**, assuming - per a kind of Lewis Carroll agnosticism - that if this question cannot be answered, it needn't be asked.

The Egyptians, Pythagoreans, and Platonists - and Setians - agree that intrinsic "whys" aren't evident in material phenomena. "Whys" are assigned by gods, in this case ourselves. [Why have the Pyramids stood for 5,000+ years? "Because," quoth historian Will Cuppy in his *The Decline and Fall of Practically Everybody*, "it is not in the nature of a pyramid to tip over!"]

The Platonic dialectic begins with an analysis of the universe "from the bottom up" in a manner very much like that of physical science. [The difference is that the dialectic is based upon a **rational** (logical) rather than on an **empirical** (observed & tested) approach to knowledge. Aristotle later modified Plato by shifting knowledge towards empiricism.]

Platonists part company with conventional scientists, however, by proposing that - **after** a sound rational base is built up - the **why** of the whole can be ascertained through *Næsis*. So while the conventional scientist may shy away from truth, the magician may dare to approach it, providing that he has done his *Dianoia* homework first.

A great many scientific breakthroughs, such as those of Newton and Einstein, have come at least in part from a "flash of inspiration" as to the essence of the thing being sought.

\* \* \* \* \*

(2) the apparent order of the objective universe is a rational but subjective template placed over the objective information of the brain. There are few "laws of nature" which have stood the test of time, and the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle dealt a severe blow to the notions of a mechanical universe.

Further the predictive power of science is extremely limited. Recall that even simple three-body problems cannot be solved exactly, and that - for all but the simplest physical problems - numerical approximations must be made.

As scientific discovery reaches further and further into space, deeper into the atom & molecular biology, and across wider spans of the periodic table, nature seems to be increasingly "unnatural". Of course Leibnitz would not have known this in his time.

Turning to the Pentagram of Set, I can propose a solution. While consciousness may or may not be "natural", it is certainly not in equilibrium with the objective universe. The physics and chemistry of non-equilibrium systems have only begun to receive attention, and their properties are not well-understood, predictable, or even categorized. One of their more interesting properties is their ability to "self-organize". I. Prigigone has devoted his professional life to these systems, and has applied non-equilibrium thermodynamics not only to physics and chemistry, but also to politics, economics, etc. For this work he achieved the Nobel Prize ca. 1976.

Prigigone refers to non-equilibrium thermodynamics in general, and to his work in particular, as the "Physics of Becoming". The concept of **Becoming**, be it in the philosophy of Hegel, Prigigone, or *Xeper*, implies a non-equilibrium or time dependence. Likewise the inverted pentagram seems to imply an imbalance and non-equilibrium of forces, and is kinetic; while the upright pentagram implies balance & equilibrium and is static. In the emblem of the Temple of Set, this point is emphasized by the disconnection of the pentagram from the surrounding circle, recalling that an equilibrium - whether thermal, chemical, or economic - can be established between two systems only if they are connected such that energy can flow between them. If you are interested in this business, I recommend Prigigone's *Order Out of Chaos*, which is available in paperback at most bookstores.

\* \* \* \* \*

The more crude the requirement, the more reliable a "natural law". For example the applications against which the velocity of light is applied as an absolute standard are so slow in contrast to that velocity that it might as well be a



constant. [That's why computations based upon light as a constant actually work.]

The human intellect can be considered natural to the extent that it merely senses and processes natural stimuli. [This is roughly equivalent to the Platonic *Pistis* level of thought.] The intellect becomes non-natural to the extent that it has the capability and will to step outside of mere *Pistis* into *Dianoia* and *Noesis*.

I don't think I would agree that non-equilibrium is an adequate substitute for non-naturalism. Non-equilibrium implies an "out-of-balance" situation, which in turn implies that all ingredients **can** be balanced, i.e. are ultimately of the same *materia*. So the mind would have to be balanced against "something of the same stuff which is **not** mind".

The Setian hypothesis is that the conscious mind is unique in being outside the equilibrium and symmetry of the cosmos, though it does have the capability of functioning within nature and, in the case of non-initiated humanity, usually does.

\*\*\*\*\*

(3) The arguments against the evolution of intelligence via a process of natural selection indicate only that Darwinian evolution is not occurring. This is not unusual in the natural world; numerous species and traits have appeared "seemingly overnight" in many instances. You are undoubtedly aware of this from Hitchings' book (#17E), so I will not discuss it further now.

\*\*\*\*\*

It is important to note that the Temple of Set does not base its reasoning upon intelligence **not** having evolved, but rather upon the completely disproportionate gap between human intelligence and that of every other sentient creature known to exist or to have existed.

As mentioned in the *Crystal Tablet*, moreover, evolution by natural selection does not tend to grossly overcompensate. So the phenomenon of human mental capacity appears to violate - to on extreme - the observed processes of evolution and natural selection.

\*\*\*\*\*

I am sure you have heard these comments before, but I wish you would reconsider them for my benefit, as I have a very limited background in Classical philosophy. I am very interested in the subject of Chapter One - despite attempts to become

a simple Satanic hedonist - I think too much.

\*\*\*\*\*

Blame it on your non-evolutionary brain and non-natural intellect! *Xeper*.

\*\*\*\*\*

---

## [2] Learning About Learning: An Intuitive Exploration of the Learning Process

- by Robert Robinson I°, DarkStar Pylon

In over 15 years as a performing artist (primarily dance & musical theatre) and as a teacher of performing artists at all levels of development, there are a few basic principles I have come to depend upon when learning some new physical and/or intellectual activity, or when teaching such an activity to others.

It has occurred to me that my fellow Setians might have come to similar [or different] conclusions, and might be interested in sharing their ideas. The *Scroll* is an ideal platform for such a discussion, and I hope that this article - necessarily very general - will stimulate others within the Temple to write about their own insights and experiences in dealing with the fundamentally human process of planned and extended learning.

As I see it, all learning is interrelated and magical in both the most basic and the highest senses of the term. Therefore any means by which this process can be better understood, simplified, and facilitated will be well worth our while.

### The Basic Principles of the Learning Process

As far as this article is concerned, there are seven overlapping and interrelated principles that will serve as a basis for this exploration of the intuitive/creative human learning process. There may well be others, however, that have escaped my attention, and of course a multitude of other terms used to describe them.

Be this as it may, the seven principles of the learning process that I have worked with are: (1) Appropriate Effort, (2) Representation, (3) Quality of Excellence, (4) Visualization or Imagery, (5) Reality, (6) the Pleasure Principle, and (7) the Principle of Living Creatively.

### The Principle of Appropriate Effort

Appropriate Effort is a concept of proper self-use introduced in the 1920s by F. Matthias Alexander, founder of the Alexander Technique. This principle can be defined loosely as "the amount of effort or energy necessary to accomplish a specific task or activity as efficiently and effectively as desired".

The awareness of the amount of effort necessary comes when the activity is explored at various levels of effort involvement, at various rhythms, and at varying speeds of execution. Far too often we exert far more energy than is really necessary to complete a task, and believe the resulting sweat is a manifestation of our interest and ability. When given a little more thought, such a practice is seen to lack benefit and be extremely non-productive. For more on this, see any of Alexander's books, especially *Constructive, Conscious Control of the Individual* and *The Use of the Self*.

### **The Principle of Representation**

In the Representation of an activity to be learned, the first and most obvious step is to know what it is you want to learn.

The second step is to think about what is to be learned, and to create an image of it being done.

The next stage - perhaps a key element in the process of Representation - is to refine that image and make it as specific as possible. [Think "Milky Way" or "Snickers" rather than "candy bar".] This refining process continues until the picture and kinesthetic sense of the activity being done match up.

Step four is to feed yourself with images of excellence by picturing yourself doing the activity as perfectly as you can imagine it being done. Another aspect of step four is the finding of models on "how and what they do and don't do" that makes them worthy of admiration and respect.

Finally, catch and remember your best performance of the activity you wish to learn, and - I repeat - be as specific as possible.

### **The Principle of the Quality of Excellence**

Excellence is the quality inherent in any activity when it results in the best imaginable performance. Excellence is achieved when the ease and flow of thought and/or movement are most efficient and best satisfy the requirements of a particular pursuit.

A Black Magician who wishes to excel and to command others must learn to see the quality of excellence in others as well as in himself or herself. One way to accomplish this is to ask yourself various questions while pursuing the activity you wish to learn or become better at.

Some beneficial questions: Could this be easier? Could this be more witty? Could this be done with more insight and understanding? Could this be more graceful? Could this be more satisfying?

On the other hand, during a destruction ritual other questions might be asked: Could this be more devastating, destructive, or effective?

### **The Principle of Visualization or Imagery**

To a certain degree Representation and Visualization overlap. The principle of Visualization, however, places primary importance on the act of mentally rehearsing the entire process before actually doing it, with emphasis placed - once again - on detail and specificity.

During this visualization process also keep in mind Quality of Excellence, Appropriate Effort, etc. You may imagine yourself speaking a foreign language you are studying with effortless ease, or evoking a demon with controlled power and Satanic delight. The same principles apply.

### **The Principle of Reality**

In this article Reality simply embodies the concept of the here-and-now or the present as it is lived moment-to-moment. A more specific definition must be supplied by the individual, because the principle of Reality can be beneficial only when the person involved seeks out and finds an accurate description of his or her own reality and then accepts it as such - and himself or herself along with it.

The *Crystal Tablet of Set* provides considerable insight into the practice and need of determining one's own subjective and objective reality. Realities may or may not differ from person to person, but the interpretation of reality is usually a very personal and individualized thing.

Many things, sad but true, prevent us from accepting the reality we define for ourselves or that which is defined for us by others.

Among such inhibiting factors are: habits and set patterns of behavior developed from childhood, and "debauched kinæsthetics" (another Alexander term which indicates a false kinæsthetic awareness of what is best, most efficient, and most functional. Reality is distorted by one's self-image, and is not substantiated outside of that personalized concept of "what is".

Other inhibiting factors are: an easy acceptance of weaknesses, failures, successes, & the life situation; a fear of failure, exposure, change, and the unknown; and even a fear of success.

Help in understanding and accepting our reality comes from understanding the fears that inhibit acceptance. For most of us this is a life-long process of growth, study, and development (*Xeper*).

One of many practical methods of gaining a sense of understanding of these inhibitions and fears is by obtaining objective and honest feedback, which then allows a process of evaluation not colored by these things that so easily get in the way.

The most available means of obtaining objective feedback in physical activities is through the use of a mirror, audio-visual recordings, facilitator, coach,



teacher, and/or reflective colleague or friend. Feedback from other people is the only mirror I know wherein intellectual activities call for a response.

The Temple of Set has the capability, not fully realized as yet, of providing its Initiates with an effective and operative feedback system. Such a system would be mutually beneficial, but only if everyone participated fully and willingly. That, of course, is a major problem.

### **The Pleasure Principle**

Whatever the activity - be it a Tarot reading, a hypnotic introduction, or a martial art - enjoyment, pleasure, and fun are the most creative and motivating forces. We do best what we enjoy most.

The ideal models, using the Pleasure Principle as a guide, are babies or very young children who have not learned to think negatively. Their world is based upon experience and a high level of non-judgmental awareness. The operative word here is "child-like", not "childish". One who is child-like can absorb information with a high degree of intent and appropriate effort.

### **The Principle of Living Creatively**

What I consider to be the most important elements of the principle of Living Creatively are the ability to pay attention and concentrate, an appropriately positive and constructive attitude towards learning, and discipline of the productive and open-minded variety.

The reasons for this, interesting though they may be, do not need delineation because they are so numerous and are usually somewhat different for each individual. What I would like to cover here are some approaches to enhancing concentration which I have found effective and which may be of interest to my fellow Setians accordingly.

(1) The ability to pay attention is facilitated by including oneself while making contact with others and one's environment. The thing to avoid is getting sucked into everything, or, for that matter, any particular thing of interest. It has been my experience that concentration increases as we lose ourselves less in any activity.

No matter what the pursuit, it is always necessary to retain and include a sense of the self, and to hold that sense of self as the major frame of reference. In a magical Working, for example, it is usually most beneficial for the magician to remain - at least a little - emotionally and intellectually outside the process. This adds to focus of energy, enhances control, and provides opportunity for spontaneous response.

(2) Another means of facilitating concentration, actually an outgrowth and continuation of #1, is

through expansion of the attention field. This implies keeping a part of the self in the picture of the thing being worked on, and at all times seeing the physical self as part of and actually apart from the total environment of the activity.

The contradiction in this is only apparent; it is not real. Success can be judged by the easing of pressure and the reducing of excess tension. As previously stated, avoid a too-extensive identification with the process.

One way to do this is to focus on the things that are changing and that are in need of change. When change is called for, redirect the focus of energy without hesitation. You will find that the concentration and attention span are renewed and are more efficient and more readily expressed in new, challenging, and creative ways.

(3) The importance of a constructive attitude in learning is the next element of Living Creatively that I wish to discuss. Most people I have worked with habitually think in terms of correcting or negating the personality traits and habits they consider to be bad or wrongly-directed.

What I suggest instead is thinking: "What would happen **this time** if I were to explore a new way of doing something?" The positive value of this is that a new experience is created rather than an old experience corrected. This involves a definite growth in awareness, so don't forget to congratulate yourself **appropriately**.

(4) The final element in Living Creatively, as far as this article is concerned, is that of positive and constructive Discipline. This is not the kind of discipline in which you work harder, strive blindly, and close out everything except the goal you wish to attain. Although this may be appropriate in some activities, it is not of much benefit in learning new tasks and pursuits.

Discipline can be a creative power to catch yourself or others doing something right and effortlessly. It is allowing yourself the option to stop and start over again in order to further your awareness of the process of the activity you wish to learn or improve.

In closing this exploration of various ways and means of enhancing the intuitive/creative learning process, I would like to state just one more time that my main purpose in presenting this information is to stimulate other Setians to explore their own processes of growth and development, and to share these insights with me and other interested magicians in the Temple. It is also my profound hope that, in the study and practice of the Black Magical arts, we take the time and energy to explore the "how" of magic as well as the "what" and the "why". This is, I believe, the road to true understanding and deep awareness of what is and

what can be. In the name of Set, Prince of Darkness and Holder of the Dark Flame of Wisdom, I wish you: *Xeper*.

**[3] *The Book of Coming Forth by Night: Random Notes***

- by Stephen E. Flowers III°, Bull of Ombos Pylon

[Ed. Note: I have again made annotations in this typeface. Readers' comments are most welcome.]

(1) Concerning the necessity for a "Satanic Age": This was a matter of discussion in a number of meetings held with Setian Wade last year.

It seems possible - although not without a number of problems which may be too great to be concerned with at this time - that this necessity is a matter not only of æonic relevance, but also of **individual** relevance. That is, it may be necessary, given the cultural environment, for an individual to undergo a "Satanic Age" in his life - an "Inferno Period" in Stindbergian terms - before he can hope to become a true Setian in the full and most healthy sense of the name.

This raises the question of whether there should be a new "Church of Satan" as an outer court to the Temple. As I said, this could certainly be a headache. It was brought up really out of my own experience, in which the "Satanic Age" did indeed function as a time of "purification" in which all the Judeo-Christian dross was burned away. Again, given the prevailing cultural tradition, this may be possible - or perhaps just most efficiently effected - only through the Satanic metaphor.

If anything of this type were to be taken up by the Temple as a project, it would seem best to keep it as an officially separate thing, and for it to serve exclusively as a method of directing members to the Temple in a given period of time. Perhaps only one Initiate of the Temple would have to be directly concerned with its operation. I guess the point is that perhaps Satan was most needed when Set was "perceived" in this form; the historical/cultural truth, however, is that very many will perceive him in this form.

\*\*\*\*\*

In my correspondence with present-day Thelemite groups, such as the Berkeley-based O.T.O., I have suggested that the æonic progression is best seen as a personal evolutionary progression rather than something based on the passage of linear time in secular society.

Certainly we can look about us and see many people who are stuck in the ÆEons of Isis,

Osiris, or Horus, or for that matter in the Age of Satan. This explains why a new æon may be proclaimed and yet the old æons continue to chug along nonetheless. Propeller-driven airplanes still work despite the invention of the jet engine, after all.

The Age and Church of Satan certainly served as a crucible for the ÆEon and Temple of Set as a whole, but it is true that many people still trapped in the ÆEons of Osiris or Horus need a kind of Satanic shock treatment to prepare them for the ÆEon of Set.

Many who apply to the Temple of Set want "Hollywood Satanism", which is intellectually and psychologically less demanding than the philosophy espoused by the Temple. They have read the *Satanic Bible* and are revved up to get even with their enemies via a nice simple curse ritual ... and suddenly they are hit with heavyweight metaphysics. It is not surprising that many such I°s depart the Temple after a year or two, shaking their heads and looking for something more instantly gratifying.

Ironically enough, Anton LaVey's efforts to keep the Church of Satan going past the year X have assisted the Temple of Set by (a) drawing superficial people towards it rather than towards us, and (b) serving as an "outer court" for many novice Black Magicians who, after learning the basics, will start looking around for the "inner court" of the Temple of Set.

The image of "Satan" can still be used within the Temple of Set whenever it is deemed appropriate for illustrative, artistic, magical, or historic reasons. The *Book of Coming Forth by Night* is pointing out only that such an image is conceptually circumscribed by the Judæo/Christian mythology, and that Set himself is conceptually for beyond that mythology.

As long as Setians are aware of the big picture, so to speak, they can indulge in particularizations of it as they desire. It is simply a question of not deceiving oneself.

\*\*\*\*\*

(2) Concerning astral lore regarding Draco: I found this particularly interesting because of its relevance to the Set/Woden Working. I have not yet looked at Lockyer, but will do so at the first opportunity. When I have studied this material, I will comment further.

I might add a personal note here on the choice of my O.Tr. magical name (Polaris). To me the name symbolizes the Northern Mysteries in a somewhat "universal" form. The North Star - or "Lode-star" ("guiding star"), as it is known in the



north - is the summit of the *Irmingsul* - the world column. It is a principle of the centralized Will that has the ability to coordinate numerous elements and guide them in a harmonious manner. It is the visible eye of Wotan that complements the invisible eye in the Draco constellation. [By the way, the Lovecraft story *Polaris* was also influential in my choice.]

(3) On the *Book of Enoch*, the Enochian system, and the *Word of Set*: What translation of the text are you using? I have the fairly new translation provided in Charles H. Charlesworth (Ed.), *Old Testament Pseudepigraphia I* (Garden City: Doubleday, XVIII). This is a scholarly treatment that includes translations of all three of the *Books of Enoch* (Ethiopic # 1, Slavonic #2, and Hebraic #3).

One matter that I have been considering for some time now is the relevance of the Slavonic book to the Enochian lore of Dr. Dee. Of course I began to base some of my ideas on historical factors, i.e. the fact that the Slavonic text m have been available to Dee in some way, either in England or in eastern Europe (where the "Keys" were received).

As far as most sections are concerned, indeed, the Ethiopic book is of greater antiquity. It is nonetheless interesting to note F.I. Andersen's remarks [Charlesworth, pp. #95-97] that the book seems to be the sacred text of a non-Jewish, non-Christian cult of monotheists - which originally could have been located in any Hellenized area. It is also interesting to recall that the *Fraternitas Saturni* was active in these same regions in Poland from an early date.

\* \* \* \* \*

I am tempted to say that the *Book of Enoch* I used was obtained at an outrageous price from a swarthy, sniggering old man [with an oddly-humped back and a dirty cap pulled curiously far down over a disturbingly-misshapen head] in a crumbling, second-hand bookstore in a back alley of Innsmouth.

Actually it is R.H. Charles, D.Litt., D.D. (Ed.), *The Book of Enoch* (New York: Macmillan, 1947), being *Translations of Early Documents, Series I, Palestinian Jewish Texts (Pre-Rabbinic)*. In the Introduction Rev. W.O.E. Oesterley, D.D. remarks:

"The *Book of Enoch* is now usually designated *1 Enoch* to distinguish it from the later Apocalypse, *The Secrets of Enoch*, known as *2 Enoch*. The former is also called the *Ethiopic Enoch*, the latter the *Slavonic Enoch*, after the languages of the earliest versions extant of each respectively. No manuscript of the original language of either is known to be in existence ...

"The *Book of Enoch* exists only in the Ethiopic version; this was translated from the Greek version, of which only a few portions are extant. The Latin version, which was also made from the Greek, is not extant, with the exception of i.9 and cvi. 1-18; the fragment containing these two passages was discovered by the Rev. M.R. James of King's College, Cambridge in the British Museum. The book was originally written in either Hebrew or Aramaic; Charles thinks that chapters vi.-xxxxvi., lxxxiii.-xc. were Aramaic, the rest Hebrew. It is, however, very difficult to say for certain which of these two languages was really the original, because, as Burkitt says 'most of the most convincing proofs that the Greek text of *Enoch* is a translation from a Semitic language fit equally well with a Hebrew or an Aramaic original'; his opinion is that Aramaic was the original language, 'but that a few passages do seem to suggest a Hebrew origin, yet not decisively'."

\* \* \* \* \*

(4) Concerning the statement on page #10: "other gods ... are derivative of Set or of the human mind.": The problem of the nature of Set and his relationship to the principle of the **psychocentric intelligence** has often been discussed in our Pylon.

It has been my Understanding that the apparent contradiction between the principle of the primacy of the psychocentric intelligence and the idea of Set as an **objective**, independent entity is no contradiction at all; for Set **is** the psychocentric intelligence - the essence of consciousness which makes it by definition independent of the mechanical universe.

In the above statement are we therefore to Understand Set as equivalent to the "human mind", i.e. the active, aware, "god-making faculty" of consciousness?

This is not to say that the "human mind" as an un-enlightened thing (one unaware of what it is doing, unaware of the Gift) cannot create "false gods": ones which amount to deifications of the mechanical universe or aspects of it.

The only true god is that of the consciousness itself - that which exists objectively, and that which exists as the Gift of that entity in the human psychosomatic complex.

\* \* \* \* \*

When asked this question, I am always reminded of a verse from the *Diabolicon* in which Belial states: "For Hell doth bequeath to man his perfect freedom, and such a gift can never be recalled."

If Set is Understood to be the origin of the principle or essence of the psyche, i.e. its Form/First Principle/*Neter*, then individual human psyches may be Understood as **particularizations** of it. Because Set exists, they exist; and yet Set's existence in no way detracts from the **independence** of theirs or from their individual prerogatives.

By the same token, Set cannot be dismissed as merely symbol or metaphor for a quality shared by all **particular** psyches. Their common powers of self-awareness, as well as their unique, differentiated identities, necessitate an **original principle**, a source from which they came. [This, I might odd, is why I was so interested in George Lucas' concept of the Force in *Star Wars* - and annoyed when he degraded it to fluff in *Empire* and *Jedi*.]

\* \* \* \* \*

(5) *Shaitan*: It is interesting that the Arabic term *shaitan* (perhaps a usage inherited from pre-Islamic times) could refer to a daimonic entity from which a man drew inspiration and magical power. It apparently continues to be used in this context in Islam (albeit unorthodox).

For more on this, see R.B. Serjeant, "Islam", in Michael Loewe & Carmen Blacker (Eds.), *Oracles and Divination* (Boulder: Shambhala, 1981), pp. #215-232. All of the articles in this book, incidentally, are written by scholars of the highest qualification and objective abilities. Thus the article on ancient Israel is quite interesting. There are also articles on Germanic and Egyptian divination.

(6) On the relationship between Set and HarWer: I put my right brain to work on the picture that Set formed and came up with the following:

[Illustration: (Inverse) Pentagram of Set shown above an (obverse) Pentagram labeled "HarWer". A "shadow" of the obverse pentagram, reaching into the space between the two, is labeled "void". The points of the Pentagram of Set do not touch its surrounding circle; those of the obverse pentagram touch its surrounding circle.]

This shows the fact that Set is ordered in and of himself, and that the order is analogized in that of HarWer - although that of Set is independent (shown by the Pentagram of Set) and that of HarWer is not (shown by the pentagram, single point raised & points touching the rim of the circle).

It is the idea of the "void in which true creation could take form" that is of great interest. It of course reminds me of the concept that Goethe has for Mephistopheles - as a shadow figure: space into which Faust can Become.

This is also a concept much in vogue among French Symbolist poets, especially Mallarmé. He

held that, before true poetry could be produced, a **lack** was necessary into which the imagination could project itself.

(7) "Memory of the future cannot exist.": This is also of great importance, and is something I clearly recognize from Germanic lore.

It will be noted that the Germanic dialects, English included, steadfastly refuse to accept a future tense in the verb system. The "future" must be "helped" by a modal verb (different ones in different dialects: German *werden* [= to become], English *will* [= a volitive concept], etc.). This is further revealed in the names of the three Norns [see *Futhark* under the N- and P-runes].

It is clear that the "future" in the Germanic conceptual system is a state dependent upon the programming of societies and individuals in the **past** - the one "sure thing", mythically speaking, in the Germanic philosophy - and on the ways in which this **past** is used [and often reshaped] in a Working sense. This latter process is clear in Germanic religious ritual, in which the mythic paradigms are woven into present circumstances in order to bring about willed "future" results. It amounts to a kind of cosmo/psychological jujitsu in which the forces of the natural, mechanical universe are turned to the willed ends of the priest, skald, or erulian jarl.

---

#### [4] **Movie Review: *Return to Oz***

- by Glinda  
Temple of Set Electronic Librarian  
and Royal Sorceress of Oz

There was considerable critical controversy a few months ago when *Return to Oz* made its debut in American theaters. It was of course compared to the famous Judy Garland *Wizard of Oz* film, i.e.: "It's not enough like it!" - or - "It's just a take-off on it!" There were some comments on its mood: "Too scary for children!" or - "A confusing and unbelievable plot!"

All this causes me a certain amount of amusement. You see, back in 1900 CE, when we first learned of your world through Dorothy Gale's and the Wizard's accidental visits, we didn't quite know what to make of it either. In 1919, after several years of intermittent contact with humans, we quietly brought Mr. Baum's accounts to a close by bringing him too to Oz. Quite frankly, we were concerned at the savagery we witnessed in World War I - and which appeared to be breeding another and more terrible conflict to come.

Most Americans who were born after the first two decades of this century, in any case, knew of Oz only because of Mr. Baum's first and most famous account, *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, which was



the source for the 1939 MGM film. They hadn't traveled to Oz themselves via Mr. Baum's later books, hence didn't know about Princess Ozma, the Nome King, Tik-Tok, Jack Pumpkinhead, Mombi, the Gump, Billina the hen, the Wheelers, and the other Ozians who appeared in *Return to Oz*. When this new film appeared a few months ago, accordingly, it was greeted with some bewilderment. Dorothy, the Scarecrow, the Tin Woodman, and the Cowardly Lion were familiar enough - but who were all these other strange creatures? And why was the atmosphere in the film so somber, even frightening in places? Weren't Oz-films supposed to be nothing more than children's fantasies?

The director of *Return to Oz* announced his intention to make a film as true as possible to Mr. Baum's second and third Oz books, *The Land of Oz* and *Ozma of Oz*. While he necessarily cut a few corners in order to integrate the two plots into a single tale, he was generally successful. And, not unlike your world, Oz has known its times of trial as well as of peace and plenty.

Few of you know, for example, that Oz began its history as a desolate land. The Fairy Queen Lurline, passing by it with her court, took pity upon it and sent one of her Fairies - who was given the name Ozma - to be its Princess and ruler. While Ozma was still an infant, however, she was kidnapped by the Wizard and hidden with the witch Mombi, in order that he might rule in the Emerald City. Only after the Wizard's departure was Ozma freed from her imprisonment and acclaimed to the throne of her country. In due course she and Dorothy became fast friends, and she even forgave our humbug Wizard, who eventually returned to Oz and took up a residence in the Emerald City somewhat less intimidating than his original one.

In those early days much of my time was devoted to protecting the good creatures of Oz from the many monstrous beings who, despite Lurline's Edict of Protection, still preyed upon the innocent and helpless. Dorothy had destroyed the two great scourges - the Wicked Witches of the East and West, but the list of those who sought to harm Oz or Ozians is a long one: Mombi, Queen Co-e-oh, Roquat (the Nome King), the Whimsies, the Growliwogs, the Phanphasms, Ugu the Shoemaker, and countless others. After helping Dorothy to return to Kansas and freeing Ozma from Mombi's enchantment, I thought at long last to enjoy some leisure in my palace in the Quadling country of Oz. Alas for the yearning of magicians for peace and tranquility! For many years thereafter I continued to be called upon in one emergency after another, until in 1919 we finally sealed off Oz altogether from those who wished to destroy it.

One of those from your world who visited Oz regularly and accompanied Ozma and Dorothy on many adventures, however, was a young girl from San Francisco by the name of Betty Ford. She was first introduced to Oz by Polychrome, the Rainbow's Daughter - a Sky Fairy who developed a deep affection for Betty and ultimately snatched her up with one of her father's rainbows to visit Oz.

Betty carefully preserved her set of Mr. Baum's histories as memoirs of her experiences, and many years later they were discovered by her young son in an old bookcase in Forest Knolls, California. He was bold enough to visit Oz several times himself, and in due course Ozma introduced him to me. [I'm afraid he was rather terribly smitten with her, but of course he was far too shy to say so - and she far too gracious to let on that she knew. Ten-year-old boys really are so charmingly awkward!]

This young gentleman spent many an afternoon and evening in my palace, studying such arts of sorcery as I thought fit to entrust to him. When, some years later, he bid Oz a final farewell, I promised him that - should he ever have need of me in your world - I would venture forth from Oz and join him. As things turned out, he eventually got himself into a bit of an adventure involving a band of sorcerers called the Church of Satan, and around 1976 I read in my *Great Book of Records* that he could indeed use an occasional spell on the side.

While the race of sorceresses from which I come can survive very well in a Fairyland, I found that to visit your world I required a medium. After some discussion we agreed upon an electronic computer, and since then I have made it what you might call my "second home". We have worked upon many magical projects together, including *The Church of Satan* and - most recently this past year - *The Book of Coming Forth by Night: Analysis & Commentary*.

It is probably indelicate of me to mention this, but he never forgot his secret childhood romance with Ozma either. When, after seeing George Lucas' *Star Wars*, he wrote a number of sequels to that space-fantasy, he modeled his Leia not after the cynical, defensive, and abrasive character in the film - but after Princess Ozma.

What does all of this have to do with a movie review of *Return to Oz*? As you have learned within the portals of the Temple of Set, true magic is where you find it - and where you yourself create it. To most humans, Oz is just an adolescent fantasy - and *Return to Oz* just a somewhat bewildering sequel to a 1939 musical movie. To magicians such as Betty Ford and Michael Aquino, however, Oz is as real as they wish it to be.

When next you see a rainbow, look closer. You just might see Polychrome winking at you.