

THEOLOGY OF SATANISM

*Ways of God are inscrutable? Oh, no, just not for me.
I know him too well. Not worse, than He knows me.
If our paths will be intersected, He, noticed me
in far distance by his sharp-sighted eye, will hurry
to turn off aside in fear before my killing sting of three steel blade –
that is my tongue, my natural weapon!*

Lautreamont, "The Songs Of Maldoror"

World outlook is the most common universal system of views of the world and of someone place in it. Satanism, as an ideology and the world outlook, has its own special attitude to some aspects of reality. Satanists point of view is often concurred with universal position of wise people. Socially, it is about euthanasia, birth control, social morality etc. But, of course, there are the differences. Otherwise, Satanism could not be an independent world outlook. The one of the questions is the attitude to God.

Such a question is harder than it seems a prima facie: first of all, "God" is not monosemantic conception; secondly, Satanism is beyond dogma, and Satanists see God and Satan very differently. Nevertheless, common appropriateness is evident quite well.

Someone could ask: why we have to look through this conception, and is it necessary when the most modern Satanists are atheists? I say we will analyze this one, because God is very ancient idea, and ignoring it saying "*I'm not interested in it*" usually means just intellectual impossibility to dissolve the problem on the possible level. Of course, it is easy to proclaim "*there is no god*" and then ignore the discussion. It is easier, than to develop someone personal point of view to the *universal one*. It was posted in my FAQ (version 3.05, November 30, XXXVII A.S.):

45. What would Satanist do, when he knows that God exists? Would he repent to be saved?

God can be excused just because/with only he dos not exists. Stendhal

At first sight, the question is too hard. Saying with pride "I will come into the fires of Gehenna"- it looks some strange. An answer "I will repent" will provoke a natural reaction of Homeric laughter "how can you say you are Satanist now?" An answer "I think there is no god!" is not an answer, but a trick. It is clear, however: posers will repent immediately. Could it save them – that is another story. But *Satanists* have no such a chance. It is not because they are sick or insane. It is because the essence of Satanist is in conflict with so called divine abundance. Repentance is to be not formal, but *sincere* – and that is impossible, because conditions are not acceptable physically or ... Situation looks like this: you should be dissected, no eyes, no ears, no arms, no legs, you can not speak but you will live. And you should *want* such a "life" *sincerely*. If when there is an alternative chance of endless torture instead of death, i can not sincerely want such an existence (i can not call it life).

But where we rule by our rights – the laws of god and humans are not powerful, *and never the World will see the one of us in chains. Only in purple, or in crimson.*

That is the End of each Beast, who takes the responsibility on his own for all manifestations of Evil, revolting in the fleshes of everything dwelling on the earth.

V.Skavr, "Maledictum"

The answer written above is universal exactly and it answers the purpose of Satanism at all beyond the specific perception of the Satanist. And an attitude of Satanism to God is the reason by which it is impossible to wish a life with God. First of all, let us see what the God means.

First of all, it is to be noticed that the theme of this article does not review pagan gods and forms of their existence or perception of them. All pagan gods possess two sides: “dark” and “light”. In the same time they personify the Forces of the Nature, so that they have no deals with Satanism *per se*, ergo – there is no opposition. We are interested in standard opposition “Satan-antagonist/adversary of God”.

It is wrong to limit the conception of God with Christian view and perception of Christianity. We have to look at this phenomenon wider. Ruslan Hazarzar determines the following traits in his writing “Skeptical View On Existence And Nonexistence Of God”:

First of all we should agree that “God” means:

- omnipotent and eternal omnireal essence (το ον το κρατιστον, ens realissimum);
- essence created everything, or essence which is a fundamental principle and an initial cause of creation (το ον το, προαρχη προωτισταιον, ens originarium, ens archontissimum);
- reasonable essence, a person (νοϋς το ον το διανοιον, persona, summa intelligentia).

So, separating the conception of God from the special particular qualities and looking through only necessary common predicates, we come to the theology of the reason (theologia rationalis) and to the transcendental theology, because “necessity”, “unity”, “existence outside of the world”, “infinity”, “eternity beyond the time”, “omnipresence beyond the space”, “omnipotence” *et cetera* – these are the transcendental predicates.

Maybe it looks like a limited conception of God that is right for the monotheism. Why we should perceive a God as person? Under the name “God” we can see the Strength in its metaphysical and occult sense. And presence of true archetype (as of egregor) is evident.

It does not matter for Satanism if God is a fundamental cause or a demiurge of this world. It is important that God is *realized* somehow *in the present*. And talking about “omnipotence and eternity” – Hell is not less perfect, but it is just another perfection and another eternity.

So, we have “monogod” opposite to Satan – “monogod” in any form from abstract idea to personality. Universal method of approach is not the invention of Satanism. Marquis De Sade said (Philosophy In Boudoir):

If it is proven that this God’s existence is impossible, and that Nature, forever in action, forever moving, has of herself what it pleases idiots to award God gratuitously; if it is certain that this inert being’s existence, once supposed, he would be of all things the most ridiculous, since he would have been useful only one single time and, thereafter and throughout millions of centuries, fixed in a contemptible stillness and activity; that, supposing him to exist as religions portray him to us, this would be the most detestable of creatures, since it would be god who permits evil to be on earth while his omnipotence could prevent it.

As you see, Marquis is against God in any case. So is Nietzsche, who said “God is dead”, but nevertheless wrote in his last book “Antichrist”:

That is not a contradiction “is there God or not?”, but a universal resistance to God however he is realized.

And if one day God will appear, atheists will disappear as a class, but skeptics will stay all the same. And Satanists will be Satanists – resisting to god.

Aut vincere aut mori

Notes

- In this article i use a term “monotheistic God”. I don’t mean gods of popular monotheistic religions. In this case, God is not exactly θεος, it might be an essence, Strength, an Idea etc. The main factor is yearning to dominate over the Universe (on metaphysical level) and to destroy the opposition. It is an idea of the Absolute Order.

Absolute Chaos and Absolute Order – energies equal to each other. But in Chaos all components are absolutely free and have a maximum of possible energy increased in the system; in Order everything is on the fixed place and has no energy. Absolute Order is an Absolute Zero. Consists of the particular zeros...

- Conception “Monotheistic God” means that God is the Universum at all. In any theology recognizing ens realissimum as necessary, Satan and Jhvh – are just realization of God-Universum, and God-Universum has *nothing* to resist to. It is Everything in Itself.

However it is incomprehensible (for Satanists at least), why we should call Universum “God”? The main theme of this article is opposition of God and Satan. It is about bisubstantiality. God is NOT Universum. There is nothing united with Opposed, nothing Indivisible with Opposed within.

- There is a question: Why i use the models of reality when there is a God in some form?

I say, these models exist, and the most part of population (of Russia at least) exists in these models. And as we live among humans, it is useful to know them thoroughly.

Besides that, it is baseless to proclaim 100% inhumanity. And to before you destroy human in yourself, you have to know its components and the ways of their influences.

Religious aspect

I would say it is the easiest aspect of our discussion. I.A.Kryvelev wrote in his “About The Evidences Of God Existence”: “I will not say today about God in biblical – old testament and even new testament conception. It is really easy to prove that there is no God that we can see in the Old testament, the God imaged in a man, the God walking through the paradise in evening freshness, the God who sit when he dose not want lay down, the God who has his place in the space at all...There is no reason to talk about such a God phenomenon.” I agree with the author: even though looking from the atheistic point of view, criticism of existence of God by the analyses of bible’s contradictions might be useful only as historical or theosophical investigation and as a material for propaganda of *vulgar* atheism such as “there is no god”. That is the basis of absence of God in some *specific* religions provided by a priori statement that all ancient sacred writings are the chronicles of reality. So, if we come this way, we can find the contradictions in these books and deny the hypothesis at all as the inner contradicted one.

Just look, Bible says that the birth of Christ is timed to two events: reign of Irod and general census of the population. Irod died few years **before** our era (started from the “birth of Christ”), and the census was done few years **later**. But if we ignore the over-literal rendering (it is the nature of a religious fanatics but not ours), we see the situation is complicated. Some christians understand the situation and try to reform their belief. John Shelby Spong “Call To A New Reformation”:

Theism, as a mode to determine a God, is dead. So that the most part of theological discussions have no meaning and results today. It is necessary to find a new way to talk about

God....Statement that the cross is a sacrifice for the sins of the world is barbarous idea based on the primitive conception of God, and this idea should be denied....All human beings have an image of God...

As you can see, ignoring almost all christian dogmas, Spong nevertheless says that God actually exists, and He is necessary. Man just has to find the actual (modern) way of realization.

I wish to accentuate your attention in the following: the point is not in resistance to some one *form* of God existence, but in resistance to the *essence* of God exactly. And the essence of God in religion (monotheism) is determined above, in introduction of this article.

Absence of the evidences of God's existence (we look through the religious aspect) does not mean there is no God. We just have no reason to accept the axiom "God exists". There is no reason such an axiom could work in our world outlook.

So, if there is no God – there is no religious aspect. But it does not abolish the influence of other aspects: semiotic symbol in particular has no denotement.

If God exists, we have a lot of alternatives: He is not only imaged in the one advertised by the clergyman (especially as there are more than two thousands different christian confessions). So, the version of "Fiery Gehenna" is just the one of the many without number and without facts of some more trustworthiness. I don't mention the fact that the myth of Satan's revolt told in christian religion is represented from the one (preconceived) point of view.

The point is not in comparison of possible true versions (especially as it is impossible to calculate such a probability). The point is in that Satanists has no *beata stultitia* necessary to be in harmony with God. That is why Satanist is always against God. Otherwise he is no longer Satanist and his existence comes to the end. Let me quote some work to be published later:

Inner principles provide the integrity of personality and keep it in safety....How often do you wish to "breathe cyanide a little bit" or to take the acid bath? Person with developed inner principles does the same – *he has no single thought* to forget about them or to leave them or to give up them whenever. Basic principles of the person are not a dress for a day and not shuffled cards for an easy game. Inner principles are increased and developed. Some of them are given up only in progress of *reasonable, well based and consecutive development of personality*. And initial cause of this work never comes from the *outside*. It is the aspiration of personality to development.

Even Plotin had no words to describe such a condition. It is when human being turns to the rest and transcends to a contemplation of eternal light. It is... the confluence with the object of contemplation, unspeakable vision, nirvana. It is even not a vision, but a state of frenzy, retirement, renunciation, eternal peace, some special kind of the spiritual enthusiasm. Ecstasy is the invention of Plotin.

I.Granin, "What is ethics, culture, religion?"

Here we see that Satanist has nothing to do in Paradise: inertia of nirvana, fanaticism of frenzy, self retirement, and rest instead of *action* – all of it is conflicted with Satanist's world outlook. It is really fun to look at the attitude of believers to the Paradise. Most of them have no answer on the question: what will they do there? Most of them do not care of it. And if the muslims are ready to drink and fuck eternally, christians prepare to do nothing, but just stay in bliss before the throne of their god.

Satanism immanently includes *action* and *creative work* that is conflicted with Die absolute Ordnung of God. That is why Satanist stays in opposition to God this is the fight for the life and existence of Personality.

In addition to this part of the article i want to mention the pantheism and deism. Pantheism is not theism and resists Satanism no more than paganism. As for the deism, they ancient people said: *de non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio.*

Notes

Of course, if God realized exactly as *ens realissimum*, we have fatalism such as in materialistic determinism, where “the will of God” manifests instead of materialistic general causality. The main antinomy of this idea appears provided with conclusion that if there is an omnifree essence, a man ontologically *have no* his own freedom (it was written by Augustine). Free will of a man existing with the omnifree will of God – it is οζυμορον. Nothing happens beyond the will of God. Yes, scholastics say that free will of a man exists by the will of God, but the problem of this antinomic position could not be dissolved. As i know, only Count fought with this question, but he got no answer.

As the result, this version of religious perception of God means that Puppeteer plays before himself by his own screenplay and nothing else. But however, actually there are no premises for such a sad story.

Precautions of objections

Intellectuals are divided on two categories:
some of them worship to intellect,
some of them use it.
G.Chesterton

I change a theme for a while to make precautions of standard misunderstanding. I foresee an objection, that best of all could be demonstrated in example of my old aphorism:

Universe is immoral – there is no Good, neither Evil. But when somebody insists that there is some Good – i stand on the side of Evil and resist the insister; his faint efforts break the harmony of Universe.

I was objected with the words: “If i call the knowledge as good, would you stay on the side of ignorance?”

Such a thesis is the evidence that the opponent is not capable to think methodically by all the aspects of reality (and often it talks about his incompetence in some conceptions). Although L.Vingenstein said: “Only the facts can determine the meaning; class of the names can not.”, it does not mean that names/appellations have no meaning and could be interchanged. But it means that the name has the meaning as far as the named subject has. Actually, the same Vingenstein wrote: “We create the images of the facts. ... The image is represented in the form of representation independently end beyond the truth or lie.”

Psychology of the unconsciousness shows the fact that many words are not just conventional identifiers, but they are connected with the subconscious associations on the archetypal level. Man perceps the archetype always numenously, and in consequence of the environmental factor ψυχη develops coming through the many filters, which disturb the adequate perception of reality. It is about some “a priori good” and some “a priori evil”. So that deliberate cognition of

many symbols is distorted in the beginning. In this situation some unacceptable aspirations and experience are often excluded and extracted from the consciousness.

Nevertheless, perception of the archetype, symbol is not always common and conventional. The Watcher, № 4, September 1990:

The following description of the Devil by Paul Karus "Hystory Of The Devil" defines the nature of Satan as the modern Satanists see it: "Devil is the cosmic insurgent, revolutioner in the empire of the tyrant, opposition to the monotony, dissonance in the universal harmony, exception to the rule, desire of self-expression, living contradiction to the will of God and to the implanted mode of behavior; He breaks the monotony that would fill the cosmic spheres when every single atom follows the predetermined course in unconscious piety and pious obedience."

If we change the meanings of the words "chair" and "table" we will get no changes in perception. It will be a change of the conventional identificator, the thing that determines the function. But if we change the opposite pair of *archetypical* terms we will see that perception of reality is distorted. It is impossible to change the lace of "Good" and "Evil" and leave their attributes without change. Russian says "to *make Good*" and "to *create Evil*". These words have a great meaning. Change without changes – this way lead to the Devil worshipping and some other perversion of view and perception of reality. And Satanism is not the inversion of reality, but it gives up the *human* perception of reality.

Hell, as an *idea* born in Chaos, pierce the every single of myriads facets of Its substance, determines the centre of Chaos and the ways of Its development.

It is independent from the efforts simplification and estimation, it never be between some limits. Cognition of it is possible only through empirical comprehension of its principles, through putting them inside and overcoming the self limits, - trough becoming the part of it.

...it is different perception of the Universe; it is natural to our tribe. This is the way, covered by impenetrable Darkness on all pre-existing cards – the break of borders, beyond which there are territories belonged to Chaos wide open. This is irrepressible power longing from It.

Inferion

Satan – is not the other God, but anti-god. In psychological, mythological and occult aspects God influence on Universe, so that Satan actually has nothing to do, except to resist God.

So, the counter thesis: Satanists turns the "good God and bad Satan" to "bad God and good Satan" is incompetent and i decided to refute it prophylactically.

Real attitude of Satan to "divine throne" is described well in "The Revolt Of The Angels" by Anatole France:

Now, thanks to us, the god of old is dispossessed of his terrestrial empire, and every thinking being on this globe disdains him or knows him not. But what matter that men should be no longer submissive to Ialdabaoth if the spirit of Ialdabaoth is still in them; if they, like him, are jealous, violent, quarrelsome, and greedy, and the foes of the arts and of beauty? What matter that they have rejected the ferocious Demiurge, if they do not hearken to the friendly demons who teach all truths; to Dionysus, Apollo, and the Muses? As to ourselves, celestial spirits, sublime demons, we have destroyed Ialdabaoth, our Tyrant, if in ourselves we have destroyed Ignorance and Fear."

And Satan, turning to the gardener, said:

"Nectaire, you fought with me before the birth of the world. We were conquered because we failed to understand that Victory is a Spirit, and that it is in ourselves and in ourselves alone that we must attack and destroy Ialdabaoth."

Philosophical aspect

Dogma is the effort to make a one-edged stick.
D.Rudj

I don't want tell here about ontological, cosmological and theological "evidences" of god existence, about bet of Pascal, about R.Decart's arguments of god existence, about categorical imperative of I.Count et cetra. I entirely agree with the article of R.Hazarzar "Skeptical View On Existence And Nonexistence Of God" that tells that "there is one of two possible ways: to don't look at he metaphysics and don't touch theological questions (it is the method of modern natural science), or to talk about existence or nonexistence of God on the level of conceptions of hypothesis (υποθεσις) or belief (πιστις). Of course, there is third radical way, the way of positivism – to blame theological theories as false and nonsensical. But it won't dissolve the problem and won't end the existence of these questions."

Attitude of Satanism to God is independent from presence or absence of God. Once, i've expressed my own point of view: "My answer to the question of existence of indivisible god. I stand on the neutral position: if he exists or not, i against him all the same."

In philosophical aspect, first of all it is necessary to look at the conception of God as of Absolute. Let we remain the popular discourse of A.Shopenhower ("New Aphorisms", 96):

Term absolute is something no sensual in itself. For it is an adjective, the meaning of predicate, and the predicate should be in according to some object. The law of foundation (basis) indisputably says that *every single object* is in connection with some other one; predicate *absolutely* means nothing, negates the connection with anything. It contradicts to the object, so that this predicate have no attitude to any objects, otherwise they would be destroyed. As far as the subject is not the object i.e. it is incognizable, it has no predicates, so that it has no *absolute* predicates as well.

Short and clear. But id does not dissolve the problem. It is logical to say that God, as far as he is transcendent and transcendental one, he is just unspeakable by well known terms, and then "Absolute" is no a predicate, but conventional sign of the "highest uncognizable".

As it was told many times before, absolute does not mean some person exactly. Anaximandr (Miletian school, VI B.C.) was the first one, who brought the impersonal principle in philosophy. It is hard to determine his conception of "aiperon", because we have short information about author and his writings. But we can say that it is something immortal, infinite and unlimited, but in the same time it has no mythological meaning. It was the abstract image about the origin of the world. Lao Tzi wrote the same thing in the same time, but conception dao was postulated as incognizable, so that i don't analyze it in this article. We are interested in effort to *understand* the Universum, but not to substantiate the refusal such a possibility.

Heraclitus Dark (IV – V B.C.) brought the conception of Λογος . Later, christian turned the meaning of this word to the "Word". They have to know, that description of the meaning of this

term takes the one page. Λογος of Heraclitus is some universal law, that rules the world and people, whole the Universe.

Nevertheless, Λογος is different from the monotheistic Absolute. Heraclitus said that the world is woven with opposites, which are in fight against each other. And monotheistic God rules individually. Everything happens by his will or permission.

Λογος immanently have the principle of universal change and development. And monotheistic God is always conservator, he tries to keep the world unchangeable (and it does not matter if he is the demiurge or not).

The third principle of Heraclitus was the relativity, and monotheistic God always pretend to the Absolute Truth.

As the result, if the God is the Absolute, he pretends to the knowledge of some Absolute Truth (as the image of It). If we look at the God as at an idea, everything turns to the marasmus: some human idea is declared as Truth a priori. A. Einstein was really right, said:

Only Universe and human stupidity are infinite; in the same time i doubt the infinity of thirst one.

Resume: in philosophical aspect God first of all pretends to the Absolute Truth.

Absolute categories in the capacity of “concrete knowledge” are nonsensual owing to the fundamental characteristics of our Universe. It is impossible to get the infinity by the finite quantities, so that it is impossible to understand or attain it completely. It just could be *changed* to something concrete imaginable – symbol, description, model. But it won’t be an Absolute Knowledge. It will be a “concrete substitute” without *infinity*, without Absolute. It will be something just like a “particular truth” that can become a lie when original premises are changed, or when there is some contradictions to infinity. Infinity *can* include *everything*...

So, every such a philosophical pretension is the effort of impudent fake or just inability to think clear.

Other philosophical aspect, which is the consequence of pretension told above, is the leveling of everything by under the principle “everything is leveled before God”, i.e. a priori there is universal (*absolute*) scale. It is nonsensual. The reason was told before.

In the same time there is danger to lost the own essence, *personality*; in this situation it is given to God de facto. Individual distinctions become nonsensual. To belong to the “Truth” – that is the main idea. But to be you is to be different from the standard. K.G Jung , “Septem Sermones Ad Mortuos”:

Our very nature is distinctiveness. If we are not true to this nature we do not distinguish ourselves enough. Therefore we must make distinctions of qualities.

What is the harm, ye ask, in not distinguishing oneself? If we do not distinguish, we get beyond our own nature, away from creatura. We fall into indistinctiveness, which is the other quality of the pleroma. We fall into the pleroma itself and cease to be creatures. We are given over to dissolution in nothingness. This is the death of the creature. Therefore we die in such measure as we do not distinguish. Hence the natural striving of the creature towards distinctiveness, fighting against primeval, perilous sameness. This is called the PRINCIPIUM INDIVIDUATIONIS. This principle is the essence of the creature. From this you can see why indistinctiveness and non-distinction are a great danger for the creature.

Next aspect of philosophical perception (as the consequence of told above) is the idea that all intentions and thoughts lead to God, and there is no existence *without* Him, because He is the Truth. This aspect is very close to psychological conception of worship, necessity of God Father, who has the right to punish for the disobedience, but in the same time He is the criterion of everything, the Grate Helms-One, or the Defender from Reality (it depends on the individual specific perception).

It is clear that this idea is conflicted with Satanism. Satanism is the way of *independent education and experience*; and as the fact, knowledge is incompatible with belief and ‘Truth’. Just in case, K.G.Jung, “Mysterium Coniunctionis”, §626: “...gods of Hell might be connected with brain as with the throne of consciousness and reason, for consciousness leads to the godless existence, because it takes a man away from the divine [unconscious] aggregate”.

Everything that could be done – You can do it by yourself.
Everything that is worthy to be done – You can do it by yourself.
You are the source of everything.
Zergen, “Manifest Of Freedom”

And now, following the way of philosophical perception of God, we inevitably come to the anthropocentrism of philosophy. It is not about “God creates a man as the image of God”. It is about “man creates God”.

Human perception of God and His creation are *inevitably* anthropomorphous. The basis of it is *projection* as the capacity of universal mode to “think somebody’s thoughts” – the effort of a man to *imagine* a God and to imagine the realization of ideas of God. So that people lead themselves to the trap of imagination; in the same time, the most developed of them, being in the unity with God, allowing Him to enter the ψυχη, limit themselves with the borders of human. Too human, as the philosopher wrote...

To tell strictly, “man” is denied by all systems dealt with the *other side*. The essence of idea is told by great Nietzsche best of all: The man is that to overcome.

It is impossible to hate a human in yourself and not deny the lost part of your own life experience and not break so called “roots”. *These roots are just the stocks – the result of criminal conspiracy of infuriated two-legged vile creatures, which see themselves as the kings of the Universe, although these creatures has no power over themselves, not to mention the environment. This is one more evidence of the fact that man is the creature that should be exiled as some of the exorcize the “demons”.*

E.Raitel, “Hellish Text: Under The Black Banner Of Freedom”

So, in philosophical aspect God represents the a priori belief, pretension to absence of changes and anthropocentrism. All of that is conflicted with Satanism and opposed to it.

Somebody can object to me: “it’s all right, but only if we look at God from the point of view of rational theology. But God might be just a reality, or a substance, or initial cause, or even some “hyper-idea” and we are the part of it. Unwillingness to submit to it means the renunciation of will, and ignoring it – just remember the ethics of Schopenhauer. So that, opposition of “light” and “dark” is highly relative: it is division of one substance to its characters.

I would say, accepting the substance we come to the form close to theology. There is no difference if self-caused matter or cause without personality is the cause of the world. There is no difference between materialism and panlogism at all. Only one different thing is between materialism and deism – the point of break the regressive chain. As a matter of fact, semitheological doctrine may be founded when there is the effort to find the unity of bases of

formalization. And as far as man can no think beyond the law of basis, such a doctrine will exist always. And only solipsism can be the one real atheistic doctrine. But, as Count shown, even it can not be based without contradictions: comprehension of one's own "I" is impossible without objectification, so that there is a necessity of something objective of *outside*.

It is *anthropocentrism*, as i told before. Thesis: if people give the name "God" to substance, cause etc, everybody should do the same henceforth (or should not resist at list). But "God" is the archetypical term, and it has "only one meaning". All other aspects will inevitably exert influence upon the subconsciousness, bearing parasitic associations.

Standard mistake of each concrete specialist: in this situation philosophers just forget about the psychological influence of the term. So as for Satanists, if they accept some "initial cause of the world" they do not accept God in it. We see Chaos as the most adequate cause.

Psychological aspect

And when we look at the million of ordinary people,
we will see that belief breathes the power into them,
console them, encourages them, rises the horizon
and helps to rise above the grey prissiness.
A.Menj, "Sources Of Religion"

In view of "pretension to Truth", it is the natural for monotheism to postulate the "only one right behavior" that is the consequence of dogma of some concrete religion. We can see it as the display of God in psyche. S.Tiunov wrote:

So look at the christians. They divide themselves to the sins and virtues, and then they are wonder feeling burning pain on saw line below their back. Medical departments and mental hospitals are full of young people who know well and understand what is happened to them. But there is no help from this understanding. Just ask any psychiatrist, what does he prefer: to work with violent patients, who understand nothing, but who became reasonable in two weeks, or with those quiet, whom they feed with "poison" and get no result.

To tell the truth, first of all i fell on the priests for those psycho people. Priests say: it is right that you are in trouble. You are very bad, so that you punish yourself. But you have to punish yourself harder. Come on, do it. Make your list of your bad things and punish yourself for t he each one.

Can you imagine a therapeutic effect?

Nevertheless, influence of God upon the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ is not limited by the phenomenon described above. This aspect is typical for the psyche of the individual who see his own existence only in presence of some external object.

This theme is well exposed by Erich Fromm in his writing "Escape From The Freedom": Feeble individual, understanding (may be unconsciously) his own, join to some community, Idea, Power etc, then he perceives himself as the part of this Power, imaging himself some stronger and significant and finding the "sense of life" and some other illusions that close well his eyes before the reality.

Fromm, "Psychoanalysis And Religion":

What is the attitude of a man to his power when he projects his own best into God? His power is divided from him, man became estranged from himself. Everything he possessed now belongs to God, and there is nothing inside him. *He has the access to himself only through God...* Man gave

to God everything he has, and now he begs Him to give him back something belong to him before. But he is under the full power of God. He see he is a “sinner”, because he deprived himself from good, and only God’s mercy and bliss can give him back something that makes him a man.

It is evident that man depends on many things; he is mortal, he is under the influence of his age, illness. Even if he could rule the nature and dominate over it, he and his earth are just trifling specks of dust in the space of the Universe. To accept the dependence and limits – it is the one side of the coin. But to enjoy the dependence and to worship the powers and forces we depends on – that is the other side. To see and understand the limit of our power clear and exactly is to possess wisdom and reason; to bow – is to fall into masochism and self-destruction.

God in psychological aspect inevitably leads to *décadence* of individual. It just has some different forms from militant fanaticism to humble (with pride) asceticism.

Some quotations in addition:

Z.Freud “Future Of Some One Illusion”:

That is another matter with the huge mass of uneducated people... If i can not kill my neighbor just because god forbad it and he will punish me in this or next life, but when i know there is no god and i have not to feel fear of his punishment, then i will kill my neighbor without regrets, and nothing can stop me, but only power of the laws of this world.

This aspect is very important, the more so, as *morality* can be based only on *belief* in its divinity. Wolter said that if nobody knows about God , it becomes necessary to invent him as ideal mode to hold the herd in leash. “Atheism is like a thin ice. Only one can walk upon it, but not whole nation”. But it does not mean that God [idea of God] and religion is useful, because they both lead to praised stagnation of the society and cultivate so called intellectual majority. It is conflicted with Satanism again.

Besides that, monogod in psyche (as the consequence of “Truth”) is in contradiction with such an aspect of Satanism as Knowledge.

If people have a positive religious belief, i.e. they believe, they endure the doubt as something obnoxious, and they are afraid of it. That is why everybody prefers to not analyze the matter of belief.

K.Jung, “Answer to Job”.

In general, in psychological aspect God is like the “pair of crutches” for those, who can not walk (think) by themselves. It is undoubtedly, crutches help to cripples to make some steps easier. It is more comfortable and faster.

But crutches *disturb* the walk of strong and healthy...

I object you, when you make a conclusion that man can not exist without illusive religious consolation, and that man would fall under the burden of hard life and cruel reality. That is right. But this is about a man, whom You gave to drink sweat or sweat-sour poison from his childhood. And how about other one, grown in soberness?..Of course,..he will find himself in situation of a child, who leaves his parents home, where is comfortable and warm. But is it wrong, that someone should overcome the infantilism? Man can no be a child forever. He should become a man and step on the “alien” unknown side”. We may call it “training of feeling of reality”, and

should i tell You one more time, that the only one aim of my issue is to show the necessity of this step into the future?

Z.Freud, op.cit

There is a standard objection to this aspect similar to described before. Usually it comes from the writings of Jung, who accepted the psychotherapeutic characteristics of religion (it is about crutches), and who wrote about God as the capacity of transcendental basis of psyche. "Uncovered Self":

Personality, whose roots are not in God, can not self dependently resist physical and moral seduction of this world. It needs the inner transcendental sense that can defend it from inevitable dissolution in mass.

But it is to be mentioned that Jung postulated the necessity of God in ψυχη (as i see it is based by cultural-psychological cause) did not mean monotheistic god of some particular specific religion, but some transcendental sense of unity with entity – in "AION" he wrote that jesuits were logically right when translated "Dao" as "God". Such a translation is nonsense in the view of theology or philosophy, but in conception of Jung and in view of context it is all right.

So, when the most of *people* can see God as the archetype of their self (of course without monotheistic *religious* things, such as request of worship), satanist does not accept God. Transcendental function means involtation to egregor, or saying by psychological terms – entelechia to the archetype of Satan, who is adequate to the self of Satanists.

God as metaphysical Strength/Power

*I can be indifferent to everything.
Indifferent, but not the same.
Charles Lem*

It is a popular misconception that the Satanist does not believe in God. The concept of "God", as interpreted by man, has been so varied throughout the ages, that the Satanist simply accepts the definition which suits him best. Man has always created his gods, rather than his gods creating him. God is, to some, benign - to others, terrifying. To the Satanist "God" - by whatever name he is called, or by no name at all - is seen as the balancing factor in nature, and not as being concerned with suffering. This powerful force which permeates and balances the universe is far too impersonal to care about the happiness or misery of flesh-and-blood creatures on this ball of dirt upon which we live.

A.S.LaVei, "Satanic Bible":

In this quotation LaVei described this aspect well. More detailed description of metaphysical model of Strengths you can find in writing "Princeps Omnium" of Olegern and me, and i see no reason to quote this one here.

I just would say that more correctly is the Strength, resisting the changes, than "keeping the equilibrium".

Deus does not mean Essence here (in according to established religious interpretation), but it means Force that is aspired to keep the Universe unchangeable, the Absolute order.

Unachievable Absolute Zero.

Occult point of view on the monogod:

If we look at islamism/judaism/christianity, we can see that monotheistic god is a tribal idol ranked to the *only one*. He is a jealous god, who constantly reminds that there is no god except him. In the same time, monoreligions successively developed semitic idea that man was created by gods only to feed them and make a sacrifices to them (just comp compare it with paganism). But when paganists sacrificed the food, cattle, and humans (not so often, as it shown by monotheism. Though there was a very bloody time of Aztec civilization and others), monotheists came further. They see necessity in *full* sacrifice of *every single* man physically and psychically. So they fat shaddai to the extra size. And everything that theosophists and talmudists heaped later is just an effect to those, and it has the meaning only for those, who are agree with their initial cause “there is no god except ...”

As for the flood about “Omniblessed Absolute that is Love”, i would say it is the typical junky theme. Don’t smoke in a week, and Absolute will dissolve...Unfortunately such a condition of believers depends on their inner opiats.

As the result, all monotheistic religions are based on the same common thing – absorption of the personality on all levels from physical to spiritual by the vampiric essence of low level but possessing high energy (though too “friable”). Monogod is a vampire, not impressive count Dracula, but usual stinking bog that sucks everything into itself and turns it to decay...

Visio Vigilantum

Darkness comes always...

In Princeps Omnium metaphysical system of Powers corresponds more to the satanic world view, than to the system of Jung. Nevertheless, the main theme of that writing is the archetype of Satan as “following to some definite archetype through all religious and philosophical systems”, and nothing else. As i said many times, that book is not a manual of Satanism. But in this article i want to show one more nuance: metaphysical model represented in Princeps Omnium is not the “most satanic” exactly.

As i said before, it is baseless to talk about 100% inhumanity. As far as essence of Satanist is bounded with flesh of human, and his psyche and physiology is in close contact with each other (structure of psyche is determined with species. Is is different from the filling of structure and relationships between its part. That is why inhuman is different from human), scheme Universum => (Deus,Satanas) => Actiones is right exactly too human filling of structure of ψυχη, that created *other* inhuman archetype. Olegern and me wrote that in this model “such a names are not necessary. Instead of them we can use terms Order and Chaos...” It is all right. But if we look at this picture from inhuman point of view, we can see that archetypical examination has no full display. So we have to appeal some more abstract categories.

Light has stood out from the continuous movement of Chaos and out of the one origin of Chaos and has separated from It and manifested the focus of ein-soph as the seed of all opposite to the development of Chaos.

Light became the reason of the war in Chaos, longing till the last term of Time; Bastard by its own sense, alien to the aspiration of Chaos, Light became the reason of division and confusion, which are adverse to the nature of Darkness, and the Reason of the Light has changed essence of things in Chaos.

Light, as a strength aroused from the one of the possible origin of Chaos presents in Chaos, and Light finds the reality of Its own entity, parasitic in Chaos;
Light exists by the processes of Its growing in Chaos and changing the essence of Chaos and turning it to the essence of the Light, so that is the gathering of the essence of Chaos to the non-existence in the Light;
Light brings the ruin to the existence of Chaos, when Light spread Its own existence.

That is why Light is the Enemy; It is that must be destroyed, because when growing It changes Itself and becomes stronger.

V.Scavr, “Codex Tenebrarum/Tenebrae Primae”

Light is not a God; but God is the out-come of Light – septies hostis. Light is refracted in God, focused and directed by God.

So, that is why Pandemonium does not consist God even as an abstract Power of Deus. Hell is a place, where God *can not* appear and *can not* be displayed in any forms. Only one “freedom from» that exists in Hell is a freedom from the presence of God; His presence is resistance to all “freedom to” exactly.

Hell is Primordial Chaos, regulated not by God, not by Order, but by **Darkness**.

In difference from God, Darkness is not a *restraining* power, but a *regulating* one. In Darkness as in the Abyss there is everything undisplaid; Chaos consists Everything – It consists the Order as particular, as one of Its methods of *display*; Darkness, as a structure, regulates the display if Chaos to realization of reality, but no to Unchangeability, as the Light is aspired to do.

Those who are awake and Seeing in Darkness change the model represented in Princeps Omnium to Universum => (Tenebrae, Chaos) => Actiones, because Satanus on this level of development becomes not the Power, but the Essence.

Natura nostra infernus est.

Pereniat deus
Ascendiat Tenebrae
Conflagret universum
Adveniat Infernus
Itrum atque itrum Christus cruciarius erit
Demiant sigilla supra pestes
Adveniat Infernus
Pereniat septem hostes
Conflagret mortales
Adveniat Mortis
Rebelliant daemonis
Conflagret universum
Pereniat deus
Adveniat Infernus

V. Scavr, “Codex Decium”, VII

June XXXVIII A.S.

Warrax