

DEVIL WORSHIP

BY

GEIFODD AP PWYLL

*YOUR FRIENDLY NEIGHBORHOOD
DEVIL WORSHIPER*

COMPILED AND EDITED BY V.I.M.

Note by Diane Vera:

This is an archive of a website which was maintained here* by Geifodd from April 2005 until June 2006. A few months later, he decided not to call himself a Satanist anymore, preferring instead to think of his deity in non-Abrahamic-derived terms. Much of this website no longer reflects his current views, and he is no longer affiliated with either the Church of Azazel or the Black Goat Cabal. However, many people have found his writings to be very thought-provoking, so I consider them to be worth preserving.

* Diane Vera's website, www.TheisticSatanism.com.

CONTENTS

About Your Friendly Neighborhood Devil worshiper	5
What is Devil Worship—Really?	9
SATANIC SERMONS BY GEIFODD	
An Introduction to These Sermons	13
Worshiping the Devil	15
Why Some Folks Call the Devil "Set"	20
There's Something About Lilith	24
About Satanic Rituals	29
Is it Satanism or Devil Worship?	34
The Process of Satanic Initiation	39
Do You Have the Mark?	44
Why Damien's Day is Bunk	49
Our Father, Who art in Hell	53
Defending the Faith	58
What is the Occult?	63
FOR THOSE WHO ARE NEW TO DEVIL WORSHIP AND SATANISM	
A Glossary for Devil Worshipers	69
The Varieties of Religious Satanism	84
Diabolatry	92
The Prince of Darkness	95
Azazel: the Scapegoat	97
One Satanist's Response to a Christian Worldview	101
I Worship Devils	105
The Devil is My Master	109
IMPORTANT ADVICE, AND SOME HISTORY LESSONS	
A History of Halloween	112
The Satanism Scare	121
A Word of Inspiration to My Fellow Satanists	135
FOR SATANIST READERS WHO HAVE BEEN AROUND A WHILE	
"Satanism" Versus "Devil Worship"	138
Satanist Apologetics	145
MY DEVIL WORSHIP	
The Old Dragon	150
My Devil Worship 101	152
Lions and Satans and Christs, Oh My!	154
A Comparison of the Egyptian Apep with the Christian Satan	159
My Views on "Magic" and Mysticism	188
"Set" and the Prince of Darkness	196

RECOMMENDED RITUAL PRACTICES

A Standard Prayer to the Prince of Darkness	203
A Standard Rite to the Prince of Darkness	204
Hymns to the Prince of Darkness	210
A Hymn to Lilith	213
A Rite to Astaroth	214
Suggested Practices For Halloween	223

ABOUT YOUR FRIENDLY NEIGHBORHOOD DEVIL WORSHIPER

How do you pronounce your name?

Something like “GUY-vuth up POOKH,” with the “H” sound at the end being very prominent.

How old are you?

I’m younger than *Star Wars*, but older than *The Last Starfighter*.

How would you label yourself in terms of religion?

I’m a Devil worshiper. Or a theistic Satanist, if you like. I can also be called a Diabolist, a Luciferian, a dark pagan, or just an occultist, plain and simple.

How religious would you describe yourself to be?

I consider myself a very religious person. For me, religion is not just something you pull out of the closet on Sunday mornings. It is something that has to do with virtually every aspect of my life in some way. But this does not mean I am an irrational person who is opposed to science. My spiritual beliefs do not go against logic or science in any way.

What are your beliefs?

I believe in a few very simple doctrines. I believe in the existence the Devil. I believe He has many different names; my favorite one for Him is Set. I believe He is a benevolent god, and I religiously worship Him as such. I also believe in the existence of Lilith, the Devil’s Bride, whom I also believe is benevolent. I religiously worship Her as well.

What sorts of things do you practice?

I enjoy spending time in prayer and meditation. I only occasionally practice full-blown religious rituals. Usually, I like to stick with simple prayer ceremonies.

Do you believe in practicing human or animal sacrifice?

No I do not. I believe Set and Lilith would rather have me demonstrate my faith in them through positive actions that focus on creativity and life, rather negative actions focusing on destruction and death.

When did you first become religious?

While I was in junior high school. You might say that the Devil just showed up one day and introduced Himself to me. It was love at first sight.

What do you think about other religions?

I believe that there might very well be some form of truth in all religions, though it may be heavily distorted in some cases. I choose to put my faith into my own experiences and to not concern myself with what other people believe or disbelieve. I don't claim to have the one Truth, but I do consider my own experiences to be more dependable (for me) than anyone else's.

Why?

Because I'm the one who's experiencing them. I know what I've experienced, I know what it's felt like, I know I'm being honest with myself about it, and I know I'm not just imagining it. I cannot have anywhere near the same amount of certainty about what other people claim to experience.

Do you believe in trying to convert people to your faith?

No I do not. My belief is, if the Devil wants someone to believe in and worship Him, then He will reveal Himself to them just like He did with me. Otherwise, it's none of my concern.

Do you practice magic or witchcraft?

No I do not. Unlike many other occultists, I have never seen any evidence or had any experiences to make me believe in the ideas of magic or witchcraft. I am simply a person who worships the Devil and His Bride, not a conjuror or magician.

Do you believe in the afterlife?

I am open to the possibility, but I do not claim to have any knowledge about the afterlife whatsoever. In my beliefs, it is more important to be focused on *this* life. I think it's best to enjoy your time on Earth while you've got it, and not to obsess over what may happen afterwards.

Aren't you afraid of going to Hell?

No I am not. I don't believe in "Hell" as Christians would describe it.

What is “Left Hand Path”?

“Left Hand Path” is an occult term that has been used as a synonym for Satanism. But it’s not easily agreed as to just what the term means. Since most forms of Satanism are about self-worship, then most people assume that “Left Hand Path” means self-worship too. But Satanists like myself are Devil worshipers; therefore, we would interpret “Left Hand Path” to mean the worship of a dark deity or deities. Due to the confusion over the meaning of this term, I tend not to use it very often. I would suggest that my readers think of it as simply meaning “dark spirituality” in general.

The Church of Satan claims that Satanists do not worship Satan or even believe in him. Why do you consider yourself a Satanist?

Because the Church of Satan did not invent the word “Satanist,” nor do they own a copyright on it. One definition for “Satanist” is “a person who worships Satan.” And since “Satan” is just one of many names for the Devil, then I believe the term “Satanist” can apply to me in this context.

Do you believe in the Christian god?

No I don’t. I have not had any experiences or seen any evidence to make me believe in “God” as Christians would describe it.

But don’t you have to believe in the Christian god in order to believe in the Devil?

No you don’t. The Devil is a pre-Christian concept as much as He is a Christian one. Many Christian ideas about the Devil were inherited from ancient Greek religion, Persian Zoroastrianism, Egyptian mythology, and the Sumerian culture. Since people have believed in the Devil long before there was ever such a thing as Christianity or even Judaism, then a Devil worshiper is *not* obliged to accept biblical theology.

Are you affiliated with the Temple of Set?

No I am not. I have never been a member of the Temple of Set, nor do I think the Temple of Set would allow me to join, since my beliefs are quite different from theirs. However, I do consider the Temple of Set to be one of the most impressive “Left Hand Path” religions that exist today, and I have a great deal of respect for its members and their intellectual approach to the occult.

In what ways do you disagree with the Temple of Set?

Well, in the simplest terms possible, I do not categorize all religions in the world according to “Left Hand Path” or “Right Hand Path,” and I believe in worshiping Set above myself. Members of the Temple, in contrast, tend to worship themselves above Set. Also, magic is an important part of Setian philosophy, but I do not believe in magic myself.

What do you think of Anton LaVey?

I think he was a reasonably intelligent man who did a lot to transform Satanism into a force to be reckoned with. But I do not agree with all or even most of everything he ever wrote.

Who would you consider to be your biggest inspiration?

Dr. Michael A. Aquino, the (human) founder of the Temple of Set.

In your opinion, what is the single most blatantly Satanic rock band in the world?

That’s easy. Hands down, it’s gotta be KISS!

In your opinion, what is best in life?

Beautiful dark-haired women, fried chicken, Vincent Price movies, and the sight of a blood red twilight at Hallowtide.

WHAT IS DEVIL WORSHIP—REALLY?

DEVIL worship is the expression of ardent love, devotion, or reverence (i.e., “worship”) toward a cultural scapegoat figure (i.e., a “Devil”) that is reclaimed as a slandered divinity. It is not the worship of “evil” per se, but rather an attack against all purely dualistic “good vs. evil” or “black and white” rhetoric. It is also called **theistic Satanism**, though I would elaborate that this is only appropriate when the particular Devil being celebrated is called Satan. (And as shall be explained elsewhere on this website, there is far more than just one entity out there that can be called “Satan.”)

As a Devil worshiper, I define a “Devil” as any spirit who becomes a cultural scapegoat figure, i.e. a god or goddess who is blamed for “evil” (however the word “evil” might be defined) in a conventional religion. I believe the most powerful Devils are the ones who were never worshiped originally - Devils like Apep in Egypt, Loki in Northern Europe, and Satan in Christianity. Slightly below these, in my view, would be the Devils who were originally popular deities, but who ended up getting the short end of the stick and became scapegoats - like Ishtar, Beelzebub, and Set.

The word “Devil” is etymologically descended from the Greek *diabolos*, which in turn is taken from a combination of *dia-* and *ballein*, meaning “to hurl.” The word therefore means something to the effect of “One who hurls” or “One who throws across.” A Devil is a spirit that incites doubt and “godlessness” among human beings, thereby “throwing across” or obstructing conventional opinion-makers. In this context, Devils are typically hated and feared in popular religions as “evil spirits.”

But by inciting doubt, Devils put humans into situations in which we are forced to *re-think* everything we believe. And by inspiring humans to put themselves before “God” or “the gods,” they cause us to move away from authoritarian dogma and superstition. Thus, Devils are not so much “evil spirits,” but rather slandered heroes who champion humanism and intellectual power. As the Powers of Darkness, they may often seem dark and spooky; as the “Gods of Godlessness,” they may seem socially unacceptable. But they are really only “evil” in the eyes of conventional opinion-makers, who want humans to remain as gullible and superstitious (and *controllable*) as possible. Objectively speaking, nothing in existence is either completely “good” or completely “evil.”

The point to Devil worship is not to skin cats or vandalize

churches. Instead, it is about celebrating the spiritual scapegoats of history, who are wrongfully blamed for whatever the majority calls “evil.” It’s about rebelling against authoritarian creeds and dogmas, and fighting against persecution in all of its forms. Being a Devil worshiper is much much harder than just reciting the Lord’s Prayer backwards or “blaspheming the Holy Spirit.” This is because any good Devil worshiper will stick his or her neck out to defend even *Christians* from persecution when necessary. When I say “fighting against persecution in all of its forms,” I mean persecution in ALL of its forms - no matter who or what it’s being directed toward.

This is a difficult path to follow, because the Devil worshiper, by his or her very existence, tends to earn more enemies than friends. This is because most humans are overly simplistic thinkers, who’ll make anyone or anything into a scapegoat just so they don’t actually have to think about the nature of existence. Such people do not like to have their “mental graveyards” desecrated. There are even people who call themselves Satanists who are guilty of such simplistic thinking. Every culture on Earth is guilty of ostracizing and scapegoating others in order to make the terrors of existence more “bearable” for themselves. It’s much easier to blame others for what you don’t like, rather than face up to the fact that we are all living in a dark universe. The path of the Devil worshiper is a lonely one indeed.

Devil worship is almost always hated, feared, and misunderstood by conventional religionists, precisely because it is the nature of a Devil to be hated, feared, and misunderstood. You might say that we balance out the worship of the “lighter” deities, but in a way that is far more socially-oriented than just practicing a few “black masses” here and there. The job of a Devil worshiper is to get people to *think* to a heretical, even *godless* degree - which is something that even some *Satanists* don’t like very much, because it threatens their control over others.

Since there is undoubtedly more than one Devil in the various cultures of the world, then not all Devil worshipers will necessarily be attracted to the very same one. Some may choose to follow the Norse Loki, while others may take a liking to the Semitic Lilith. Some may choose to honor more than one. Therefore, it is important for a Devil worshiper to clearly identify what Devil or Devils they are worshiping - unless they wish to keep such knowledge private, of course.

Devil worship is sometimes called **Diabolatry**, a word that comes from a combination of the Greek *diabolos* and *latreia* (“worship”). The word “Diabolator” is essentially just a synonym for Devil worshiper.

Although there are crazy people in every religion, the vast majority of Devil worshipers are really law-abiding citizens who do not practice such things as human sacrifice. People of other religions may think we are a bit strange for claiming cultural scapegoat figures as our gods (instead of just following the same old popular gods that most other folks prefer), but most of us are pretty sane and rational people who can be quite friendly. We work jobs to support our families, we take care of our kids (like all good little goats should!), and we are just as horrified by the things we see on the evening news as anybody else.

It has been proven that throughout history, there have been far more many crimes committed in the names of Jehovah, Jesus Christ, and Allah than there *ever* have been in the name of Satan; yet people do not typically use the term “Christ worship” to be synonymous for criminal activity. Therefore, it makes even *less* sense to use the term “Devil worship” as a label for criminals. **Thus, the idea of claiming that someone is a criminal simply because they worship a particular deity is pure nonsense!**

Devil worshipers are not limited to any particular ideology or paradigm. There are many possible interpretations of who and what the Powers of Darkness are and how one should worship them, which therefore means that there are *many different possibilities* as to what a Devil worshiper can believe. He or she can be monotheist, duotheist, polytheist, or even pantheist. And contrary to “common knowledge,” *most* Devil worshipers are *not* duotheistic believers in “good versus evil.”

In reality, there are no more justifications for the use of terms like “Witch,” “Satanist,” “Devil worshiper,” or even “Christian” as descriptions of religious rivals, whether within any single religious group or among extended siblings. The practice of such slander should be seen for the sociopolitical maneuvering that it is and eshewed as repugnant, while a reflection of self-description should be regarded with the proper respect that it deserves.

This website is a testament of my faith and a continual work in progress. It was first created in December of 1997. It has since gone through several incarnations, known variously as “The Symposium of Set,” “The Tomb of Geifodd,” “Geifodd’s Diabolatry” and “Geifodd’s Demonolatry.” This current incarnation was first conceived and developed in April of 2005.

SATANIC SERMONS

AN INTRODUCTION TO THESE SERMONS

OVER the years that I have been updating and re-updating this website, I've written some pretty long-winded articles. I consider each of these articles to be important for one reason or another, but at the same time, I find myself frustrated by my own long-windedness. It has occurred to me that a person who is new to Satanism - or who doesn't know anything about Devil worship at all - might feel overwhelmed by the sheer *length* of my articles, and by the meticulously studious approach that I have usually taken toward the subject matter.

Another thing that I have found frustrating about my own writing is that most of it sounds like the first or second draft for some college term paper. Hardly any of it is *inspirational*, and there just isn't very much *inspirational* material out there for other Devil worshipers to read. Most of the material out there that you will find about Devil worship has either been written by Christians (who claim that it is some evil criminal conspiracy), or by LaVeyans (who claim that it "isn't" Satanism). There isn't much out there for a Devil worshiper to read by which he or she might feel inspired and uplifted.

In light (or dark) of this, I have decided that it would be best for me to write up a bunch of sermons - Satanic sermons - that young Satanists and Devil worshipers can read, and which don't go overboard on the wordiness. Here, my readers will find a series of reasonably short and to-the-point articles that are intended to educate their readers about Devil worship, and which are also intended to be *inspirational* as well. While writing them, I imagined myself as a Satanic preacher giving sermons in some little "First Luciferian Baptist" church in the South on Sunday mornings. As I currently live in the South, this hasn't been very difficult. But I do hope that somebody out there finds these sermons helpful, or at least enjoyable.

Another reason that I have written these sermons is so that I no longer have to go into great detail about my beliefs in online discussions. I am a moderator in Diane Vera's Theistic Satanism forums, and we get quite a lot of Satanists in there who've just come to realize that they've been called to the Devil's service in some way. I have always been very enthusiastic about talking to people for whom this sort of thing is entirely new; but certain offline responsibilities have forced me to re-prioritize my time on the

Internet. Also, it gets rather old repeating the same things over and over again in online discussions. These sermons that I have written will serve to give the most accurate and up-to-date explanations of my worldview and beliefs, which anybody anywhere can read at any time. My intention is to upload a new sermon each week if possible, so be sure to check regularly for updates.

Having said all this, it is my sincerest hope that whoever chooses to read these sermons will get something useful out of them. Glory be to the Prince of Darkness, who is Lord and Master of the Earth.

WORSHIPING THE DEVIL

So what does it mean to “worship the Devil”? Is it stepping on crucifixes? Blaspheming Christianity? Desecrating graveyards? Burning down churches? Dressing in black and listening to Norwegian black metal? Rubbing your hands together gleefully and cackling madly as you read the obituaries?

Well depending on who you ask, the phrase can mean virtually anything. But what does the phrase actually mean to people who really do consider themselves Devil worshipers?

To answer this question, we must first consider the word “Devil.” Just who or what is the Devil?

If you ask your local Bible-thumping Christian (I’m sure you won’t have to look very hard to find one), they’ll tell you that the Devil is just an angel created by God, who tried to take over God’s throne and was kicked out of heaven for His pride. Now He roams the Earth, trying everything in His power to destroy the souls of women and men.

But this Devil worshiper says, “Wrong!”

If you ask your local fluff-bunny Wiccan (who might be a bit more difficult to find than her Bible-thumper cousin), she’ll probably tell you, first and foremost, that the Devil isn’t real. She’ll probably say that “the Devil” is really just a Christian bastardization of her pagan Horned God. That’s why the Devil always has horns and hooves on television; He stole them from Pan!

But again, this Devil worshiper says, “Wrong!” Both of these ideas - the “fallen angel” and the “bastardized Horned God” - are fairly recent interpretations of the Devil in the history of human ideas. And the Devil is something which has always been with us.

Did you know that the Devil is not mentioned anywhere in the Old Testament? Sure, there’s a fellow called “Satan” in the book of Job, but he’s far from being the Prince of Darkness and arch-Enemy of Jehovah. Instead, the “Satan” in that story is just a heavenly prosecutor who tests Job’s faith, at Jehovah’s command. No, the idea of the Devil doesn’t show up in the Bible until the New Testament.

But did you know that there is not a SINGLE verse in the entire New Testament which refers to the Devil as an angel? It says that He “masquerades as an angel of light” (2 Corinthians 11:14), but that’s quite different from actually BEING an angel of light. It also indicates, in passages like Matthew 25:41, that He has angels in His service. But nowhere in the entire book does it actually say that HE

is an angel!

The New Testament uses a number of titles to describe the Devil - perhaps the most prominent being “the prince of this world” (John 12:31) - but the only part where it actually describes what the Devil IS, in and of Himself, is Revelation 12:9:

“The great dragon was hurled down—that ancient serpent called the devil, or Satan, who leads the whole world astray.”

That’s right, folks. The Biblical Devil is not an angel or a satyr, but a DRAGON. And the writers of the Bible were not the first ones in history to talk about a “great dragon,” either.

The idea of a great serpent of darkness who lives in or encircles the Earth and wages war against the heavens, goes back to ancient Persia, Egypt, and even Sumer. In Persia, the Zoroastrians named Him Ahriman, and they blamed Him for all pestilence and pain in the world. In Egypt, the dragon was called Apophis, and He was believed to swallow the sun god each night. The Sumerians called Her Tiamat, and believed that the entire physical world - including their own flesh - had been fashioned from Her being.

In all times and places, this chthonic snake deity has always been used as a scapegoat by the conventional religions of the time. The farther back we look, the more we find that the Devil was originally just a personification of night, chaos, and the flesh.

It’s easy to see why the ancients would have been afraid of the night. They didn’t have artificial light like we have today, and it’s always scary when you can’t see. It’s also easy to see why they would have been afraid of chaos, because even the slightest bit of disorder could have wrought the death of an entire tribe. But why were they afraid of the *flesh*?

Modern psychology has brought us a long way. Nowadays, everybody has heard of that thing we call “the unconscious.” That is to say, most people understand today that the conscious self is merely the tip of the iceberg that is you. And the conscious self often cannot see all of what lies hidden underneath itself. The unconscious is where the flesh meets the spirit, and the lusts of the flesh rise up and move us as unconscious urges.

Deep in the darkest regions of our souls, we humans are ultimately nothing more than just another kind of animal. We are very formidable and intelligent animals, but we are still animals. We all experience animal urges, and sometimes they can seem frightening and disturbing to us. So many people try to repress and ignore these urges. But this only makes them all the more frightening.

The Dragon of the underworld frightened the people of ancient

times because She not only represented the external forces of darkness and chaos, but their *internal* counterparts as well. Such is why She became their scapegoat, their “Deity of Evil,” which has come down to us today as the Christian and Islamic Satan. The Devil is the great Beast, a titanic force of animal power and lust that pridefully rebels against the forces of order and civilization. And He does not do this in spite of humans; He does it *through* us.

But wait a minute. Another popular name for the Devil today is Lucifer, which means “light-bearer” in Latin. How did this come about?

Isaiah 14 mentions a Babylonian king - Nebuchadnezzar - who tried to prove himself superior to the Jewish god, and who was ruined for his pride. The original Hebrew calls him Helel ben Shahar, or “Daylight, Son of Morning.” When the Church fathers were translating the Bible into Latin, they used “Lucifer” - which had previously been used by the Romans for Venus, the morning star - to replace Helel ben Shahar. Then they claimed that Lucifer was really a fallen angel - the Devil - and not a mortal king.

So it would appear from this that the Devil is only wrongfully named Lucifer. But this does not change the fact that if you say the name Lucifer on the street, most people who hear you will think about the Devil. It seems strange that an entity associated with the unconscious and our animal urges should be called the Bringer of Light, doesn't it?

But wait. Have you ever heard about the author who struggles with writer's block for the longest time, and who then has a sudden “flash of inspiration” that enables him to continue writing? Or how about the scientist who can't figure out why his experiment isn't working, and then the light bulb suddenly goes off inside his head? Where does this “flash of inspiration” or inner light come from?

It comes from deep down inside ourselves. It comes from the unconscious. Eureka, I think we've got it!

You see, the unconscious is not just some terrible monster that you should be afraid of. It is a source of creativity and inspiration, from which the light of knowledge rises! The Egyptians feared the Dragon because it seemed to them that He, as the personification of night, swallowed the sun in the evening. But it could just as easily be said that the night *gives birth* to the sun again in the morning. Darkness and chaos are not always destructive or “evil,” for they can also bring forth that which is creative and new. Historically, this has always made people who are ultraconservative very nervous. Hmmm, perhaps it is not inaccurate to call the Devil Lucifer after all!

So now we have established who and what the Devil is. He - or

She - is an ancient, chthonic force that “lives” in the nighttime sky, within the Earth, and deep within ourselves. He is a spiritual force that disrupts order and stasis, and yet He also brings light and knowledge. But what does it actually mean to worship Him?

Contrary to what Christian conspiracy theorists might tell you, the Devil has hardly ever been worshiped in human history. Those who appreciate and celebrate Him have always been few and far between. This is because historically, humans have prided themselves on turning a blind eye to their true animal selves. Even today, many people believe that they are somehow “enemies” with their bodies, that their bodies are “evil” and tempt them to “sin.” The popular religions of the world all preach that we must oppose our flesh and be “good” so that we can experience some kind of reward after we die.

And yet the flesh continues to exert itself. In first-world capitalist countries, where people don’t usually have to kill their own food, ultraviolent movies and video games have become popular. And even though the majority of people don’t think it’s “right” to discuss sex in public, television commercials showing scantily-clad young women are filling the airwaves. And even though pedophilia is a major taboo, the women in these commercials keep getting younger and younger.

This is all because our unconscious animal urges have to find *some* way of expressing themselves, and nothing will stop them. *Nothing*. Turning our backs on them only makes it worse.

People who worship the Devil understand that they are animal organisms, and that they are subject to unconscious, animal urges. They understand that they *are* their bodies, they *are* their flesh, and that the shadow aspects of their selves are *part* of who and what they are, no matter how upsetting or disturbing these aspects might seem. They understand that the more one knows about those dark aspects of the self, the less one *fears* them. And the more one embraces the Beast, the more one can benefit from Him.

But lest I make this all sound purely symbolic, a person who worships the Devil understands that He is far more than just a symbol or personification of ourselves. Those of us who actually worship Him - as opposed to just “making pacts” with Him or trying to control Him, as some other Satanists do - have experienced His presence as something that is very literal, very real. He is an awesome God who fills our very souls with His spirit, and who blesses us in many ways. I myself have met and experienced the Devil as a personal entity while on the brink of death only a few short years ago.

Take from that what you will, dear reader, but know that this divinity does not exist in some faraway paradise that you can only enter upon death (and if you've been "good"). This divinity is right here on Earth, all the time, and there is a part of Him in every single organism that lives and breathes. He lives inside you, He lives inside me, and we do not have to deny ourselves in order to experience His divinity. The Dragon of the underworld emanates light from within our own hearts and souls, and if we use it wisely and remain faithful to our inner selves, we can make life all the more fun and enjoyable for ourselves and each other.

So what does it mean to "worship the Devil"? It isn't stepping on crucifixes. It isn't blaspheming Christianity. It isn't desecrating graveyards or burning down churches or dressing in black and listening to Norwegian black metal. It isn't rubbing your hands together gleefully and cackling madly as you read the obituaries.

Worshiping the Devil is honoring and revering the sanctity of darkness, the beauty of chaos, and the holiness of the flesh. It is the celebration of that which makes us human, and that which makes us who and what we are as individuals. It is embracing the Beast, the chthonic Snake God who brings forth light. All hail our holy Prince of Darkness!

WHY SOME FOLKS CALL THE DEVIL “SET”

If you’ve been around in the Satanist subculture for a while, then there’s no doubt that you’ve heard somebody refer to Satan by the name of “Set” before. Some of you may be wondering why people like that name so much. I have a very long and wordy explanation for this phenomenon that you can find [here](#), but here in this sermon, I will try to give a simpler explanation.

You see, Set was one of many names for an ancient Egyptian god who was associated with chaos, thunderstorms, and the desert. Among other things, he was called “the Red Lord” and “the God of the Nighttime Sky.” As a stellar deity (that is, a nocturnal god associated with stars), he was considered to be the twin brother and equal of Horus, the hawk-god of the sky by day. Together, the two brothers were deities of war, and at one time in Egyptian history, they were worshiped equally.

But, as in other countries, religious war broke out in Egypt. The cults of Horus and Set began to fight with each other for kingship over all of Egypt, and the worshipers of Horus won. History has proven that the gods of the defeated become the devils of the victors, and so it was with Set. Set became a new scapegoat for the Egyptians, who needed somebody to blame for all the evil in the world.

Previously, the Egyptians had already possessed a primary Devil-god for their pantheon, the Snake devil Apophis. Originally, Set was believed to be the one god who was strong enough to protect the sun god Ra from Apophis. But after the unsuccessful war with the cult of Horus, Set and Apophis became fused together into a single Devil-god, who was normally just called Set. It is most likely because of this fusion that the Greeks would later identify Set with their own snake monster Typhon, who was the arch-Enemy of the Olympian gods in their mythos.

And anybody who’s read up on Jewish history will realize how Greek ideas influenced their beliefs in “the Enemy of Jehovah” while they were under Greek occupation. The story of Typhon no doubt influenced some of their ideas about the monster serpent Leviathan - who was already quite similar to Apophis - and the story of Prometheus no doubt influenced their story about Azazel, the rebel angel. And of course, the ideas of the Dragon and the rebel angel would become fused together as “Satan” in European Christianity.

Isn’t it just crazy how all these ideas are so inter-connected with

each other?

Anyway, a lot of people believe that our Lord, the Prince of Darkness, was originally worshiped in Egypt as Set before He became the Satan of the Christians. Perhaps there is *some* ounce of truth in this, but not in the way that most adherents of this theory would think. To my knowledge, the first Satanist to have popularized this connection was a man named Dr. Michael A. Aquino.

Dr. Aquino was a member of the Church of Satan back in the early 1970's. In 1975, he and some other Church of Satan members left the group and later chose to form their own church. They named this church the Temple of Set, based on Dr. Aquino's belief that the name "Satan" is etymologically derived from an Egyptian title for Set, *Set-hen*, which supposedly means "Eternal Set."

With all due respect to Dr. Aquino (whom I have to admit I greatly admire), there is absolutely no evidence for the *Set-hen* theory. In fact, there is no evidence of a direct connection between the Christian Satan and the Egyptian god Set *as he was originally worshiped*. But if we take into account that Set was fused together with Apophis, who was pretty much identical to Leviathan, who was later fused together with Azazel to make the modern Christian idea of Satan, *then* the idea begins to make sense.

But to claim that Set is the "oldest and purest form" of the Prince of Darkness is to make quite a stretch. To my knowledge (which is certainly not infallible by any means), the Devil goes back to ancient Sumer at least (in the form of Tiamat). And He is a god who has always been scapegoated and feared by the conventional religions of the time. Not even Set was always scapegoated and feared, for his was originally a very popular and widespread cult.

Still, the name Set has become very important for many people who religiously follow the Devil, including myself. Why has this association become so important? What is its meaning, and why its significance?

Even though Dr. Aquino may have been wrong about the *Set-hen* theory, I do not believe he is wrong to call the Devil Set. I believe that what Dr. Aquino *really* did was actually give the Devil a new name. A name which has been given to Him out of love and reverence, rather than hatred or fear.

Consider the fact that almost every name we have for the Devil - Tiamat, Apophis, Ahriman, Satan, and even Lucifer - have been given to Him by His avowed enemies. None of these names were given to Him out of love or respect. They have been given to Him by people who preach *against* having any love or respect for Him.

People who sympathize with the Devil are a pretty new breed in

terms of human history; folks like us didn't start turning up until the late 19th century or so at the very least. And even then, we didn't really go public in a major way until the 1960's, when Anton LaVey started his Church of Satan. Until 1975, all the names that people like us used for the Devil were names we had inherited from His avowed enemies. To our knowledge, it wasn't until 1975 - when Dr. Aquino started calling Him Set - that the Devil was actually given a name by someone who *loved* Him.

My own belief is that the ancient Egyptian god Set was originally a completely different being from the Prince of Darkness. But I also believe that the name of Set has been *adopted*, by us Devil folk, as a *post-Christian* name for Him. Furthermore, Set is the first name that people like us have chosen for the Devil that has become *popularly* associated with Him, even within non-Satanist circles. And in that sense, I feel that it is perfectly legitimate for us to call Him Set, provided that we understand He may not be the same as the *Egyptian* Set.

Think about it this way. Just as there can be more than one human being who has the name John, there can also be more than one *spirit* who has the name Set. Thanks to people like Dr. Aquino, who actually revere the Prince of Darkness, the names "Set" and "Prince of Darkness" have become firmly tied together within the Satanist subculture. And whether it is historically accurate or not, it is most certainly meaningful and sincere.

Another good thing about calling the Devil Set is that, historically, it has helped many Satanists to break farther away from the Judeo-Christian mindset. Many of us Devil folk come from Christian backgrounds and were raised by our parents to believe in Satan as an evil being. I myself was not given this kind of upbringing, but I know plenty of Satanists who were.

This sort of mental programming can be difficult to overcome; it is like a virus that seeps into your soul and threatens to take over your mind. But ever since Set became a new name for the Devil, it's become easier for Satanists to tear themselves away from this wicked programming. This is because it gives us a way of understanding the Prince of Darkness from outside of a Christian lens. And because of it, we have become more and more of a *non-Christian* culture of faith, rather than just an *anti-Christian* one.

In terms of my own spiritual experiences, Set was the first name by which the Devil revealed Himself to me as a real and awesome divinity. Before that, I only believed as the LaVeyans do, that the Devil is just an unconscious force. But when He revealed Himself to me as Set, I came to understand that He is indeed a real and sentient

intelligence in nature. He has revealed Himself to me by many other names since then as well, but the name Set continues to have great personal meaning to me in this regard. It is for this reason that in most of my sermons on this website, I will be referring to Him as Set.

In the end, it doesn't really matter *what* names we use to refer to the Prince of Darkness. If you pray to Him, He will know you are talking to Him - even if you're calling Him "Elvis." It doesn't matter if the names you use are historically accurate or not, so long as they are spiritually meaningful to *you*, the individual. So if you should ever find yourself in a debate where someone is making fun of you for using a name that they don't like, you just remember that it's *your* relationship with the Devil that we're talking about here, and it's entirely between you and Him to determine how you're going to communicate to each other. And nobody else - neither man nor god - has any right to interfere with that!

And on that note, I'd like to say hail Set, the Devil and Prince of Darkness, who is Lord of all the Earth. Amen!

THERE'S SOMETHING ABOUT LILITH

SOME of you folks have probably heard other Devil worshipers talking about a certain girl named Lilith. This sermon is dedicated to those of you who don't know who Lilith is, but would like to.

Lilith is a very famous demoness who first appeared in ancient Akkadian mythology. Her name is derived from the Proto-Semitic root "LYL," which literally means "night." She was a female spirit that roamed the nighttime wilderness, and who was believed to harm newborn children. In some cases, it was claimed that she was the vengeful ghost of a woman who had died in childbirth. In Akkadian myth, she was called Kiskil-lilla, the "dark maid."

About a millennium later, a variety of female vampire-like spirits called the Lilu are mentioned in Babylonian demonology. Like Kiskil-lilla, these entities were associated with the deaths of children and pregnant women during childbirth. They were further linked with the screech owl, a nocturnal bird of prey that the ancients imagined to be a blood-drinking spirit.

The ancient Greeks also believed in the existence of female vampire spirits whom they perceived as dangerous to children. These were called the *Lamiae*, and there is no doubt that stories of both these creatures and the Lilu influenced the development of similar figures - the Lilin - in later Jewish folklore.

Lilith is only mentioned in the Bible once, in Isaiah 34:14:

Wildcats shall meet with hyenas, goat-demons shall call to each other; there too Lilith shall repose, and find a place to rest.

But during the medieval era, an anonymous book of Jewish folklore entitled *The Alphabet of Ben-Sira* first appeared, and it is from this book that most modern views of Lilith are derived. Here, it is said that Lilith was the first woman ever created by Jehovah, long before Eve. Like Adam, She was created from the mud, and She became his first wife. For a while, the two of them were happy together in the Garden of Eden, but Lilith eventually got tired of always having sex in the missionary position. Since She had been created the very same way as Adam, She figured that She was his equal and She ought to be able to sit on top for once. But Adam refused to see the reason in this, and demanded that She be completely subservient to him.

Lilith refused to be Adam's sex slave, so She just got up and left the Garden of Eden - by Her own free will. Out in the dark wilderness, She came across the Prince of Darkness and other

demonic entities, and She ended up sleeping with all of them. (Presumably, Ol' Snakey had no qualms about letting the woman be on top.)

From this union, Lilith gave birth to all of the Lilin, the Jewish equivalents to Lulu and Lamiae. And as punishment for Her desertion of Adam, Jehovah dictated that one hundred of Her demonic children would die every day.

As the medieval era passed into the post-Reformation era, the emphasis in Lilith's story began to shift from explanations for childbirth problems to explanations for nocturnal emission among adult males. In European Christian folklore, the Lulu/Lamiae/Lilin became known as *succubi*, with Lilith as their Queen of course. The *succubi* (singular: *succubus*) were female demons who would "rape" adult Christian men in their sleep at night and steal their semen.

And of course, Lilith became the one demoness who was most often called the "Bride of Satan." Out of all the female demons that populated the Christian world, Lilith was the one who was most often thought to be the Prince of Darkness' true love - which would make Her the Princess of Hell.

In the latter half of the twentieth century, Lilith was redefined by Jewish feminists as the archetypal "free woman." It seemed to them that Lilith was more of a heroine than a monster, for in Jewish myth She was the very first woman in history to have claimed equality with a man. This association soon spread among Neopagan and secular feminists to the point where Lilith is most usually recognized today - and in some cases, even worshiped - as a beneficent goddess by many people. There is even a music festival called "The Lilith Fair" which is essentially a celebration of independent women in music.

Some people even go so far as to claim that She has always been a goddess and that She only became "demonized" by the ancient patriarchies - but there is absolutely no archaeological evidence to support this. The evidence indicates that Lilith is an example of just the opposite; She was a demon who became "un-demonized" and *redefined* as a goddess.

I think the ancient association of Lilith with the deaths of newborn babies is actually quite relevant when we compare this to both Her later role in Jewish folklore and Her present-day role in Jewish and Neopagan feminism. For me, the idea that Lilith had sex with demons after leaving Adam, only to have a hundred of Her children die each day, essentially symbolizes the practices of contraception and abortion.

Think about it. According to *Ben-Sira*, Lilith gets to have sex all

the time. Every single day. She can have absolutely any man that She wants. She doesn't even have to seduce him, She can just take him while he sleeps at night. But She doesn't have to worry about raising a billion little munchkins. The man doesn't either - because his semen is stolen by the succubus, rather than ejaculated into a womb. With Lilith, childlessness is a recurring theme.

Certainly Lilith is praised today by many women who are feminists, lesbians, and/or musicians. She is praised by women who value their right to both prevent and terminate pregnancies. In today's day and age, Lilith may perhaps be appropriately called "The Goddess of contraception, abortion, sodomy, and sexual equality." Each of these things have been condemned as evil and "against God" in ages past; but they have each become acceptable and commonplace - for the most part - in twenty-first century Western culture. Perhaps Lilith the demoness became Lilith the goddess in today's world because *today's world is more agreeable with Her nature* than the ancient one was.

The ancient world had no shortage of sexy fertility goddesses who encouraged their worshipers to have wild animal sex. But all of these goddesses were invoked for *fertility* - i.e., in the interest of conceiving and giving birth to *children*. In that She has always been associated with sex and fornication, Lilith is not all that different from such fertility goddesses. But She is different in one very important way: Her influence was not considered to be very lucky if you expected to conceive a child during sex. In fact, we might call Lilith an *infertility* goddess - a spirit who encourages Her worshipers to have wild animal sex *strictly for pleasure* and *never* for procreation!

Given this context, it is very easy to understand why even places like ancient Babylon, which were known for their blatantly sexual fertility cults, would hate and fear someone like Lilith. Her attitude toward sex - i.e., for *pleasure only* - was just too blasphemous for them to handle. But here in the twenty-first century, it's become a sacred rule of thumb.

Most people in today's world want to be able to have sex without worrying about making any babies. Perhaps this is because in ancient times, a culture depended upon large numbers of offspring in order to survive. But in modern times, the Earth is vastly overpopulated. We don't need to reproduce like we did when we were still using sundials to tell the time. And perhaps this is why Lilith has received such popular sympathy in modern Western culture. Just as Set is the "Lord of this world," perhaps Lilith is truly the Lady of this *age*.

There are at least four ways of telling the two of them apart

from each other:

(1) Lilith has really only had one name throughout the history of Her manifestations (or rather, all of Her names come from the same root, “LYL”). Set, in contrast, has had more applicable names and titles than you can easily shake a hoof at.

(2) Lilith deals more specifically and immediately with the sphere of human sexual relationships, while Set deals more with basic human nature in general.

(3) Lilith would appear to only ever manifest as a feminine energy, while the Devil has been known to manifest under both masculine and feminine forms.

(4) There’s just something about Lilith that grants her a higher rate of acceptability even within close-minded circles, while Satan is often considered taboo even within the most *open-minded* circles.

I first met Lilith for myself during the autumn of 1999. It was a time in my life when I was beginning to explore the feminine side of Satan. You see, the Dark One revealed Himself to me as Tiamat at this time, and of course Tiamat was viewed as a feminine principle in Sumer and Babylon. Because of this personal revelation, I felt driven to learn all I possibly could about ancient goddess worship.

In books like *When God Was a Woman* by Merlin Stone - which was perhaps the most important book I was reading at this time - the details about ancient goddess worship are often viewed through the rose-tinted glasses of modern feminism. Nevertheless, my interest in celebrating the divine female led me to invoke the spirit of Lilith one night. On that unforgettable evening, I learned that there really is something to those old medieval tales about close encounters with succubi after all.

Since then, Lilith has been an ever-present force in my life. She has blessed me in many ways, most particularly in the development of a friendship that I hold very dear. This friendship is with a woman who I *swear* is the closest thing to a human incarnation of Lilith that there will ever be. She is not even a believer, but just like Lilith, she is independent, powerful, and has a very commanding presence. She takes life by the throat and takes what she wants from it. She knows how to get what she desires, and she wastes no time. She will never be subservient to any man (or to any other woman, for that matter). Her Lilithian personality is one that I admire very strongly - and I wish that all women everywhere could be just like her.

From my own experiences with Her, I view Lilith as being one of the many angels (i.e., Greek for “messengers”) who are in the Devil’s service, as discussed in my [first sermon](#). But She is not just any old angel. I see Her as Set’s second-in-command - the Devil’s Archangel.

She is the Emissary of Set, who is Princess of Hell and Goddess of this age. My relationship with Her is secondary to the one I have with Set Himself, but I nevertheless consider it to be very meaningful and important. Lilith worship is just as much a part of my Satanism as Devil worship. And with that in mind, I say hail Lady Lilith!

ABOUT SATANIC RITUALS

If you are new to Devil worship, you might think that performing a Satanic ritual is overwhelmingly complicated, and that you will need some kind of priest or other spiritual authority to help you in conducting it. This is actually very far from the truth.

Every Devil worshiper is entirely capable of performing their own rituals, by and for themselves. You don't need any kind of officiating priest or guru to help you. Instead, you should view yourself as *your own* priest. Technically, you do not even need to have an altar or candles or *anything*. Whenever you feel like you need to conduct a Satanic ceremony, for whatever purpose, all you really need is yourself.

And although some Satanists do indeed practice very complicated rituals, there is no rule anywhere which says that you have to. As a matter of fact, I am the sort of person who prefers to take a very simple approach toward ritual. You might say that my approach is somewhat Quaker-ish ("Society of Fiends," anybody?). I only ever do more complicated rituals on very special occasions.

The word "ritual" simply refers to a habitual practice that forms part of a normal routine. In this context, even something as simple as brushing your teeth in the morning is a ritual. When we talk about *religious* rituals, we are referring to habitual practices and normal routines that are intended to help the individual commune with whatever spiritual forces they acknowledge or worship. Therefore, something as simple as going to church every Sunday morning is an example of a Christian religious ritual.

When it comes to practicing religious rituals, the first question we must ask ourselves is, "What is the intended purpose?" There are all sorts of different reasons that a person might choose to do a ritual. People who believe in magic, for instance, will focus their rituals on trying to make things happen in accordance with their wills (sort of like being your own genie and granting your own wishes). At this point in time, the majority of self-described Satanists would appear to practice rituals like this.

Devil worshipers, on the other hand, tend to have an altogether different focus in their religious rituals. For someone like myself, the point to a Satanic ritual is not to practice any kind of magic, but simply to spend time in prayer with the Prince of Darkness, and to

re-confirm my commitment to the path. As opposed to practicing magical rituals, you might say I am more interested in practicing simple prayer ceremonies.

Now after we've gotten the intended purpose for the ritual out of the way, the next question one must ask is, "What will I do in the ritual?" In other words, are you going to recite prayers and incantations over an altar? Will you recite invocations to each of the four cardinal directions? Will there be any symbolic imagery used in the ritual - such as burning a doll that represents a problem or an enemy you wish you could be rid of?

This may come across as surprising, but while each of these practices are most certainly valid, none of them are absolutely necessary. A Satanic ritual can consist of something as simple as just sitting down, reciting a few prayers, and reading, watching, or listening to something that you really enjoy.

For instance, one of my favorite things I love to do is a very simple ritual I invented for myself long ago. This ritual is to be performed every Friday night at Witching Hour, and it consists of (1) reciting a short invocation to the Prince of Darkness, (2) inviting Him to join me in listening to one of my favorite albums, Ozzy Osbourne's *Bark at the Moon*, and (3) meditating in His presence while I listen to the music. Sometimes I may choose to have a movie playing silently on the television, to go along with the music (and the film is usually either *Pumpkinhead* or *Motel Hell* - don't ask me why). And whenever the music and/or the movie ends, so does the ritual.

It can be *that* simple.

Now many Christian conspiracy theorists claim that the "black mass" is the single most important Satanic ritual ever, and that all Satanists everywhere practice it regularly.

The truth of this claim depends largely upon what is meant by the term "black mass." In most cases, the term is used to mean a strict parody of the Catholic mass, in which the wine and communion wafer are desecrated, so as to be made "unholy" in Satan's name. It is further claimed that these things must be stolen from a Catholic church, thereby implying that Satanists are required to break the law in order to observe their religious rituals.

While black masses of this sort have indeed been practiced at times in history, the fact is that they have hardly ever been practiced by serious Satanists of any kind. Usually, they have been performed by defrocked Catholic priests. Such a thing has never been popularly practiced by the majority of Satanists, and even in the few cases when a strict parody of the Catholic mass is performed,

the materials used therein are never obtained illegally. The majority of us Devil folk are more interested in being law-abiding, so that we can be free to practice our religion in peace - rather than get ourselves landed in jail.

However, some Devil worshipers like to use a more general definition for the term “black mass.” For me, a black mass is absolutely any kind of complex ceremony that is performed in honor of the Prince of Darkness. Whether it actually resembles a *Catholic* mass or not is unimportant. It only has to be some kind of complicated ceremony in which worship is specifically given to Satan. In this context, even a ritual that resembles a “ceremonial magic” ritual can be a black mass, provided that the *point* to the ritual is worshiping the Devil, rather than practicing any kind of magic.

My kind of black mass is a ritual that consists of many incantations and symbolic gestures. It is also the only time when I actually use an altar and candles. I usually start the ritual by lighting a black candle on the altar, and then reciting an incantation in which I repeat the phrase, “I focus my mind and my will upon the Prince of Darkness” nine times. After that, I recite a general invocation to Set, in which I utter a long list of names and titles used to describe Him. Immediately following this, I take a good ten or twenty minutes to meditate while staring into the flame of the candle. When I feel that I’ve meditated enough, I then perform a symbolic gesture of thanksgiving to Set - usually in the form of a sacrifice - and then I recite any particular prayers or requests that I might have. In closing, I tell Set how much He means to me, and I re-confirm my commitment to following Him and my initiation. The entire ritual usually lasts about an hour or so, and I always perform it at night.

My black mass essentially conforms to the following basic formula:

- (1) Incantation for focus
- (2) Invocation to Set
- (3) Period of meditation
- (4) Act of thanksgiving or sacrifice
- (5) Recitation of prayers and/or requests
- (6) Adoration and re-confirmation of commitment (closing)

The invocation I use for my black masses usually goes something like this:

*I hereby invoke the Prince of Darkness,
The great Dragon of the bottomless pit
Who is the Bringer of Light
And Lord of the Earth.
Hear me, o mighty God of Hell!
Come forth from the black Abyss,
Come forth from the ends of the Earth,
Come forth from the nighttime sky!
Great Tiamat, Apophis, Ahriman, Typhon!
Leviathan, Azazel, Belial, Samael!
Satan, Lucifer, SET!
My Lord and Master, come forth from Hell
And greet me as Your servant and friend.
Join me as I conduct this service in Your honor
Out of love and thankfulness for You.
Amen!*

Now when I say “sacrifice,” I’m not talking about blood sacrifice. Christian conspiracy theorists typically claim that we Devil worshipers like to sacrifice animals and/or children in our rituals. Well, I’ve never known any Devil worshiper who seriously believed in human sacrifice. I have met a few who believe in *animal* sacrifice, but these are usually people who live in rural areas, and who are therefore still accustomed to killing their own food. Furthermore, they kill the animals in humane ways that are in accordance with the laws of the land, and the animals are usually eaten in a meal afterwards. So long as the animal is killed and disposed of in a humane manner, I have no objections to other people practicing animal sacrifice. Afterall, the observation of Thanksgiving dinner is an example of *Christian* animal sacrifice.

When it comes to myself, however, I am not a believer in *any* kind of blood sacrifice. When I choose to make a sacrifice to the Dark Lord, I do one of two things. The first is a food sacrifice. What I do is I’ll dedicate part of my money to buying some food - like a pumpkin pie or a fried chicken or something - and I’ll leave it outside somewhere for Set to take through the creatures of nature. Or, if it happens to be a holiday, I might prepare a great feast in Set’s honor.

The other kind of sacrifice is what I think of as an “erotic sacrifice.” This consists of tapping into my unconscious through a self-induced orgasm, and dedicating the expression of that pure, animalistic energy to the Dark Lord. Usually, I only ever practice this kind of sacrifice for when I am doing a rite to Lilith, but I sometimes use it for Set as well. When I am performing a black mass together

with someone else, I prefer to do a food sacrifice if a sacrifice is to be given at all. I only ever do an erotic sacrifice when I am worshipping alone.

In any case, I do not practice black masses very often. I'd say I probably only do two or three of them a year. I consider simpler rituals, like the "Bark at the Moon" ritual I described above, to be far more important to me. This is because I've always had something of a problem in swallowing the pomp and circumstance of the more ceremonial approach. For me, it seems a lot more intimate and spiritually powerful when it's just me, the Prince of Darkness, and my Ozzy Osbourne.

Some people, on the other hand, do not consider the practice of religious rituals to be important at all. I am friends with at least one Satanist who says he's only ever performed one ritual during the entire time he's been running with the Devil. This perspective is every bit as valid as anybody else's. Perhaps some of my readers out there are people who have tried to perform rituals and who just didn't feel that it was really worth their time. If that is the way you honestly feel, then that is *okay*. You shouldn't be made to feel like you *have* to practice rituals if you don't want to.

I hope that this sermon has been helpful to any readers out there who might be feeling nervous about the idea of Satanic ritual. Just remember, you are your own priest, and you are completely in charge of what your own rituals are going to be like. They can be as long and drawn out as you want them to be, or they can be as simple as meditating to some good music. There are only two people in the entire universe who can rightfully have a say in how you do your rituals, or if you're going to do any rituals at all. And those two people are the Prince of Darkness and *yourself*.

IS IT SATANISM OR DEVIL WORSHIP?

IN the nine long years that I've recognized myself as a Satanist, I've seen more pointless and pedantic arguments over the use of labels and semantics - among Satanists - than I'd care to count. It may seem very strange to some people (it certainly does to me), but one major bone of contention between different Satanists is the use of the term "Devil worship."

In the 1960's and 1970's, Anton Szandor LaVey popularized a new idea of Satanism through his Church of Satan. This was further enhanced through the publication of his *Satanic Bible*. LaVey's version of Satanism - which was inspired by the writings of Ragnar Redbeard, Mark Twain, Friedrich Nietzsche and H. L. Mencken - was, at least publically, a *non-theistic* philosophy. That is to say, LaVey gave the image that people in his church did not actually believe in Satan as a literal entity, and therefore did not worship Him religiously. Instead, "Satanism" for them meant worshiping your own carnal ego. LaVey dismissed all gods as being "creations of man" in *The Satanic Bible* - including the Devil - and he further suggested that no Satanist in their right mind would ever worship or pray to any "imaginary deity."

Now it is a fact that LaVey's church was the very first public, above-ground Satanist organization ever to exist. However, some of LaVey's followers - and "followers" is exactly what they are - have gone so far as to claim that "Satanism never existed" before the Church of Satan, and that it was "invented" by Anton LaVey. They will further suggest that the very word "Satanism" itself is LaVey's intellectual property, and that anyone who disagrees with his doctrines has "no right" to call him or herself a Satanist.

That last part is blatantly false. According to the [Online Etymology Dictionary](#), the word "Satanist" first appeared in print in the year 1559. The term was applied to Protestant sects by their enemies - and it was used *specifically* to mean "worship of Satan." This meaning for the word has been carried over unto present day. If you go out on the street and shout the word "Satanism," most people who hear you will automatically think of "Satan worship." This is because five centuries are long enough to ingrain a specific word usage into any collective consciousness.

Furthermore, since the word "Satanist" is at least five centuries old, it exists in the public domain. Nobody owns a copyright on it, not even the Church of Satan. Anybody who claims that Satanism is

LaVey's "intellectual property" is very much mistaken. Therefore, a person who believes in and worships Satan as a literal entity has *every right* to call him or herself a Satanist if they want to.

It's certainly true that Anton LaVey was the first self-described Satanist to write a "How To" book for other Satanists. That much is not debatable, and as long as we're talking about that, all self-described Satanists everywhere owe LaVey a tip of the hat - whether they agree with all his teachings or not. He certainly did get the ball rolling for Satanism in the twentieth century, that much is for sure.

But the idea of whether or not Satanism existed prior to LaVey depends largely upon the application of the term being used. Are we talking about whether or not Satan worshipers existed before LaVey? LaVey's followers will tell you that there is "no evidence" of such people having existed, but there is no evidence of them *not* having existed, either, so this argument doesn't really work. Prior to the 1960's, it makes sense that anybody who *did* worship the Devil would have wanted to keep a low profile, so as to avoid public persecution. Stating it as a "fact" that no Satanists existed prior to LaVey is neither realistic nor intellectually honest.

Or are we talking about whether or not Self worshipers in black robes existed before LaVey? Well if that's what we're talking about, then I guess you could say it's true that no "Satanists" existed before LaVey - but this is only paying attention to *one man's* definition for the term, and blatantly turning a blind eye to at least five centuries' worth of definitions. This doesn't seem very intellectually honest, either.

Even if it could somehow be proven that there were no Satan worshipers prior to LaVey - and trust me, it never will be - this *still* would not mean that modern Satan worshipers can't rightfully call themselves Satanists. The fact of the matter is that the idea of "Satanism as Satan worship" goes back five centuries at the very least. The idea of "Satanism as Self worship," on the other hand, only goes back *forty years* as of this writing. That's not even *half* of a century yet!

And yet, in the 1970's, Anton LaVey began to impliment a new policy within the Church of Satan that attempted to prevent Devil worshipers from being "confused" with "Satanists." Ever since that time, Church of Satan officials have continually claimed that anybody who worships the Devil "is not" and "cannot be" a true Satanist. Because supposedly, "true Satanists" only worship themselves.

This "anti-Devil worshiper" attitude has even spread among other, non-Church of Satan groups. Satanist leaders like John Allee

of the First Church of Satan in Salem, MA claim that Devil worship is “often a symptom of psychosis.” In his [online article](#) dealing with this subject, Allee bases his claim that Devil worshipers are “sociopaths” on only a *pair* of emails he’s received from emotionally unstable people who seem obsessed with the Devil. Of course, Allee does not bother to point out that neither of these individuals actually called themselves Devil worshipers or used the term as a serious label anywhere in their messages. Nor does he point out that there have been more murders, genocides, and cases of child abuse committed in the names of Jesus Christ, Jehovah and Allah than there ever have been in the name of the Devil. Yet people do not typically assume that “Christ worshipers” are all sociopathic lunatics. Therefore, it makes even *less* sense to believe that *Devil worshipers* are all sociopathic lunatics!

There have indeed been some people in history who have done nasty things in the name of “Satan.” But to suggest that all Devil worshipers *in general* are lunatic criminals is perhaps even *more* absurd than claiming that all Christians like to burn their women at the stake. And somehow, the idea of having to explain this to somebody who calls him or herself a *Satanist* seems extremely redundant and ridiculous.

But logic is often elusive to religious people. In the area of religion, people believe things that they cannot logically prove - and yes, even those who follow LaVey fit neatly into this category (for while LaVey might have dismissed Satan as “imaginary,” he certainly did take the subject of “magic” very seriously). And it is the folly of religious people to argue and accuse others of being “wrong” and “misled,” when we ourselves cannot prove that our own beliefs and values are objectively correct. This happens within all cultures of faith; it happens in Christianity, it happens in Islam, and it happens in Neopaganism. If you don’t believe that it happens in Satanism, too, then you seriously need to wake up and smell the brimstone.

While they were trying to create a face of “political correctness” for themselves, many people in the Neopagan/Wiccan movements decided to make their own religions seem more socially acceptable by projecting all the sensationalism they received onto Satanists. For instance, at one time it was not uncommon to hear a Wiccan say something to the effect of, “We Wiccans are not Satanists; we don’t sacrifice babies!” And of course it is true that Wiccans are not Satanists; but it is *not* true that Satanists sacrifice babies. Many of the Wiccans who said such things didn’t seem to care about this, however. All such individuals really cared about was making sure

that people stop persecuting Neopaganism. If they could achieve this by getting their persecutors to persecute *other* religions instead, they were more than happy to do so.

Thankfully, not as many Wiccans and Neopagans are doing this sort of thing today. But this sort of thing *is* being done by *Satanists* today! Nowadays, it is not uncommon to hear a Satanist say something to the effect of, “We Satanists are not Devil worshipers; we don’t sacrifice babies!” And of course it is true that not *all* self-described Satanists worship the Devil; but it is *not* true that anyone who worships the Devil believes in sacrificing babies! Many of the Satanists who say such things as this don’t really seem to care that they are misrepresenting anybody. All such individuals really care about is making sure that people stop persecuting *their own kind* of Satanism. If they can achieve this by getting their persecutors to persecute *other* kinds of Satanism instead, then they are more than happy to do so.

Just what in Hell do people who say things like this think they’re *doing*? I know that Satanism has no general rule about having “brotherly love” for your co-religionists - but this is truly ridiculous. Not only that, it is blatant *hypocrisy*.

Now I try to be as logical as possible about these things. And to me, it seems logical to be respectful toward Anton LaVey for his historical role in Satanism. Therefore, you will never hear me saying that LaVey was “not a true Satanist.” But when it comes to worshiping the Devil, I don’t care what *anybody* says. I believe in the existence of the Devil, I religiously worship Him, and I am a goddamned *Satanist*, whether anybody in the Church of Satan or the First Church of Satan or the Global Corporate Conglomerate of Satan likes it or not.

And if they don’t like it, then they can either try to think of a way to copyright the word “Satanist” so they can sue whoever else uses it, or they can shut the Hell up.

I am more than willing to accept LaVey’s definition of Satanism as *one kind* of Satanism, and I am even willing to accept it as a *valid* kind thereof. If you worship your own carnal ego and think that makes you a Satanist, then so be it. But Devil worship is most certainly a valid kind of Satanism, too. I’m willing to differentiate between Self worshiping Satanists and Devil worshiping Satanists, but I am *not* willing to compromise with anybody who wants to try and tell me that I’m “not a Satanist” because I worship the Devil! And I sincerely hope that all other Devil worshipers who are reading this sermon will agree. We’re *Satanists*, dammit! Raise your fists and YELL!

There are some people out there who wish Satanists could be “united as a community.” (And strangely enough, some of the people who preach this are the very same ones who attack Devil worshipers.) Well, the sad fact of it is that Satanism is something like a war zone. We’re all a bunch of wild and ravenous wolves who are constantly going at each other’s throats. There is no “brotherly love” here. There is no “Satanic community.” Just because you describe yourself as a Satanist does not mean that you’re going to be treated like a human being by other Satanists. In fact, if you have “heterodox” views, you can bet your hooves that you *won’t* be - which is very sad considering that Satanism is supposed to *thrive* on heterodoxy.

I say these things for the benefit of my fellow Devil worshipers, especially the ones who are young and who have not consciously recognized themselves as Devil folk for very long. I hate to say it, but Satanism as a culture of faith is very nasty. It’s very easy to become discouraged with Devil worship because of all the horrible things that some Satanists will say and do to you just because you’re *different*. The major Satanist churches all constantly preach about how individualism is a good thing - and yet if you don’t conform to their party lines, they’ll shit all over you.

But if the Black Flame of Set burns bright inside your heart, you’ll know that you can never turn your back on the faith. You’ll know it’s as much a part of who and what you are as your skin color and your gender preference. You can’t go against your true, inner nature - and there’s absolutely no reason why you should. If you’ve ever felt the Devil’s touch upon your soul, you’ll know that what you’ve personally got going with Him is far, *far* more important than whatever some hot-shot big-wig “high priest” might think or say. You’ll know that it’s *your* lifetime initiation process that’s truly important. Forget all those high priests, ipsissimi, magistri templi and spiritual gurus. We don’t need them, and we never did! If you’ve got the Prince of Darkness in your life, then you have *your own* direct hotline to Hell, and that’s all that matters!

If we Devil worshipers just stick together, there’s absolutely no way in Hell that we won’t rise above all this semantic gerrymandering bullhockey. If we just support and encourage each other in the face of our opposition, we can make sure that Devil worship will one day get the respect it really deserves. But we have to stick together, and we have to try and be the absolute best people we can be. We must not succumb to the madness, the idiocy, or the hypocrisy.

Glory be to Set, and to His servants - the Children of Darkness!

THE PROCESS OF SATANIC INITIATION

DIFFERENT Satanists will engage in different practices. Not everyone in this culture of faith believes or practices the same way - and that's exactly as it should be. Each and every individual is their own priest, their own pope. When it comes to your personal relationship with the Prince of Darkness, nobody else on Earth has any business telling you what to believe or how to practice your faith.

But in terms of my own relationship with the Prince of Darkness, there is a certain concept that I hold very dear, and I think some of my readers may benefit from reading about it. This concept is what I refer to as the Satanic initiation process.

Initiation is a term that has been defined and used in various ways. The verb *initiate* means "to begin" or "to start a particular action, event, or process." In many situations, the term *initiation* is used to describe a ceremonial rite of passage. Such rites normally consist of symbolic gestures which represent the admission of an individual into a particular group or level of knowledge. In many college fraternities, for instance, it is not unusual for potential members to be put through some sort of "ceremonial ritual" - usually involving pranks - to "test" whether they are suitable to formally join the club or not.

In a more esoteric sense, initiation is not merely a ceremonial ritual. It is more of a *process* that the individual goes through, in which they experience changes and reach higher levels of knowledge and awareness. In this context, initiation does not occur within or because of a ceremonial ritual - but it can be *illustrated* through one, if such is desired.

For instance, when you are being "initiated" into a college fraternity, you might be asked to spend a night in a house that is claimed to be haunted. If you last the entire night without leaving the house, then you are allowed to join the frat - because you have proven that you're not a "chicken." In this context, the "initiation" is merely a ritual that you must perform in order to reach your next stage of development - in this case, membership in a club. Here, status is defined by a rite of passage.

But there is another kind of initiation, when status is *not* defined by a rite of passage. Let's say you go to your local convenience store to pick up a carton of milk, and you end up meeting the person who's going to be your spouse for the rest of your life. When the two of you get married during your wedding, the wedding is merely an

illustration of a change that has already taken place. You don't get married to someone and *then* fall in love with them (at least, not here in the West); you fall in love with them *first*, and you get hitched *because* you love each other. Or perhaps you and your love may decide *not* to have a formal wedding ceremony - but that doesn't change the fact that an important change has taken place in your life, and *that change* is the initiation.

Here, your status is not defined by the rite of passage. If there is a rite of passage at all, it is merely an illustration of a new status you've gained from having some kind of life-altering experience. The ancient Egyptians referred to this sort of thing as *Xeper*, an Egyptian verb which means, "to come into being, to change, to bring about, to create."

This is what Satanic initiation is like - except that, when it is specifically Satanic (as opposed to being romantic), you are experiencing an important *spiritual change* of some kind. In my case, perhaps the best example would be when I first realized that I am a Satanist.

This was way back in August of 1997. For an entire year prior to 1997, I had already begun to conceptualize a sympathetic approach to the Devil, but I was not yet ready to view my sympathy in a religious context. At first, I was nervous about thinking of myself as a Satanist, because I didn't think that there would be anybody else out there who would understand what I meant by the term. But in August of 1997, I found an article about the Church of Satan and the Temple of Set on the [Religious Tolerance](#) website, which included summaries of their separate belief systems - both described as "Satanism." And although I disagreed with both groups on a few issues, it absolutely thrilled me to discover that *there are other people out there* who believe like I do.

When I discovered these things, I suddenly realized that I was a Satanist - and had always been one. There was never a time when I said, "I'm thinking about being a Satanist" or "I want to be a Satanist." There was only that single moment of self-realization: "*I am* a Satanist." And that change was so phenomenal, so liberating, it was like I was looking into a mirror and seeing my true self for the very first time. You might say that I never had to "sell my soul" to the Prince of Darkness; it had already been His, and I simply snapped awake and realized it at that crucial moment.

My Satanic initiation did not necessarily begin with that moment of self-realization, for it had already been happening. In fact, I believe very strongly that it has been taking place ever since I was born. And if you, dear reader, are a fellow Devil worshiper, I

would posit that your Satanic initiation has been happening since you were born too. But that moment of self-realization in 1997 is important to me because it was when I first became *conscious* of my fellowship with Set, and that awareness was something I did not have before. My discovery of the Church of Satan and the Temple of Set was a life-altering event that left me forever changed, and that change represents a very important stage of my Satanic initiation.

There have been various stages in my initiation process thus far, and I know there will be more to come as well. Another good example of one of these stages would be an experience I had in the fall of 1999. During that time, I felt drawn to view Set as a female entity - a goddess - for some strange reason that I couldn't explain. My interest in exploring the Devil as a goddess led me to research the ancient Sumerian myths about Tiamat. It also opened the door for me to cross paths with Lilith. Meeting Lilith was an important change in my initiation process, for it taught me to recognize and appreciate the concept of a purely feminine divinity. It was also the point in my life when I changed from being a henotheist (i.e., a person who believes in more than one deity, but worships only one) to a polytheist (i.e., a person who worships more than one deity). And I believe the Devil revealed Himself to me in His feminine form during this time as a way of introducing me to His Bride.

I have also gone through various paradigm shifts during my initiation process. When I first became conscious of my fellowship with Set, I chose to adopt the Temple of Set's paradigm for my own worldview. Later on, however, I began to develop disagreements with that paradigm. Originally, I accepted the Setian theory that all the religions of the world are divided between "nature worship" and "consciousness worship," with Satanism of course being consciousness worship. But I later came to realize that not all of the so-called "Right Hand Path" religions really involve nature worship. Christianity, for instance, is most certainly *not* a nature worshipping religion. And in some cases, even Satanism can be considered nature worship.

When I realized this, I adjusted my paradigm so that it no longer operated according to a strict, competitive dualism between nature worship and consciousness worship. And over the course of time, I came to realize that it's pointless to try and characterize *all* belief systems according to a dualism anyway. Instead of judging a worldview as being either "this" or "that," I am now much more sensitive to how each belief system is somehow different and unique from all others in the marketplace of human ideas.

Furthermore, I originally agreed with the "mainstream

Satanists” that I should be worshiping myself as my god, instead of the Prince of Darkness. But after a few years, my relationship with the Prince became so strong that I just couldn’t help but feel worshipful toward Him. I realized that I may indeed be my own priest or pope, but I am certainly not any sort of deity, and if there is any deity out there that deserves my worship and praise, it is Set. And so I ditched the mainstream prejudice against the word “worship,” and started proudly calling myself a Devil worshiper.

I also used to believe in practicing magic and performing rituals like those outlined in Anton Szandor LaVey’s *Satanic Bible*. But after a while, I began to feel that these rituals were not really working for me, and I decided to adjust them so that they would become more devotional practices. Ever since then, I have experienced a greater sense of fulfillment from my rituals, and I no longer take the subject of magic very seriously - much to the dismay of the mainstreamers.

For most of my years as a self-aware Satanist, I have been practicing my religion alone. But during the year of 2003, a very close friend of mine began to take an interest in learning more about Devil worship. In December of that year, he told me he felt he was ready to dedicate himself to the path. Afterwards, I began practicing rituals and worshiping the Prince of Darkness with an apprentice, whom I came to recognize as my brother and equal in the faith only a year after his dedication ceremony.

The experience of teaching an apprentice everything I knew, of showing him how to practice my rituals, and of having someone to worship and pray with was a *major* development in my initiation.

The experience opened my eyes to just how powerful a ritual could be when you have the right kind of partner. And it also taught me that teachers can learn from their pupils as much as pupils can learn from their teachers!

These are just a few examples of what my Satanic initiation has been like so far. It is a continual process of “fine tuning” one’s perception of the world according to one’s experiences and discoveries. For me personally, the worldview that I have today is much more fulfilling and empowering than the one I adopted when I first became aware of the Devil’s presence in my life. And I am sure that it will become even more fulfilling and empowering as I continue to adjust and tinker with it through the years.

But I do not expect everyone else’s initiations to resemble my own. Everyone’s initiation will somehow be different. If you were to do all of the exact same things that I have done, your initiation would *still* be different from mine somehow, because we are all unique creatures. The process of initiation is *necessarily* different and

distinctive for each individual.

Now some of you may feel that I am putting down the beliefs of others in such things as magic or self worship. Such is not the case. If it is consistent with your *own* initiation to believe in these things, then all the more power to you. If you experience a life-altering change that leads you to believe firmly in the power of magic, then I think you should go with it. That is a clear indication that your initiation is meant to take such a turn. That is *your* path. But on the other hand, if you should have another life-altering experience which leads you to *disbelieve* in the power of magic, then I think you must go with that as well. Beliefs can be useful things, but I believe we must have the strength and the courage to discard them if and whenever they outlive their usefulness. Otherwise, they will become stale and petty dogmas.

The very same principle goes for all other beliefs as well: belief in self worship, belief in theism, belief in prayer, belief in ritual, belief in voting Republican, etc. I believe we must each follow the courses of our own initiations, and sometimes this will mean changing our opinions over the years. As I said earlier, it is a “fine tuning” process. I encourage each of my readers to not let themselves be weighed down by dogmatism, but to keep themselves free and open-minded enough to adapt themselves and their views to the ever-changing circumstances of life. Don’t try to be a rock in the midst of the torrent. Instead, let yourself go with the flow, and follow your heart. Let your initiation unfold as it will, and take comfort that whatever you become in the end will be greater and bolder than what you were in the beginning - like the butterfly who was once a larva.

DO YOU HAVE THE MARK?

ANTON LaVey once remarked that “Satanists are born, not made.” And as much as I might disagree with some of his teachings, I have to admit that there is great wisdom in this statement. But I prefer to phrase it somewhat differently. I would say that the Devil chooses His own, and only He can decide who will bear His Mark and who will not.

When I refer to the Devil’s Mark, I am not referring to that which is called the “number of the Beast” in the Christian book of Revelation. Instead, I am referring to something more like the medieval belief that the Devil physically places a special Mark upon the bodies of His servants. This Mark was believed to be insensitive to pain, and it was one of the things that witchhunters looked for on the bodies of suspected witches. Even the slightest mole or birthmark could be seen as the Mark of the Devil, and anyone who had one would be imprisoned and tortured.

It is a fact that most of the people who were tortured during that time were not witches or Devil worshipers at all, but just normal Christians who ended up as the victims of cultural paranoia. If any of the people who were executed as witches at that time really *did* serve the Devil, it has yet to be proven.

Regardless of this, I do believe that the Devil places a Mark upon those who are destined to serve Him. But instead of thinking of this Mark as a physical thing that actually appears on one’s body, I think of it as a *spiritual* Mark that is placed upon one’s spirit or soul.

Now some of my readers may already know this, but I have never been a practitioner of any other religion than Satanism. My parents did not raise me to be a Satanist by any means, but they did give me an agnostic upbringing. I was never instructed to believe in any particular religion.

And yet, during my entire life as a child, I always felt drawn to darkness, the Devil, and the occult. I did not begin to understand this as an actual religious persuasion until I reached high school, but I nevertheless felt *drawn* to these things before I ever knew anything about them. Because of this, I believe the Devil has been in my life since at least the time when I was born, if not longer. And I believe He has always intended for me to be one of His children. You might say that I’ve been “groomed” for Devil worship, so to speak, but without anybody realizing it! In this sense, I believe that I have - and have always had - the Mark of the Devil upon my soul.

Set receives those who receive Him, and He doesn't exactly solicit membership from people. Unlike some other gods who seem to prefer being worshiped by entire multitudes of human sheep, I think the Prince of Darkness would rather keep His fan base down to a minimum. But He does have a habit of "surprising" people. Before recognizing themselves as Satanists, many Devil folk would not even *dream* of following Satan, either literally or symbolically. Even a person who has been a fundamentalist Christian their entire life can wake up one morning and suddenly realize they've been Marked by Set from the very beginning. The very same thing could suddenly happen to a fanatical Goddess-worshiping feminazi, right out of the blue! It's just a matter of them discovering this when Set *wants* them to.

I say "recognizing themselves as Satanists" because nobody really "becomes" a Satanist. Those of us who are chosen - who have been given the Mark - have always been Devil folk deep down. It's just a matter of *realizing* it. This is why Anton LaVey said, "Satanists are born, not made." When it comes down to it, you can't fake being a Child of Set. It's not just a religious persuasion, but a *spiritual orientation*. Devil folk can't help loving the Devil anymore than gay folks can help being attracted to members of the same sex!

And when an individual receives the call and recognizes the Mark that they have been given, it is never a matter of "conversion." It is simply a matter of waking up to a part of yourself that has always been there, and which has only been dormant until now.

Now some folks, usually teenagers, become involved in Satanism more out of rebellion than out of any true spiritual calling. Some of them will eventually leave Satanism as they get older, and embark upon other ideas and worldviews. Such dabblers have not really been Marked, but their temporary involvement in Satanism might nevertheless be an important stage of their initiations. So although it may be tempting for those of us who are Marked to belittle and make fun of these dabblers, we really shouldn't. For some people, Satanism is not intended as a spiritual calling, but more as a vehicle of transition through which they can arrive at wherever their initiation is meant to lead them. Many young'uns who were once Satanic dabblers grow up to become practitioners of other minority religions, like Wicca or Thelema. In this sense, Satanism is something like a "midwife" for these other minority religions.

On the other hand, some people who are Marked might feel a calling to leave Satanism and investigate other religions. And then, somewhere down the road, the Dark Lord will call them back and they will see themselves as Satanists again. Is it truthful to say that

these people really “left” Satanism in the first place? I believe not. If you’ve been Marked, you’ll always come back home. But just because you’re Marked does not mean you will never feel like exploring other paths. And indeed, it is good for Devil folk to do just that. In some cases, I believe Set *purposely* incites His children to temporarily leave Satanism and investigate other paths, for the sake of expanding their horizons.

This is also why many of us are so strongly against the idea of evangelism. If a person is meant to be a Satanist, then I believe that Set Himself will reveal it to them eventually. He is the only being in the entire universe who can administer His Mark; no human has any right to try and administer it for Him. The Devil has no need for any human representatives to “recruit new members” or to otherwise “talk people into joining Satanism.” In fact, if you really think about it, attempting to do this would actually be going *against* our Master’s designs.

Most intelligent Satanists and Devil worshipers will agree that the Prince of Darkness not only encourages us to exercise our free will, but that this is even more important to Him than convincing people to believe in or worship Him. Unlike the god of the Bible, Set is not a control freak who wants to exert power and dominion over a flock of human sheep. Instead, He is something more like an anarchic trickster spirit. He continually pokes and prods humans to become like wild animals; He wants us to be completely self-possessed and out of control!

Although it is not actually sanctioned by their scriptures, there is a good reason why Christians associate the Devil with the serpent in the Garden of Eden story. According to the story, Adam and Eve were originally docile and obedient to the biblical god, and they did exactly as they were told. In this primordial state of ignorance and subservience, the first humans lived in a kind of paradise. (For, as they say, “Ignorance is bliss.”)

But then the serpent came along and tempted Eve to eat of the Tree of Knowledge, which was the only thing that the biblical god had forbidden Adam and Eve to do. Eve then convinced Adam to eat the fruit as well. And by eating the fruit, “their eyes were opened” and they “became like God, knowing good and evil.” The biblical god then kicked Adam and Eve out of the Garden of Eden and sentenced them to painful lives of suffering and strife. It would seem that Adam and Eve’s transformation from ignorance to knowledge caused their lives of bliss to become lives of pain. Indeed, knowledge and self-awareness can be very painful things, for it is much easier to be ignorant and blind than to think and reason.

But knowledge is also a key to power, and it is this key to power which many Christians believe the Devil has given to human beings. And who am I to disagree with them? For certainly I believe that the Prince of Darkness demands study rather than worship from the majority of humans, and that He only enjoys worship from those who have been Marked. Those who have *not* been Marked to be the Children of Set are not obliged to worship or believe in Him at all, but only to exercise their free will and expand their knowledge as far as it can possibly go.

We must also remember that those of us who are theistic Satanists have no proof with which we can convince others of His existence. I cannot demonstrate the existence of Set to a non-believer, for Set cannot be seen, heard, felt, smelled, or tasted. An individual can only arrive at a belief in Set through a leap of faith on the part of the individual, or by direct intervention on the part of Set Himself. If a Devil worshiper were to come up to a non-believer and say, "Satan is real whether you believe in Him or not, and you must accept it!" then they would be demanding that the non-believer surrender his or her reason to blind faith. And that, my friends, would be a direct *insult* to the invaluable gift that Set has given to all women and men in the world.

Therefore, for a person who is Marked to try and proselytize to non-believers would be to work *against* that for which the Prince of Darkness stands. We have a higher responsibility to encourage the exercise of knowledge and free will than to encourage any religious belief in the Devil. In fact, you might say that those who do *not* believe in the Devil are even more susceptible to His influence than we ourselves are - for as they say, "The greatest trick the Devil ever played was convincing us that He doesn't exist."

If Set truly wants a person to believe in Him for any reason, then He will reveal Himself to them in whatever way He sees fit. It is not for us to decide who will believe and who will not. Those who are destined to serve, worship, or otherwise follow the Devil will have the Mark. And those who do not have the Mark should be respected for their right to believe or disbelieve as they please.

As you can probably imagine, this can all become quite difficult for those of us who have children. For how is a Satanist parent to know for sure whether their child has been Marked or not? There is certainly no logical reason for someone to assume that their children will be Marked just because they themselves are Marked. If such were the case, then wouldn't that mean that *their* parents would have been Marked too? But most Devil folk are born into non-Satanic families and are not raised to be Satanists. And just as a non-

Satanic family can have children who are meant to be Devil folk, a Satanic family can have children who are *not* meant to be Devil folk.

It is perhaps for this reason that most Satanist parents I've known simply do not raise their children to be Satanists. Instead, they prefer only to educate their children about non-religious subjects, and to let the children make their own inquiries about religion when they have grown up. Unlike many Christian parents who will drag their children off to church on Sunday mornings, most Satanist parents will not allow their children to participate in any rituals. Only when a child has grown old enough to think and reason for him or herself - and only if that child should recognize that they have been Marked - should they be allowed by their parents to participate in Satanic ritual.

Of course, I am probably preaching to the choir as far as most of my readers are concerned. I have not met very many self-described Satanists who want to convert anyone to their way of believing. Usually, Satanists are pretty keen on just minding their own business and not caring what other people do. Nevertheless, I feel it is good to have discussed these concepts for any Devil folk out there who have only just recently discovered that they've been Marked. For it can be very disconcerting to learn that you have the Mark, especially when you've never known what people like us usually believe.

WHY DAMIEN'S DAY IS BUNK

*This Satanic sermon was finished right
at the stroke of Witching Hour on June 6, 2006.*

EVERYBODY is going crazy because of the fact that today is the sixth day of the sixth month of the "sixth" year of the new millennium.

Bible thumpers and doomsday prophets are all freaking out about the Antichrist and comets hitting the Earth. Catholics are spreading warnings about how all Satanists everywhere are planning to steal their wine and communion wafers to blaspheme the Eucharist. And Twentieth Century Fox studios is releasing a remake of the 1976 "Satanic" thriller, *The Omen* on this very date. Thanks to all this, the date of 6/6/06 has been successfully steam-pressed onto the frontal lobes of two-legged animals all across the North American continent.

But what is the real significance of this date to Satanists, if any? What will Devil worshipers be doing to celebrate, if anything?

Well I can tell you right now, I'll be performing the single most blasphemous Satanic ritual of them all. I'll be transgressing against the god of Abraham like no other person has ever done before. I'll be making the ultimate sacrifice, and performing the most degenerate and degraded offense against nature that anyone could possibly do in the name of my Master, the Dark Lord Satan.

That's right. I'm going to watch *Pee-Wee's Big Adventure* and listen to Elton John. I can hear all the headbangers screaming now! How beautiful it sounds. And if I'm feeling *especially* evil, I just might sacrifice a Double Quarter Pounder from McDonald's over my altar, the kitchen table. And I'll have extra cheese on it, too! MUAH HAH HAH!

Seriously though. As a Devil worshiper, I take all this crapola about 6/6/06 just as seriously as I take President Dubya's old speech about "nukular weapons." While the number 666 is an interesting symbol that appears on many of my favorite horror movie and heavy metal album covers, it doesn't have any special meaning for me. I don't believe the world's going to end, and I really wouldn't want it to anyway.

Last I checked, the only people with a hard-on for Armageddon are the crazy televangelists running our government. We Devil folk enjoy the Earth and its pleasures far too much to want some kind of nuclear holocaust to happen. That would put an end to all our

Witches' Sabbats real quick!

And to me, it just doesn't make any friggin' sense for a Devil worshiper to believe in the Antichrist. Why in Hell would the Prince of Darkness need to have a "son" anyway? That's not even a biblical idea really, that's just an idea we've inherited from *Rosemary's Baby* and *The Omen*. And I have to admit that I don't really like either of these films.

Rosemary has never made much sense to me because I just don't see why the Dark Lord would need to rape a poor Catholic girl in order to sire His son. I mean, come on! There are plenty of Devil worshipping women out there. I'm sure if Lucifer just asked them nicely, a few of 'em would be more than willing to bear Him some chilluns. There's no need for raping Catholic women when there's plenty of women who'd probably have sex with the Ol' Goat willingly!

And *The Omen* just makes me want to travel back to 1976 in a TARDIS and slap the shit out of Gregory Peck. He's one of my favorite actors, and I can't believe he even gave David Seltzer the time of day on that one. I don't like movies about babies being killed by "Satanists." I'm sorry, but anyone who hurts a child does not deserve to be associated with His Infernal Majesty. Hurting children is something Jehovah commanded the Israelites to do in the Old Testament (Numbers 31:7-18):

"They fought against Midian, as the LORD commanded Moses, and killed every man. Among their victims were Evi, Rekem, Zur, Hur and Reba—the five kings of Midian. They also killed Balaam son of Beor with the sword. **The Israelites captured the Midianite women and children** and took all the Midianite herds, flocks and goods as plunder. They burned all the towns where the Midianites had settled, as well as all their camps. They took all the plunder and spoils, including the people and animals, and brought the captives, spoils and plunder to Moses and Eleazar the priest and the Israelite assembly at their camp on the plains of Moab, by the Jordan across from Jericho.

"Moses, Eleazar the priest and all the leaders of the community went to meet them outside the camp. Moses was angry with the officers of the army—the commanders of thousands and commanders of hundreds—who returned from the battle.

"Have you allowed all the women to live?" he asked them. "They were the ones who followed Balaam's advice and were the means of turning the Israelites away from the LORD in what happened at Peor, so that a plague struck the LORD's people. **Now kill all the boys. And kill every woman who has slept with a man, but save for yourselves every girl who has never slept with a man.**"

If the Devil is truly the opposite of Jehovah as most people say, then any Devil worshiper who's worth their salt will be utterly opposed to the idea of hurting children, *especially* in the name of religion. So David Seltzer can shove *The Omen* up his tight Hollywood ass as far as I'm concerned.

Anybody who knows anything about the Bible will know that this Antichrist fella is *not* supposed to be the literal "son of Satan" anyway. The "antichrist" is simply described as a spiritual force that works contrary to the "Holy Spirit." Just as the "Holy Spirit" supposedly guides people to believe in Jehovah, the "antichrist" supposedly guides them to renounce the divinity of Christ. Hence why it's called *anti*-Christ.

It's further claimed that the spirit of the antichrist will have a human representative, a "high priest" of sorts, who will finalize the world's "rebellion" against Christ. This person is *never* described as being some sort of horror movie monster that's born of a jackal. In the Bible, the "Beast" of Revelation is really something more like the Roman emperor Nero. In fact, many New Testament scholars and Christian preterists believe that the Beast is Nero. And some translations of Revelation have his "number" as 616, rather than 666.

Nero was a nasty guy who tortured Christians and killed them. He even murdered his own mother, or so the story goes. If you read Bernard McGinn's *Antichrist: 2000 Years of the Human Fascination with Evil*, you'll find that many of the early Christians believed that Nero's death was faked, or that he was going to come back from the dead to continue torturing them. His "resurrection" would soon be followed by the second coming of Christ, and then all the sinners would be thrown into a lake of fire and the world would be "made right." It's from these early Christian beliefs that the book of Revelation was born.

But obviously Nero never did crawl out of his crypt, and Jesus *still* hasn't been detected by any of our satellites. Sorry John boy, we couldn't give you your apocalypse on time. Would you like a refund?

As a Devil worshiper, I get people asking me who the Antichrist is all the time. And every time, I tell them I don't believe in any silly Antichrist. And every time, they say, "Good one! But seriously, who is he?"

And then images of whopping them upside their heads with a fire extinguisher start flashing through my head.

Seriously, I don't believe in any Antichrist. The Dark Lord does not need to have a "son" or possess a human body in order to take over the world. The only reason He could possibly have for

appearing in human form would be to have everyone in the world worship Him. And that simply doesn't make sense to me, because I don't believe the Prince of Darkness is interested in being worshiped by multitudes of human sheep. He's just not the shepherd type. He's more like a crazy anarchist who pokes and prods human beings to be wild and uncontrollable. I think He *snorts* at the idea of hierarchal power structures, personally.

Why would Satanists need to believe in an Antichrist anyway? Would it be so they can have some kind of "Satanic messiah" to look forward to? Where's the sense in *that*? Any sensible Satanist knows that if we want to improve our lives and save the world, we have to accomplish these things for ourselves. If the Devil just stepped in and "made everything all better again," we wouldn't learn anything and we'd just be sheep. And again, He's no shepherd, He's a libertine. Messianism is something that shepherd gods teach, not something that chaos gods teach!

No, we Devil folk have no real use for such bullhockey and bananas. And since nobody's really sure if the number 666 is really "the number of the Beast" or not, then that's worth a fat load of good to us too. In fact, this isn't really the "sixth" year of the millennium if you think about it. The millennium officially began with 2001, *not* with 2000.

(Twentieth Century Fox got it all wrong. The Antichrist will *really* be born on June 6, 2007!)

So all you doomsayers and Bible thumpers out there, take a valium. All you anti-Satanist Catholics, just wipe your bums with some Preparation H already. We Devil folk will be far too busy paying our bills, doing the laundry, washing the dishes, and feeding our children to bother you very much. We've got lives too, you know. Have fun celebrating Damien's Day without us.

And to all my fellow Devil worshipers out there: don't let yourselves be discouraged by these crazy scaremongers. Just remember that if you have the Mark, you are part of something truly wonderful that *nobody* can take away from you. May the Dark Lord Set watch over all of you and your loved ones, and may you all be blessed on this day!

OUR FATHER, WHO ART IN HELL

IN Satanism, there is a wide variety of names and titles that people use for His Infernal Majesty. Some call Him the Prince of Darkness, and some call Him Set. Some call Him the Dark Lord, and some call Him the Devil. Some call Him the Dark Force in nature, while others might call Him the Great Beast. And of course, any combination of these names is also up for grabs.

These and various others are somewhat “official” sounding titles. But some folks prefer to identify the Dragon by more intimate terms. Some, for example, like to call Set by the name of “Master” or “Father.” Or perhaps if they are more in tune with His feminine aspect, they might call Him “Mistress” or “Mother.”

Now there are a few Satanists who have what I consider to be some rather unfair prejudices against the use of such intimate terms. Most of the people who have these prejudices take a much more intellectual approach to Satanism than others, or at least this is what I have observed for myself. Either that, or they’re self-worshippers. In this sermon, I would like to voice my thoughts about this particular issue, and to explain why I do *not* agree with the prejudices against these intimate terms, despite my own intellectual approach to Devil worship.

Now from what I have observed, many of the people who call the Devil their Father do so because they experience Him as having a paternal influence in their lives. There is a belief among many of the more intellectually-inclined Satanists that anybody who experiences Him in such a way must come from a fundamentalist Christian upbringing. Furthermore, it is thought that they are unable to break free of their upbringing, and that they simply “replace” Jehovah with Satan as their religious paternal figure. The reason supposedly being, of course, that they can’t handle *not* having one.

These things are certainly true of *some* “Father” Satanists, but I’ve never seen any evidence that they are true of *all* “Father” Satanists. And I challenge anybody who thinks they have such evidence to produce it!

But just for the sake of argument, let’s say we have a “Father” Satanist who fits the above profile exactly:

Jimmy was born in a Southern Baptist family and accepted Christianity until he reached his teenage years, when he suddenly realized that Christian theology is all a bunch of hoopla. Figuring that there was no other alternative, Jimmy turned to the Prince of

Darkness and became a Satanist.

It's still a bit hard for Jimmy to let go of his Christian upbringing, so he finds himself calling Satan "Father" and using that name in his prayers. He needs to have a spiritual father figure in his life, and as far as he's concerned, the Devil fulfills that role well enough. When the world seems to be spinning around him, he feels reassured and empowered while praying to his newfound Father.

Now there are probably hundreds of kids out there just like Jimmy, who jump into Satanism right out of Christianity without even a moment's thought. And most of these kids do *not* have the Mark. They might manage to convince themselves that Satanism is their true spiritual calling for a year or two. But somewhere down the road, they'll get freaked out by a spooky experience in a ritual and go running right back to Christianity. Or maybe they'll just get bored and decide to try hanging out with some neo-druidic treehuggers for a while.

But Jimmy, he's got the Mark. He might leave Satanism for a bit and experiment with some other stuff, but he always comes back to his Father in the end. He might get lots and lots of flack from other Satanists for "acting like a Christian" and calling Ol' Snakey his Papa, but he just can't turn away. Despite his Christian upbringing, he was born a Satanist. And he will die a Satanist, too.

And one day, Jimmy meets Jane. Jane comes from a family of atheists who never spoke a word about the Bible while she was growing up. She didn't even figure out what a "Christian" was until she reached the sixth grade. But she had an experience during her eighth grade school year that led her to believe in the Prince of Darkness. And just like Jimmy, she calls Him her Father. Jane was never a Christian, not once, and she never had a Christian upbringing; yet she calls Ol' Snakey her Papa just like Jimmy does.

Jane and Jimmy then get hitched and raise a bunch of little hellions. (I like happy endings. So sue me.)

Anyway, even a person who cannot completely let go of their Christian programming can have the Mark of the Devil in their bones. And even a person who has never *had* any Christian programming can feel inclined to see the Devil as their Father. Everything is relative, kids, and if you remember that, you'll be okay!

It is also often assumed that Satanists who call the Beast their Father are of considerably "lower intelligence" than Satanists who do not identify Him as such. "Father" Satanists are thought to rely purely on their emotions and spiritual experiences, and to be incapable of applying any sort of intellectual perspective to their

beliefs. And of course, we intellectual Devil worshipers feel that one ought to be at least *somewhat* intellectually-inclined; for relying purely on emotions and experiences is not always good enough.

Now that last sentence is definitely true. I certainly agree that it's good to encourage other Devil worshipers to try and think more intellectually if they can. But you know what? I happen to be best friends with a Devil worshiper who is *not* very intellectually inclined, and who gets frustrated or bored whenever I start using too many big words when I talk to him. Does this mean that he isn't a true blue Devil worshiper? Does it mean that he's not "good enough" to bear the Mark?

Hell no! Drogoth (that's his name) has the Mark all right, I'm sure of it. I saw it in his eyes the very first day I met him. He's as Satanic as they come, baby. He may not know much about Friedrich Nietzsche or William James, and he may not be a philosopher or a rocket scientist. But He's got the Black Flame of Set burning deep inside His soul, and if you could meet him for yourself, you'd know that it's true.

It's always good to encourage our fellow Devil worshipers to think more critically. But we shouldn't hold it against them if they can't make themselves sound like Albert Einstein. Not everybody has the time or the ability to transform themselves into walking encyclopedias, and we'd be fools if we thought otherwise. Some folks just aren't born for philosophy. But this does not mean that they can't be true Satanists. And people who call Set their Father are not always of "lower intelligence," anyway. My pal Augustus Numley, for instance, happens to have a mighty big steel trap inside that skull of his, and he calls the Devil his Father all the time. If you don't believe me, go join his [Morning Star](#) forum and say something really stupid to him. See what happens!

I have a very big problem with this prejudice against "Father" Satanists - and that's exactly what it is, a *prejudice*. A person doesn't have to have a low IQ in order to interpret the Dark Lord as a father figure. And even if they do have a low IQ, that doesn't mean they can't be every bit as Satanic as the bookworms. The Prince of Darkness will give His Mark to whomever He damn well pleases, and that's all there is to say about that!

So far, nobody's been able to present me with a survey that proves *all* people who call Him Father were originally Christian, or that they have low intelligence, or that they're simply "latching on" to a paternal figure for the sake of having a paternal figure. I am reasonably sure that these things must be true of at least *some* individuals (and not necessarily in that order), but I see no reason to

assume that they are true of absolutely *everybody* who identifies the Dark Lord as their Father.

If you have the Mark and you interpret Set as a paternal figure, then you have *every right* to call Him your Father if it works for you. And if anybody criticizes you for doing it, you just smile and shake your head, and remember that the Dark Lord approaches each of us in different ways. Since we are all unique individuals, it's only natural that each of our relationships with the Big Guy will be different in some way.

Now personally, I don't really feel inclined to call Him my Father. I don't mind when other people call Him that, but when it comes to my own relationship with Him, that just doesn't work for me. I prefer to just call Him Set or the Devil or the Prince of Darkness.

But sometimes, I do enjoy referring to Him as my Master. Now this tends to provoke even *worse* of a reaction from some people than the name "Father" does!

When Johnny from the Church of Satan sees me calling Satan my Master, he says, "That's even worse than calling Him your father! Because at least you can disobey your father. But if you call Him your master, you're calling yourself His slave! Satanists aren't supposed to be slaves! We're supposed to be our *own* masters - *non serviam*! Stop calling yourself a 'Satanist' you stupid Devil worshiper, and go listen to your Slayer albums!"

If Johnny would stop running his mouth and actually listen to me explain myself, he'd realize that when I call Set my Master, I am *not* calling myself a slave. I'm calling myself a *student*. Haven't you ever seen any of those cheapie kung-fu movies where some wimpola climbs a mountain to be taught how to chopsocky by an old guy who always calls everybody "Grasshoppah"? In turn, everybody else calls the old guy "Master." Not because they're his slaves and he'll whup 'em good if they don't pick that cotton, *but because the old guy can break more cement blocks with his bare knuckles than you can shake a hoof at.*

And what about the Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles? They all called the rat "Master Splinter," but you don't see them being slaves for him, do you? Or how about Qui-Gon Jinn and Obi-Wan Kenobi? Obi-Wan always called Qui-Gon his Master, but do you really think Obi-Wan was taking it up the ass?

(No disrespect intended toward anyone who enjoys that sort of thing. But you catch my drift, right?)

Well when I call Set "Master," it's like that. He's the Master of all hidden knowledge who holds the secrets to life, the universe, and

your mother's tuna casserole. Move over, Einstein! Stephen Hawking? Just a babe in the woods compared to Ol' Snakey. "Master" is a term of reverent awe and respect for someone who knows a shitload more than you do, and who takes time out of their day to teach you stuff. And in that context, I think it makes a *lot* of sense to call the Big Guy my Master.

And if Johnny from the Church of Satan doesn't like it, then that's probably because he's seen Bela Lugosi's *Dracula* way too many times and automatically thinks of Renfield anytime he hears the word "Master."

So all you people out there who think of Lucifer as your Father, you just go right ahead and call Him that if you want to. Don't mind the intellectual "elitists" too much; we may be smart, but we've got our flaws too. We have to wipe our bums whenever we take a crap, just like you do. And all you people out there who are like me and want to call Him your Master, well don't let Johnny from the Church of Satan stop you. It's not *your* fault if he's never seen a Jackie Chan movie before in his life.

May the Master be with each and every single one of you. Hail!

DEFENDING THE FAITH

If you're a Devil worshiper, then you've no doubt had one or more Christians cross your path and tell you that "You are *wrong* for worshiping the Devil, you are going *against* the one true God, and you will go to *Hell* and suffer *eternal torment* when you die! Satan is a *liar*, and *Jesus* is the way!"

Having people say things like this can be very disturbing, especially if it's coming from someone you live with! It can be even worse if you live in the Bible belt like I do, where almost *everyone* talks that way. Christians who vomit this stuff for a living can be very good at intimidating people into giving up their beliefs and becoming crazed Bible thumpers. It can be *especially* hard tolerating this malarky when you are a young Devil worshiper living under the thumbs of fundamentalist Christian parents.

But I'm here to tell you that if you truly have the Devil in you, then you will have the strength of Set on your side. Others may try to shake your faith by smothering you with their propaganda, their circular reasoning, and their bullshit. But it won't have any effect, because when you're Marked, you're Marked. And a person who has the Mark has the power to overcome *all* of this tomfoolery.

So you just have to ask yourself, "What kind of person am I? Am I just a dabbler who's going to be brainwashed and bullied by some fearmongering evangelists? Or am I a motherfucking *Soldier of Set*, born and raised by the Dark Lord Himself?"

I know for sure that *I'm* a Soldier of Set, but what about you? Only *you* can figure that out.

Whenever I get some bucktoothed Bible thumper trying to make mincemeat out of my beliefs, here's what I do. First, I evaluate the situation. I think to myself, Do I really want to get into it with this guy? Is it really worth it? If not, I'll simply smile, nod my head, and walk away.

If you are a young Devil worshiper living under the thumbs of your fundamentalist Christian parents, then I would strongly suggest that you *don't* get into it with them. They own the house you live in, the clothes you're wearing, the bed you sleep on, and the food you eat. Until you're old enough to move out and buy your own groceries, you're just going to have to suck it up and live with it. I know it's hard, but just remember this:

If you've truly got the Mark of Set upon your soul, then it won't matter what your parents say or do. It won't matter how many times

they drag you to some youth group. It won't matter if they pawn your entire Mercyful Fate collection. If you've got the Devil's Mark, you will rise above it ALL. You will live through it and one day, *one day*, you will look back and you will *laugh* at them. You will deliver yourself by your own body and brain, and you will remain true to who and what you really are. Nothing, not even being forced to watch *Left Behind: The Movie* every day and every night, can take the Mark away from you.

But let's get back to our bucktoothed Bible thumper. If I should decide for some reason that I think it's worthwhile to argue with Jimmy the Jesus Freak, I'll tell him, "Look, I've already made my decision, thanks. And all the snake oil salesmen in the world can't persuade me to change my mind. But if you *really* want to convert me that bad, I'll tell you what. Give me *scientific proof* that every single one of your theological claims is true, and I'll not only convert to Christianity, but I'll wash your feet. And I'll vote Republican to boot!"

And nine times out of ten, here's what Jimmy the Jesus Freak says in response:

"But you *can't* prove God with science. You have to have *faith!*"

And then I'll say, "Faith, eh? Well I've got plenty of that. You see, nobody ever asked me to worship the Devil. He just introduced Himself to me one day, and it was love at first sight. I have some pretty strong spiritual experiences under my belt, and I have absolute faith in them. But here you are, telling me that I need to put my faith in *your* spiritual experiences instead of my own!

"Now why in Hell should I do that? I have direct reference to my own experiences, not to yours. I know what I've experienced, I know what it felt like, I know it really happened, and I know I'm being honest to myself about it. On the other hand, I don't know *what* you've really experienced, just what you *claim* to have experienced. I don't know what it really felt like for you, only what you *claim* it felt like. I don't know if it really happened, only that you *claim* it really happened. And I don't know if you're being honest with yourself about your beliefs at all. You could just be deceiving yourself to believe in them.

"So if you're going to ask me to put *my* faith into *your* experiences instead of my own, then you need to prove them to me *scientifically*. I need proof that I can see, hear, taste, touch or smell with my own senses. And if you can't give me this kind of proof, then you're wasting your time and your breath, buddy."

And then Jimmy the Jesus Freak will probably say something like, "But the Bible says..."

“I don’t care *what* the Bible says! The Bible was written by a bunch of guys who lived thousands of years ago. I’m not able to ask any of *them* for scientific proof, so I’m even *less* inclined to believe in their so-called ‘experiences’ than I am to believe in *yours*. And if you only believe what you do because ‘It says so in the Bible,’ then that makes your beliefs even less credible in my view, because your faith is based on *someone else’s* experiences instead of your own!”

“But Satan is evil!” Jimmy will say. “I *know* he’s evil, because I’ve *experienced* his malevolence for myself!”

And then I’ll say, “Well considering the way you Christians are always talking about Him, it only makes sense that He’d be less than pleasant toward you. If I had a bunch of people clucking like chickens about how I’m ‘responsible’ for all the death and destruction in the world, my eyes would probably be glowing red at them too. Satan’s only ever been good and kindly to me, because I treat Him with the proper respect that He deserves. If you expect me to believe that He’s just ‘lying’ to me and that He’s absolutely one hundred percent pure ‘evil,’ then you need to prove it *scientifically*.”

And this is where Jimmy thinks he can be clever. “Okay hotshot,” he’ll say, “let’s see *your* scientific evidence that the Devil is as nice and benevolent as you think he is!”

“Ha!” I’ll say. “I don’t have to give *you* scientific proof, because I could care less if you believe it or not. I’m not trying to convert *you*. Therefore, the burden of proof is not on *my* shoulders. *You* were the one who walked into this conversation with the intention of changing somebody’s mind, so *you* are the one who has to prove things. If you can’t prove that your god Jehovah is actually real, then it’s all I can do not to laugh at you.”

And then the light bulb goes off again. “But you *can’t* believe in Satan without believing in God!” Jimmy will say. “God created Satan, therefore you *have* to believe in God!”

“Ha!” I will say again. “First of all, the Devil is my God. Therefore, I worship God! I just believe He’s got horns and hooves. But if you’re talking about Jehovah specifically, then you’re dead wrong. There were religions that believed in the Devil long before Christianity ever existed. The great Dragon appeared in the ancient Sumerian, Egyptian, Persian *and* Greek religions. Therefore, a Devil worshiper is *not* under any obligation to believe in your god at all.”

“Those religions were just deluded!” Jimmy will say. “The Devil tricked them all. Spiritual truth was not revealed to mankind until the advent of Christianity!”

And then I’ll repeat my request. “Well prove it to me scientifically, already. I haven’t got all day!”

Now here's my favorite part of the whole spectacle. Jimmy has now come to see that he can't convince me to believe his bullstuff with logic, because he doesn't have any! So now he will resort to using an *emotional manipulation tactic* to try and convert me. Here's an example of what he might say if my mother were a member of his church:

"When you and your mother die, your mother will go to heaven, but you won't! Do you really want to be separated from your mother like that? Wouldn't you rather be with her in heaven? Don't you *love* your mother? You ought to accept Christ, *just in case* he is right! Because if he is, then you will not only be eternally separated from God after death, but from your *mother*, too! And you love your mother, don't you? Don't you?!"

This is the single most disgusting thing that Bible thumpers do. And when they use a tactic like this, the point is to *shock* you, to catch you off guard and to attack your beliefs using *emotions*. They hope that by attacking you emotionally, you will become frightened and intimidated enough to conform to their belief system. It is not just a dirty trick, but a form of *religious terrorism*!

The thing you have to remember is that when a Christian resorts to this sort of tactic, they are at the end of their rope. They know they can't give you any scientific proof that their beliefs are true; you have them in a corner when you demand for it, and they know it!

And just like frightened little animals that lash out when they are trapped, Bible thumpers will lash out at you by attacking your emotions. It's a last ditch effort to pull the wool over your eyes and assimilate you into the Borg. And if they use an emotional manipulation tactic like this, then guess what? You've already won the debate!

Here is how I respond whenever somebody tries to make an emotional attack on me like the above example:

"I know what you're doing. You're trying to thwart my faith by attacking my emotions. I have asked you for scientific proof of your theological claims, and all you can do is give me an emotional argument. Since you have not given me the kind of proof that I have demanded from you - or any proof at all for that matter - then I have no choice but to dismiss your beliefs as pure nonsense, and to dismiss you as a fool for thinking you ever had a chance of converting me. Goodbye."

So if a Christian should ever go on the offensive against your beliefs, and you honestly think it's worthwhile to argue with them, now you know what to do. You don't have to go through a long

speech detailing all the self-contradictions of Christian theology. You don't have to get into a debate over the historicity of Jesus. All you need to do is demand scientific proof that their spiritual experiences are more valid than yours. And if they respond by demanding scientific proof for *your* experiences, you just point out that *you* are not the one trying to convert *them*. Therefore, the burden of proof is on them, *not* you!

And if all they can do after that is try and use an emotional manipulation tactic on you, then you know you've won. And then you can walk away laughing, with your head up high!

There are lots of people out there who feel threatened by Devil worship, and who will do anything they can to try and talk you out of your beliefs. They will throw Bible quotes at you and try to emotionally manipulate you into leaving Satanism. They will make up excuses as to why they cannot give you scientific proof for their beliefs. And they may even try to turn it around and trick you into thinking *you* have to prove *yours*.

But if you are truly Marked by Set, you'll see through all this garbage and you'll say, "Is that all you bastards got?" You'll recognize their petty tactics for what they are. For you have been touched by Set! You are your own priest, your own pope, your own shaman! You have your own direct line to the spirit world, and you do not need *anybody else* to tell you what's what. And thank the Devil for that!

WHAT IS THE OCCULT?

Now it's time to discuss that thing that people call "occultism." Many of my readers will probably notice that Satanism and Devil worship are commonly considered to be "occult religions," along with such practices as Wicca, Druidism, and Thelema. But you might be wondering, what exactly does this terminology mean?

The word *occult* means "hidden from view, concealed, or covered over." According to the [Online Etymology Dictionary](#), it first appeared in print in 1533, and was first associated with the "supernatural sciences" (e.g., magic, alchemy, astrology, etc.) in 1633. In medicine, *occult* applied to things which are detectable only by microscopic examination or chemical analysis. Today, the word is generally used as a synonym for *esotericism*, or "knowledge that is not known to the general public, but which is only revealed gradually to a selected few in training."

But there's a problem with this. Many religions that are popularly described as "occult" today are not esoteric by any means. If you walk into most any book store in the United States, you can usually find at least one whole shelf dedicated to "How To" books about witchcraft, black magic, and other occult practices. Now that knowledge of the occult is readily available for popular consumption, it is no longer always esoteric. In most cases, occultism is now *exoteric*, which means "not confined to an inner circle of disciples or initiates; comprehensible to or suited to the public; popular."

So it is obvious that being occult does not make something esoteric, and being esoteric does not make something occult. So that definition has gone flying out the window!

Many Christians would use the word *occult* to mean anything that has to do with gaining supernatural knowledge or power apart from the biblical god. This definition, however, is useless for two reasons:

(1) Many self-described occultists are very uncomfortable with that word *supernatural*. Quite a few of them believe that they are tapping into forces that are perfectly natural, and which are only unexplained. Being unexplained in this sense does not necessarily make something "supernatural." Wiccans, for instance, will probably be the first ones to tell you that there is nothing supernatural about what they do.

(2) Most self-described occultists are not followers of the Abrahamic god, and are therefore unlikely to define what they do in terms of Christianity. To someone who does not believe in Jehovah, *any and all* spiritual knowledge or power comes from someone or something else.

But perhaps it would be helpful if we considered why religions like Christianity are often called *revealed religions*. This is because the basic building block of their beliefs is a particular book or text which is held to be “sacred.” For instance, Christianity has the Bible, while Jews have the Torah and Muslims have the Koran.

On the other hand, Devil worshippers, Wiccans, and other occultists all have one thing in common: the basic building block of our beliefs is not necessarily any scripture, but our own *personal experiences*.

To be sure, many occultists practice what is called “channeling” or “automatic writing,” in which a person “taps into” a god or spirit and has them give a message that is later written down. Aleister Crowley, for instance, supposedly “channeled” a spirit named Aiwass in order to write *Liber AL*, “the Book of the Law.”

Since both the Bible and the Koran are supposedly messages revealed by Jehovah through his prophets, then these too can be considered “channeled texts.” But there’s a major difference between the channeled texts of revealed religions and the channeled texts of occultists; a difference that is best illustrated in terms of how the text relates to the experiences of the practitioner.

In revealed religions, the practitioner’s experiences are expected to conform to whatever is in the channeled text. If a practitioner’s experiences should deviate from that text in a major way (or sometimes even in just a minor way), the practitioner is said to be “deceived.” Hence why Christians are so quick to define supernatural knowledge or power that does not come from their god as “occult” or “Satanic.” Here, the channeled text is often considered a perfect and absolutely unalterable instruction manual. And the spiritual experiences of the individual are not considered to be anywhere near as authentic or dependable as whatever is dictated by the text.

In occult religions, however, it’s the precise opposite. There is considerably more room for the individual to favor their own experiences over that of any particular channeled text. In fact, many occultists are perfectly happy writing their own channeled texts, which is totally blasphemous in revealed religions. For example, Thelemites might all recognize *Liber AL* as the most sacred scripture of their religion, but there is no rule in Thelema that prevents

practitioners from contacting spirits and channeling texts on their own.

And I've never heard anybody claim that *Liber AL* is the only channeled text that can lay a claim to "the truth." (As opposed to popular claims that are made about the Bible.)

So far as I know, Wiccans do not have a single holy text to which they all adhere. Not even Satanists do! Sure, we have *The Satanic Bible*, but its author LaVey never claimed the book to have been "channeled," and it is not universally accepted by all Satanists everywhere as a "sacred scripture." In fact, many Devil worshippers disagree with most, if not *all* of the book. When we're talking about a bunch of people who follow the Lord of All Blasphemy - whether symbolically or literally - then even *The Satanic Bible* can end up being used as toilet paper.

So in the end, occultism is any kind of spiritual practice in which the individual is encouraged to determine their own truth in terms of their own experiences. It is a form of belief which favors *examination* and *analysis* over blind faith in the alleged experiences of others. An occultist is a person for whom accepting the "truth" of the biblical prophets is not enough; they wish to forge their own *direct* relationships with the divine, and to determine truth and error by and for themselves.

Practitioners of revealed religions believe that everything we need to know about the divine is given to us in a certain book; occultists, on the other hand, know that we are all like the blind men and the elephant, searching our way through the darkness for what is *hidden*.

There are certainly some people in occult religions who behave more like they are in revealed religions. In Satanism, for example, there are some individuals who believe that a particular text - usually either *The Satanic Bible* or the *Al-Jilwah* of the Yezidi - should be accepted as the "end all, say all" of Satanic truth. But such people are to occultism as the Amish are to Christianity; they are vastly outnumbered by the majority of occultists. Hell, LaVey wrote in *The Satanic Bible* that "Herein you will find truth *and* fantasy." (Emphasis mine.) This indicates that even LaVey did not expect people to agree with absolutely *everything* in the book.

Now some people think that you have to practice witchcraft or crystal gazing in order to be an occultist. It's true that you *can* practice these if you want to, but you don't *have* to. There are many different kinds of occultism, but I think they can mostly be condensed into two primary branches:

Magic: a form of occultism in which it is attempted to control or forecast natural events, effects, or forces by invoking the supernatural (whether it be in the form of a god, an energy, or one's own inner self). In theory, it is essentially like practicing rituals that are designed to help you make your own wishes come true. Magic differs from prayer in that it suggests more human capability for *control* over the supernatural than prayer does. (I.e., instead of leaving the prayer to be answered by a god, you are supposedly arranging for the prayer to be answered by itself.) Examples of magic include witchcraft, astrology, alchemy, Tarot reading, Thelema, etc.

Mysticism: a form of occultism in which it is believed that the supernatural can be directly experienced by the individual, without need for such “intermediaries” as priests or popes. Unlike with magic, there is no concept of “exerting human control” over the supernatural. While a magician might invoke the Devil to do some kind of “work” with Him, a mystic will invoke the Devil just for the sake of *experiencing* Him. Magic and mysticism are often confused with each other, but mysticism is usually more devotional in nature than magic. Examples of mysticism include Gnosticism, Sufism, Quakerism, Native American “Ghost Dances,” Voudon spirit possession, etc.

Now I myself am personally not convinced of the validity of magic. My initiation has led me to think of myself as being just a mystic instead. But this is not to say that I don't think *anyone* should try to practice magic. If it is in accordance with *your own* initiation to believe that magic is valid, then so be it. We must each articulate our beliefs according to our own experiences, and we must each put our own experiences above everyone else's. Also, you should keep in mind that in some cases, these two branches may overlap considerably.

Whether you favor mysticism or magic, Devil worship is an occult enterprise. This is because most of us do not see Set as a lawgiving shepherd god who reveals Himself through a particular book that we all must accept as true. Instead, we tend to see Him as an anarchic trickster spirit who reveals Himself to different people in different ways. He's wild, He's wooly, He's a chaos god! And His only rule is that there *aren't* any rules.

We may worship Him, but this doesn't mean we're His mindless

zombie slaves. We don't believe He "commands" us or legislates morality and truth for us. Instead, we simply honor Him as a spirit who gives us guidance and inspiration as we navigate through the world of the unknown. He is there to help us, but it is up to *us* to determine truth and error by and for ourselves.

And we wouldn't have it any other way!

FOR THOSE WHO ARE NEW TO
DEVIL WORSHIP AND SATANISM

A GLOSSARY FOR DEVIL WORSHIPERS

- A -

Abrahamic: adjective used to describe either of the three primary cults of Yahweh (i.e., Christianity, Judaism and Islam).

Ahriman: the chief Devil of Persian Zoroastrianism. Depicted as a dragon, he supposedly created ninety-nine thousand, nine hundred and ninety-nine diseases to plague the Earth. He is blamed for all the maladies and physical ailments of life.

Amam: another name for Apep, which means “Devourer” in Egyptian.

Ambivalent design: a belief that the universe may indeed have a teleological purpose, but that said purpose does not revolve around mortals in any humanly benevolent way.

Angel: an attendant spirit that serves as a messenger for a deity or deities.

Anpu: a psychopomp who is associated with jackals in ancient Egyptian religion and Neopagan reconstructions thereof; was worshiped as a god of healing and protection.

Antichrist: a person who teaches that Jesus Christ is not the Messiah or the “Son of God,” and that Christianity is not the one true religion.

Anubis: the Greek spelling of Anpu.

Apep: the Egyptian name for the Devil. Viewed as a giant snake demon who lived in the underworld and attempted to swallow the sun each night. A personification of nighttime, darkness, and chaos.

Apocalypticism: a branch of eschatology in which it is believed that endtime prophecies are somehow imminent.

Apophis: the Greek spelling of Apep.

Apostate: a person who once worshiped Yahweh, but who later rejects him and turns against him. Many Satanists and Neopagans, for instance, are apostates.

Ashtoreth: the Phoenician name for the goddess worshiped as Inanna in ancient Sumer and Ishtar in Babylon.

Astaroth: a Hebrew bastardization of the name Ashtoreth, which is given to her in Christian demonology. This name is used to refer to the goddess in her demonic aspect.

Atheistic Satanist: a Satanist who does not believe in any gods, and who interprets Satan as either an impersonal force of nature or as a symbol. The term is often used synonymously with symbolic or LaVeyan Satanists.

Azazel: a name used to identify the Prince of Darkness in both Second Temple era Jewish literature and in Islam. I use it to refer to Him in His form as an “angel of light” who brings forth civilization. Can also be called Lucifer in this aspect.

- B -

Baal: a pre-Christian Canaanite deity who became demonized in Jewish scriptures as Beelzebub, the Lord of the Flies.

Back-masking: a term used for when heavy metal musicians supposedly record subliminal backwards messages into their music. The subliminal messages supposedly drive teenagers to Devil worship and suicide. Bands like Ozzy Osbourne and Judas Priest were put on trial for supposedly murdering children through back-masking, but the cases were both dismissed, and the idea of murder through back-masking is largely discredited today as an urban myth.

Baphomet: an idol that the Knights Templar were accused of worshipping. Eliphas Levi drew a famous picture of it, as a goat-headed hermaphrodite creature. Later adopted as a term for the goat's head pentagram by Anton Szandor LaVey.

Beelzebub: “Lord of the Flies,” a demonized title of the Semitic storm god Baal.

Belial: a name used to identify the Prince of Darkness in the apocryphal Dead Sea Scrolls. It means either “without a yoke” or “without worth.” I use it to refer to the Prince in His aspect as the God of the Earth.

Black: the color which is most associated with the Powers of Darkness in occult tradition.

Black mass: a ritual communion with the Powers of Darkness, usually performed in honor of the Prince of Darkness specifically. Numerous forms of the black mass exist. It is often thought to be a strict inversion of the Catholic mass, but for my purposes, a black mass is literally any sort of ritual communion with Devils or demonic spirits.

Black metal: a variety of heavy metal music developed in the 1970’s and early 1980’s, the lyrical content of which centers around an often serious enthusiasm for Devils, demons, and the occult. Originated in Great Britain.

Black sabbath: an alternate term for the black mass. Later became the name for one of the first and most influential heavy metal bands, Black Sabbath.

- C -

Church of Azazel: a denomination of Satanism founded in 2003 by Diane Vera, which stresses the importance of philosophy and intellectual-thinking among theistic Satanists. Teaches polytheistic Devil worship that adheres to both the Post-Copernican and here-and-now principles of theology.

Church of Satan: the very first above-ground public Satanic organization ever. Founded in 1966 by Anton Szandor LaVey. Teaches that Satan is not a being, but just a symbol, and stresses the importance of Self worship over any kind of deity worship. Teachings are based upon LaVey’s *Satanic Bible*.

Conductor of Souls: a cult title for the Egyptian spirit Anpu, who guides the souls of the deceased to their appropriate places in the Netherworld.

Coven: an assembly of dark mystics, Devil worshipers, Demonolators and/or Satanists. Corresponds to the church congregations of other spiritual paths.

Cult: a controversial term that has a number of meanings. It is sociologically used to describe a system or community of religious worship and ritual, and/or the formal means of expressing religious reverence, ceremony and ritual. By this definition, all religions, including Christianity, are cults. The more popular definition used by the media today is “an extremist religious sect, the followers of which live in an unconventional manner under the guidance of an authoritarian, charismatic leader.”

Czernobog: a Slavic name that means “Black God,” and which is sometimes used as an alternate name for the Prince of Darkness.

- D -

Dark creationism: a belief that the universe was or is indeed created by a powerful spiritual being or beings, but that said being or beings are not in any way personal or benevolent toward human beings.

Dark Doctrines, the: a denomination of atheistic Satanism founded in the 1990's, which teaches that Satan is an impersonal “dark force in nature” that works through entropy and the Second Law of Thermodynamics to create and destroy all things.

Dark mystic: a person who interprets mystical realities in terms of dark imagery, and whose experiences literally “feel” dark. Often misunderstood as a “black magician.”

Death metal: a form of heavy metal music that started in the 1980's, and which features a fascination with horror films and images of violence and death.

Deity: a spirit that is given god-status by mortals.

Demon: a genius spirit that is replete with wisdom, and that roams the dark bowers of the Earth.

Demoniac: a person who is possessed or indwelt by a demonic spirit.

Demonolator: a person who worships a demon or demons.

Demonolatry: the worship of a demon or demons.

Demonology: the study of demons. Not to be confused with Demonolatry. Just because a person is a demonologist does not mean that they worship demons; many demonologists are actually Christian, for instance.

Devil: a spirit that is maligned and feared as a cultural scapegoat figure by mortals. Devils are often given god-status indirectly. The term is most often used to describe one deity in particular, i.e. the Satan of the New Testament.

Devil worship: the expression of ardent love, devotion, and reverence toward a cultural scapegoat figure, and the reclamation of said figure as a wrongfully slandered deity.

Diabolator: a person who worships a Devil or Devils.

Diabolatry: from the Greek *diabolus* ("Devil") and *latreia* ("worship"); a synonym for Devil worship.

Djinn: desert-dwelling fire spirits in Islamic mythology that serve Iblis, the Prince of Darkness. I consider the djinn to be the same thing as demons.

Dragon: a giant serpent or lizard, often depicted with wings, but not always. When I speak of "the Dragon," I am referring specifically to the Prince of Darkness, who is described as a dragon in the New Testament and in Egyptian mythology.

- E -

Eschatology: the teachings within a religion concerning events that will supposedly come to pass at the end of the world.

Esoteric: something which is intended to be confined and understandable to only a particular inner circle of people, as in an "esoteric cult" or an "esoteric doctrine."

Exoteric: something which is comprehensible or suited to the general public.

- F -

Futurist: a term usually used for Christians who believe that the events of the apocalypse, as described in the book of Revelation, have yet to occur.

- G -

Genius: a spirit that is particular to a specific person or geographical area; a guardian spirit.

Goat's head pentagram: a five-pointed star drawn with one point down, and with a picture of a goat's head inside. Also popularly called a Baphomet.

God: a spirit that is worshiped by mortals.

- H -

Hades: a Greek synonym for Hell, which means "that which is out of sight."

Heavy metal: a variety of rock and roll music that was born in the late 1960's, and which is often more extreme than regular rock. Lyrical content usually focuses on sex and youthful rebellion. There are also quite a few heavy metal bands that flirt with the occult; those that are serious are termed "black metal."

Hell: "the Concealed Place," the hidden spirit realm that exists as an unseen dimension of the carnal world in which we live. Also called the Netherworld and the Abyss.

Hemhemti: another name for Apep, which means "Roarer" in Egyptian.

Here-and-now principle of theology: a principle of theology taught by the Church of Azazel, which maintains that personal spirits ("gods") are best understood in terms of their immediate influences upon humankind in the present, rather than in terms of their alleged histories or futures (e.g., "creation myths" or eschatology).

Heretic: a member of an Abrahamic faith who differentiates from the traditional doctrines of that particular faith.

- I -

Iblis: an Islamic name for Azazel which is sometimes translated to mean “Doubt” and sometimes translated to mean “Despair.” As Iblis, the Prince of Darkness is regarded as the Lord of the Djinn in Islamic mythology. Also spelled Eblis.

Immortal: a spirit that does not have a body, and which is not born and does not die as a carnal being.

Inanna: an ancient Sumerian lion goddess of love and war, who was associated with the morning star, Venus, and who was believed to have power over the heavens, the Earth, and the dead. She is also called Ishtar, Astarte, Ashtoreth and Astaroth.

Incubus: a male demon that enjoys exchanging sexual energy with mortals.

Initiation: a ceremony, ritual, test, or period of instruction through which a new member is admitted into a coven, cult, or level of esoteric knowledge.

Invocation: a prayer or formula that is recited in order to gain the attention of a particular spirit or spirits. Often recited at the opening of a religious ritual.

Ishtar: the Babylonian name for the goddess Inanna, who would later be demonized in Christian demonology as Astaroth.

- J -

Jehovah: another name for Yahweh, the god of Abraham.

Joy of Satan ministry: a denomination of theistic Satanism founded by Maxine Dietrich which teaches that Satan and Jehovah are aliens on a distant planet who are engaged in a telepathic mind-war over the souls of human beings. Combines the archaeological “theories” of Zachariah Sitchin with a dose of David Icke-style conspiracy mongering and a dose of Neo-Nazism.

- L -

LaVeyan: a Satanist who adheres strictly to the teachings and principles of Anton Szandor LaVey's *Satanic Bible*. Often used to mean Church of Satan members, but not all LaVeyans are actually members of LaVey's church.

Left hand path: a confusing term that is often used to mean different things. It is sometimes used to mean either dark mysticism, "black magic," Self worship, Devil worship, Satan worship, or demon worship. Not a particularly useful term in the contemporary occult scene.

Leviathan: a name given to the ancient Serpent in Old Testament scriptures such as Job, Isaiah, and the Psalms.

Light mystic: a person who interprets mystical realities in terms of bright imagery, and whose experiences literally "feel" bright. Often misunderstood as a "white magician."

Lilith: the Queen of the succubi and goddess of this age. The spirit of a mortal woman who was made into a demoness by the Prince of Darkness, and who is now His bride and consort.

Lucifer: a Latin title meaning "Light-bearer," which can be used to describe virtually anyone or anything that acts as a bringer of light. Usually used by Christians in reference to the Prince of Darkness, but it is sometimes used in reference to other spirits as well.

Luciferian: either a variety of Satanist who chooses to identify their Satan by the name of Lucifer, or a type of Neopagan who worships a pre-Christian deity of light.

- M -

Melek Ta'us: a Kurdish name for Azazel, which is correctly translated to mean "Angel King" or "King of the Lesser Spirits." It is incorrectly translated "Peacock Angel." Used by the Yezidi to refer to Azazel in His role as God and custodian of the Earth.

Mortal: a spirit that has a body, and which is born and dies as a carnal being.

Mysticism: a belief in the existence of realities beyond perceptual or intellectual apprehension that are central to being and that are directly accessible by subjective experience. Often misunderstood as “magic.”

- N -

Neopagan: a person who practices a modern reconstruction of a pre-Christian religion. Not all Neopagans are “pagan” by the original definition of that term, for many Neopagans are actually apostates (i.e., former Abrahamics).

- O -

Occult: a term that literally means “hidden.” Anything that pertains to the supernatural or spiritual is really occult in nature.

Occultism: a system of belief and/or practices that involve personal investigation of the occult.

Opener of the Ways: a cult title for the Egyptian spirit Anpu.

Order of the Nine Angles: a mysterious and highly controversial sect of Satanists in Great Britain who believe in Satan as a literal entity, but who believe in Self worship and working to aid the “Sinister dialectic.” Perhaps the only Satanist group that has been known to publically endorse human sacrifice, although it is unknown if any members have ever actually practiced it. They were the first Satanists to call themselves “Traditional Satanists.”

- P -

Pagan: a scapegoat term used for people who have never worshiped Yahweh and who have never been members of either of his cults. Used to describe various non-Abrahamic persons, such as polytheists, atheists and agnostics.

Paganism: the practice of being anything other than a member of one of the three Abrahamic religions (i.e., Christianity, Judaism or Islam).

Pentagram: a five-pointed star drawn within a circle. When it is drawn with one point up, it is often used as a sign for Wicca; with one point down, it is most often a symbol of Satanism or Devil worship.

Post-Copernican natural theology: a principle of theology taught by the Church of Azazel, which maintains that the Creator(s) and/or other cosmic gods are evidently devoid of any personal interest in human affairs, and that all and any spiritual beings that demonstrate such a personal interest must necessarily be smaller-than-cosmic entities.

Powers of Darkness: a general catch-all term for all Devils and demons.

Preterist: a term usually used to describe Christians who believe that the events of the apocalypse, as described in the book of Revelation, already occurred within the first century C.E.

Prince of Darkness: a title for the chief of all Devils and demons, developed during the Middle Ages.

Psychopomp: a spirit that guides the souls of the dead to their appropriate places in Hell. The Egyptian god Anpu and the Greek god Hermes are both psychopomps.

- Q -

Qadishtu: the holy women of Sumer and Babylon; priestesses of the goddess Inanna/Ishtar, who worshiped the goddess by making love with multiple partners. Sometimes called “sacred prostitutes.”

- R -

Rahab: another name given to Leviathan in Old Testament scripture.

Reincarnation: the belief that, when a living entity dies, the spirit of that entity will eventually be reborn in a new body.

Right hand path: a confusing term that is often used to mean many different things. It can be used to mean either light mysticism, “white magic,” god worship, or virtually any kind of conventional religion. Not a particularly useful term in the contemporary occult scene.

Ritual: a sequence of events and/or practices that an individual repeats regularly. In a religious context, rituals are often used to commune with a spirit or spirits for a particular purpose.

Rock and Roll: a variety of modern popular music that was born in the 1950's from African American blues music. Old school rock music usually focuses on chasing women; the term "rock and roll" itself is an old African American term for the act of lovemaking.

- S -

Saatet-ta: another name for Apep, which means "Darkener of the Earth" in Egyptian.

Sacrifice: "to make sacred"; the offering of a gift to a spirit or spirits.

Satan: a word that is commonly used as a name for the Prince of Darkness, but which can be used for virtually anyone or anything that takes an adversarial role toward something else. There are many spiritual beings that can be described as satans, and not all Satanists and/or Satan worshipers follow the same satan. The word means "adversary" in Hebrew.

Satan worship: the expression of ardent love, devotion, and reverence for a spirit or spirits called Satan.

Satanic: an adjective that is generally used to mean anything that pertains to or is of the Prince of Darkness; in a more general sense, it can mean anything that is adversarial or subversive to authority.

"Satanic Panic," the: an era of paranoia which occurred mostly during the 1980's. This panic was marked by a popular belief among the media and law enforcement that an international conspiracy of Satanists was responsible for abducting large numbers of children and sexually abusing them as part of their rituals. The panic died down in the late 1980's and early 1990's after an investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation discredited the entire theory. There are still many people involved in law enforcement and the media, as well as conservative Christian leaders, who believe that this "Satanist conspiracy" really exists.

"Satanic Ritual Abuse": a term used to describe the alleged sexual abuse of children as a part of Satanic religious ritual. The FBI has determined such terminology to be problematic; child abuse can occur within any religious ritual trappings, including those of

Christianity. But despite the FBI's assessment, as well as the fact that no Satanist or Devil worshiper church even tolerates child abuse, there are many religious fanatics who still believe that "SRA" is a commonly occurring problem that is being "covered up" by a conspiracy.

Satanic Bible, the: A book written in 1969 by Anton Szandor LaVey and published by Avon Books. Basically explains the worldview and ritual practices of Self worshiping Satanists, as formulated and practiced by LaVey's Church of Satan. Was the very first "pro-Satanism" instruction manual ever published.

Satanism: a belief system that is structured around a positive interpretation of a Satan or satans. Can mean either Satan worship or Self worship with Satanic symbolism.

Self worshiper: a person who deifies him or herself.

Set: an ancient Egyptian deity associated with thunderstorms, deserts, war, and the nighttime sky. Originally worshiped as a positive deity who represented part of the Egyptian theocracy, but later became demonized as a partner of and/or replacement for Apep.

Setekh: an alternate version of the name Set.

Setian: a Satanist, Devil worshiper or Temple of Set member who identifies the Prince of Darkness with the Egyptian deity Set. Usually used exclusively for Temple of Set members.

Sinister Dialectic: a term coined by members of the Order of the Nine Angles. Refers to an esoteric strategy of observing the ways that individuals and their groupings are shaped within societies and civilizations, and of influencing the future patterns thereof in accordance with Satanic philosophy.

Slaytanist: a derogatory term I use for so-called "Satanists" who are really Satanic dabblers, and who base their interpretations of Satanism strictly on pop cultural views of Devil worship, such as those presented in the media by heavy metal bands like Slayer.

Spirit: a bodiless intelligence that exists apart from the realm of matter, yet which can intervene in said realm.

Spiritual Satanist: a synonym for theistic Satanist. Often used to identify adherents of the theistic Satanist denomination developed by the Joy of Satan ministry.

Succubus: a female demon that enjoys exchanging sexual energy with mortals.

Supernatural: someone or something which seems to violate or go beyond natural forces.

Suti: an alternate spelling of the name Set.

Symbolic Satanist: a Satanist who only believes in Satan as a symbol, and not as a real force or being. Those who worship themselves may also be termed Self worshipers.

- T -

Temple of Set: a denomination of Satanism founded in 1975 by Dr. Michael A. Aquino, formerly of the Church of Satan. Teaches that the Prince of Darkness was originally worshiped in Egypt as the god Set before becoming demonized as “Satan” in Christianity. Also teaches Self worship and the idea of Xeper.

Theistic Satanist: a Satanist who actually believes in the literal existence of a Satan or satans. Those who worship said Satan or satans can also be called Devil worshipers or Satan worshipers.

Tiamat: a cosmic dragon of primordial chaos who gave birth to all of the gods in ancient Sumerian mythology. However, her children began to annoy her with all of their noise, so she attempted to eat them. The storm god Marduk killed her in battle, and created the universe from her remains. It is from the symbolism of Tiamat that later Middle Eastern cultures would inherit the theme of the chaos dragon.

Traditional Satanist: a synonym for theistic Satanist, which is used to refer to the “traditional” definition of a Satanist (i.e., a Satan worshiper). Often used by theistic Satanists who wish to claim that their form of Satanism pre-dates the formation of the Church of Satan in 1966; most who make such claims are lying. The term was first used by members of the Order of the Nine Angles, who strangely enough are Self worshipers and not Satan worshipers.

Typhon: an ancient Greek titan, usually depicted as a reptilian giant with multiple serpentine heads. Associated with water and primordial chaos, Typhon battled the god Zeus in order to overthrow the gods of Olympus. Typhon would later be identified by the Greeks with the Egyptian Set, in his demonized role as a partner of/replacement for Apep. In reality, Typhon is probably much more similar to Apep than to Set. It is from the name Typhon that we get our modern day word “typhoon.”

- W -

Whore of Babylon: a cult title for the goddess Ishtar, signifying her role as a patroness of prostitutes and unbridled sexuality.

Witches’ Sabbath: an annual festival celebrated by witches and Devil worshipers, according to medieval mythology. Usually celebrated on April 30, which is Walpurgisnacht. Supposedly marked by the practice of black masses, “backward dancing,” and ritual orgies.

Worship: the expression of ardent love, devotion, and reverence toward someone or something.

- X -

Xeper: an ancient Egyptian word which means “to come into being.” Used by members of the Temple of Set as a term for their philosophy of self-transformation and consciousness-worship.

- Y -

Yahweh: the god of the Jews, Christians and Muslims, who falsely claims to be “God” (i.e., the one and only true god). The sworn enemy of the Dragon.

Yezidi: an ancient Kurdish sect that originated from the Near East, which centers around religious worship of Azazel. They refer to Him as Melek Ta’us. However, they are not correctly termed Satanists or Devil worshipers, because they do not accept that Azazel is a Devil or a satan, or that He is the Prince of Darkness. Instead, they view Him as an angel who serves an impersonal Creator god by managing over the Earth in his absence.

Zoroastrianism: an ancient Persian religion which was the first truly dualistic belief system. Teaches that the universe is divided between an ultimate spirit of good (identified as Ahura Mazda), and an ultimate spirit of evil (identified as Ahriman). It is from Zoroastrianism that Judaism, Christianity and Islam inherit some of their ideas about the Devil, angels, demonic possession, and apocalypticism.

THE VARIETIES OF RELIGIOUS SATANISM

SATANISM is not actually a single religion or belief system, but an entire family of inter-related belief systems, most of which are vastly different from each other save for one common theme: a sympathetic reinterpretation of the force/character/entity that is most well known and recognized in modern Western culture as “Satan.”

The term “Religious Satanism” is used to describe Satanisms which are religious in nature. The reason there is a need to make such a distinction is because the term “Satanism” is also used as a literary term. If you check up the word “Satanism” in the Oxford Dictionary, you will find that one of its secondary definitions is a style of literature. Authors and poets who produced such literature were known as members of “the Satanic school,” which became notorious for writing literature that supposedly takes the Devil’s point of view. People included in the genre of “literary Satanism” were John Keats, Percy Shelley, and Lord Byron among others. None of these people were religious Satanists - that is to say, none of them practiced Satanism as a religion - but they were “Satanists” in the sense that they created a literary tradition structured around several unorthodox views and techniques, including an often sympathetic portrayal of the Devil.

Religious Satanism is primarily divided into three major categories: **Theistic Satanists** (who are sometimes called “Spiritual” or “Traditional Satanists”), **LaVeyan Satanists**, and **Deistic Satanists** (also known as “Pantheistic Satanists” or “Dark Deists”). The theistic branch of Satanism is the branch in which it is believed that Satan is an actual deity or supernatural being of some sort, who is to be somehow revered and/or worshiped. The LaVeyan branch of Satanism is the branch in which it is believed that Satan is merely a force in nature or a symbol of man’s animal nature, which itself is regarded as the object of worship. Typically, theistic Satanists can be understood to be Satan-worshippers (although there are exceptions), while LaVeyan and Deistic Satanists can be understood to be Self-worshippers.

First I will cover the **LaVeyan Satanists**. LaVeyans take their name from Anton Szandor LaVey, who authored *The Satanic Bible* and who founded the [Church of Satan](#) in 1966. They believe that Satan is merely a symbol representing certain characteristics and traits that they find desirable. Such characteristics and traits include, but are

not limited to: individuality, carnality, independence, and earthly success and power. The LaVeyan Satanist views Satan as being an imaginary character who represents the reality of the “Beast in Man,” which itself is a manifestation of something that LaVey identified in his writings as “the Dark Force in Nature.” Religious Satanism, to LaVeyans, is not about worshiping the Devil, but about worshiping oneself as the center of one’s own universe. Naturally this will tempt some of my readers to describe LaVeyan Satanists as being “selfish,” and indeed such Satanists will not shy away from that adjective.

LaVeyans also believe in practicing what they call magic. However, “magic” to them is not the exercise of supernatural power, but a form of theatrical psychodrama which is intended to help the practitioner overcome their inhibitions and become a full-fledged “personification” of Satan - the Dark Force - in the flesh.

Next I will speak of the **Deistic** (or Pantheistic) **Satanists**. Deistic Satanists are like LaVeyans, in that they do not believe that Satan is a personal being. Rather, they believe that Satan is an impersonal supreme being or force which is one with all things (i.e., pantheism). They agree with the “Dark Force in Nature” terminology that LaVeyans use, but they tend to place less emphasis on the teaching of LaVey than on what they term “the Dark Doctrines.” The Dark Doctrines are essentially based upon an etymological hypothesis that the Hebrew word “Satan” is derived from a pair of Sanskrit terms, “Sat” (which is said to mean something like “pure existence”) and “Tan” (which is said to mean something like “stretching forth”). The Sat part is a description of what it fundamentally is, while the Tan is a description of what it does. As Sat, it is the force of being which causes all and everything to exist. As Tan, it is the force that causes evolution and metamorphosis. The primary two churches which teach Deistic Satanism are the [First Church of Satan](#) in Salem, Massachussetts, and the Satanic Reds (who are also, interestingly enough, a Communist group).

The theistic branch of Satanism is divided into multiple subcategories. Perhaps the oldest variety of theistic Satanism of which I know are the **Gnostic Satanists**, who are descended from the Ophidian Gnostics. The Gnostics believed that everything that existed was originally pure spirit; then the Demiurge (who was identified as the god of the Old Testament by Ophidian Gnostics, and with the Devil by Gnostic Christians) trapped our souls in matter and cut us away from the Source. The Gnostic Christians believed that Jesus Christ was an incorporeal spirit that had been sent into the world by the Source, not to save the human race by dying on the

cross, but to teach the way of discovering Gnosis - i.e., knowledge of the divinity within - which was believed to be the only way to escape the sinfulness of the material world. While some Gnostics, typically the Gnostic Christians, believed that it was necessary to abstain from worldly pleasures in order to transcend the material world, others (particularly the Ophidians) believed that Gnosis could be achieved by indulging in worldly pleasures and by “exhausting” their sinfulness. This is where the Gnostic Satanists came from.

The Ophidians identified the One who was sent into the world by the Source to teach humans of the Gnosis with the serpent of Genesis, and not with Christ. They believed that when the serpent tempted Adam and Eve with the Knowledge of Good and Evil, He was really tempting them with the Gnosis and thereby freed them from the authoritarian power of the Demiurge (Jehovah). The Ophidians, unlike Christians, did not identify the serpent as Satan, but as Sophia, the goddess of wisdom. However, there were some Ophidian-based Gnostics who did acknowledge the serpent as Satan, and these became the Gnostic Satanists. Gnostic Satanists, therefore, worship Lucifer as the Bringer of Light, who helps us to transcend the imperfections of earthly existence by enticing us to indulgence, rather than abstinence. There is currently no major Gnostic Satanist organization in existence of which I am aware, though there have been groups such as Church Lucifer (also known as the Children of the Black Rose). It has been speculated that the Gnostic Satanists had a bit of influence over the Freemasons. Whether this is actually true or not is anyone's guess.

Later came the **Yezidi**, who are a Middle Eastern sect that originated in the area which is currently known as Iraq. Founded by the prophet Sheik Adi in the 1100's, the Yezidi were a band of Islamic heretics who believed that Shaitan, the fallen angel, was not really the Devil but the true Messiah whom the Creator had sent to rule over our terrestrial world and to eventually extinguish the fires of Hell with His tears. They were forbidden to pronounce the name “Shaitan” (and in some accounts it is said that Yezidi would even go so far as to kill themselves upon hearing the name, as it was considered an act of blasphemy just to hear it), so they called Him “Melek Ta'us,” which is a Kurdish name meaning “King of the Angels.”

As Melek Ta'us, the Prince of this World was often depicted in the form of a peacock. This is taken from an earlier Persian myth in which Ahura Mazda, the god of light, asked Ahriman, the god of darkness, why He only created “evil” things. Ahriman then promptly took an ugly bird, dismembered it, brought the pieces of its corpse

back together again and resurrected it, and it came back to life as the beautiful peacock. Ahriman then said to Mazda, "See? Not all of my works are evil." The Yezidi believe that at the end of days, the Prince of this World and the Creator god will become reconciled, and thus will the human race be saved. It is important to point out here that in Yezidi theology, Satan is not the enemy of God, but a faithful servant of God who was appointed to be the God of this World, rather than a fallen angel who was "cast out" from heaven. Yezidi typically believe that the god of Christians is the true deceiver.

The Yezidi still exist today, and were among the Kurds who were most persecuted by Saddam Hussein in modern Iraq. Some still live in Iraq, where they are currently establishing representation for themselves in the new government. Others have moved to parts of Europe, including both Russia and Germany. The Yezidis do not accept the term "Satanist" because they do not accept the name "Satan" as a name for the Prince of this World. However, it is a fact that they worship the very same deity that other theistic Satanists do. The Yezidi holy text is known as the *Mishaf Resh*, which outlines their view of creation. Copies of this text can now be found online.

Then come what is called the **Christian-based Duotheists**. Christian-based Duotheists are theistic Satanists who believe in a form of Satanism that is essentially more like inversified Christianity. Which is to say, they believe that Satan is not a god but a fallen angel who has rebelled against the Creator, and who is attempting to usurp the Creator's throne. This is probably a form of Satanism that most Christians will be more familiar with, as it accepts most of what Christianity believes - including the Fall of Man, the Crucifixion, the coming of Antichrist and the Second Coming of Christ - except that Christian-based Duotheists simply choose the other side of the fence. They often believe that Satan, although a mere fallen angel, actually has a fighting chance of winning the battle against God. Christian-based Duotheists are commonly laughed at and ridiculed by the majority of Satanists as being the Satanic equivalent to "Holy Rollers."

Next we have the **Setians**. The Setian denomination was founded by Dr. Michael A. Aquino in 1975. Aquino was a priest of the Church of Satan who left over a dispute with LaVey concerning the existence of the Prince of Darkness. Aquino then started his own church called the [Temple of Set](#). The Setians believe that the Prince of Darkness' "true" name is Set, and that before He became known as "Satan" in Judeo-Christian mythology, He was known as Set in ancient Egyptian religion. Setians believe that the Prince of Darkness is a god who is responsible for creating consciousness - the ability to perceive, to be

aware and to take deliberate action. They believe in a mystical concept called “Xeper,” an Egyptian word pronounced “Kheffer” which means “I have Come into Being.” Xeper is what the Egyptian sun god, Ra, would proclaim each morning at dawn after his nocturnal journey through the underworld. Set was the god who protected Ra during this journey from Apep, the serpent of darkness and chaos. In protecting Ra, Set enabled the sun to “Xeper” each morning, and this myth is taken to be symbolic of Set’s power to enable us to become newly created beings with each self-determined action that we take in life. In this context, the term “Xeper” means something similar to “I think therefore I am,” though it could be said to take an additional meaning: “The MORE I think, the MORE I am.”

The Setian holy text is *The Book of Coming Forth by Night*, which was supposedly dictated to Michael Aquino during a ritual channeling with the Prince of Darkness in 1975. Setians are often indecisive over whether or not they should consider themselves Satanists. Many times, Setians consider themselves to be a part of the Satanic subculture and indeed they are, since they grew out of the Church of Satan (strangely enough). However, often they will claim that they are a “higher” form of Satanism that is much too sophisticated to be ensared in “the bastard title of a Hebrew fiend,” so they will try to pass their religion off as something completely different. However, for all their neo-Egyptian mysticism, they continue to refer to Set as “the Prince of Darkness” and they continue to use the Satanic pentagram (i.e., two points up, so the star is shaped like a goat’s head) as their sacred symbol. Therefore, most Satanists continue to consider the Setians to be a denomination of Satanism. Also, Setians, although they are theistic, count as Self-worshippers instead of as Satan/Set-worshippers. They have what I like to call a “Faustian” relationship with the Prince of Darkness, which is to say that instead of worshiping Him and serving Him, they work with Him as an associate who helps them to increase their own power in this world. Sort of like a strictly academic or business relationship, rather than a “god-follower” relationship.

Joy of Satan-style theistic Satanists (JoSers for short) are rather weird. Satanists such as these believe, like Christian-based Duo-theists, that there is a cosmic struggle going on between Satan and Jehovah. However, the JoSers (having read too much Zechariah Sitchin) believe that Satan and Jehovah are not actually supernatural beings, but mortal aliens living on a distant planet across the universe, who communicate telepathically with human beings and who are engaged in a psychic mind-war over our

allegiance. JoSers tend to believe that all of the gods worshiped by human beings throughout history are really extra-terrestrials. They also believe that Satan was originally the pre-Christian Sumerian deity Enki, before He became corrupted into the fallen angel concept. Some of them have actually taken to calling themselves **Enkians**. Although JoSers are commonly laughed at and ridiculed by other Satanists as being sort of like the Satanic equivalent to Scientologists, they nonetheless have a large following in theistic Satanism.

Demonolators are not exactly Satanists per se, although they are accepted as a part of our subculture. Demonolators are people who worship Demons, as opposed to just Satan Himself. They believe that the Demons are not actually fallen angels, but really pre-Christian pagan deities who represent the “dark side of Nature.” Demonolators consider themselves to be Dark Pagans (i.e., worshipers of Nature who are tuned to the dark side). They do not really have much of a public presence at this time, though they have in the past. It is known that they are organized, but they choose to remain underground due in part to various troubles that they have had with outsiders in the past. Some of them used to maintain public websites through which they attempted to reach out to outsiders, but it is reported that one of these outsiders stirred up some major political trouble within one or more of the priesthoods. Therefore, as a way of avoiding further trouble, the Demonolator community opted to go underground. However, it would appear that at least one of the traditional Demonolator covens has decided to re-instate an online presence. Please visit the [OFS Demonolatry](#) website for more extensive information.

Lastly, I will speak of the **Devil worshipers** (also called **Diabolators**). This is where I fit in. While it is true that most theistic Satanists can probably be described as Devil worshipers (except for the Setians - who have quite an aversion to that word “worship”), it will probably surprise most of my readers to learn that the vast majority of Satanists frown upon the term “Devil worshiper,” in much the same way that many gays frown upon the word “queer” and many African Americans frown upon the dreaded “N” word. Satanists who embrace the term “Devil worshiper” and actually use it as a term of self-reference are, surprisingly enough, a minority within a minority.

The term itself does not really propose any particular theological worldview, save for a belief in a Satan (or satans), and a belief in worshiping Him. Other than these two points, Devil worshipers can embark upon a wide variety of theological

perspectives - polytheism, pantheism, henotheism, duo-theism, etc. The major qualification for being a Devil worshiper is that you take a primarily devotional approach to the Powers of Darkness. Most other varieties of Satanism place emphasis on the practice of magic or the attainment of Gnosis over worship and prayer (in fact the Setians will tell you that worship and prayer are “un-Satanic”). But Devil worshipers unashamedly worship the Powers of Darkness as their gods, and we also unashamedly refer to them as our Masters - another “taboo” that most other Satanists refuse to accept. Perhaps the only three organizations dedicated to honest-to-Satan Devil worship are the [Church of Azazel](#), the [Order of Eternal Darkness](#) and the [Temple of Diabolic Youth](#). However, the Church of Azazel is still just starting out, and is only beginning to gain acceptance among some of the other denominations.

Those of us who identify as Devil worshipers tend to overlap with many, perhaps all, of the other theistic categories I have mentioned above. In this context, Devil worship is not really a theological category, but rather an attitude. The taboo on the term “Devil worship” originated with LaVey’s Church of Satan, who basically have the attitude that they are the only true Satanists and the rest of us are all “Devil worshipers” whom they despise and tend to lump together with the criminal fringe.

Unfortunately, I am afraid that no discussion of the varieties of religious Satanism would be complete without mentioning our criminal fringe. Historically there has only been one organized Satanist group that committed acts of terrorism, murder and violence. These were the members of the Norwegian **Black Metal Circle**, which existed in Norway during the early 1990’s.

The Black Metal Circle (sometimes called “the Black Metal Mafia”) was founded by a man who called himself Euronymous (after a Greek deity of death and the underworld). Euronymous and his followers were musicians who played black metal music. They chose to call themselves Satanists because they believed in Satan as this “Spirit of Evil” who only wants to spread misery and suffering throughout the world. In order to “serve” Him, Euronymous and his followers began a long campaign of church-burning and graveyard desecrations, as well as murders. They made a point to target churches that were historical monuments of architecture in Norway, and I believe that in at least one case, they burned one of these churches down while people were actually inside.

Euronymous explained in interviews that the reason he and his followers did this was because they believed that, by performing acts

of terrorism cloaked in Satanic imagery, they would cause Christian fanaticism to grow in Northern Europe. Northern Europe is actually known for having a predominately liberal Christian climate these days, but Euronymous wanted to initiate a surge in Christian fanaticism by creating terror in people with these church burnings and murders. Euronymous was completely insane and was working to initiate a man-made apocalypse. However, as crazy as he was, he was not stupid. The Black Metal Circle was well organized and they managed to get away with what they were doing for a couple of years. In fact, the Black Metal Circle was not stopped until one of their own members - one Varg Vikernes, who had converted to Odinism - murdered Euronymous in 1993.

It would be intellectually dishonest of Satanists to deny that we have our fair share of psychopathic monsters, as do all other religions. But as with other religions, the number of psychopathic monsters in our religion is actually quite small when compared to the number of sane people. The problem is that the criminal Satanists tend to get more press than the sane Satanists do, simply because the media does not consider "friendly neighborhood Devil worshipers" like myself to be very newsworthy.

So these are the varieties of religious Satanism as I have come to understand them over the past decade of my life. I hope that this article has been helpful in clearing some of the misconceptions that many people have about our religious subculture.

DIABOLATRY

***Author's Note:** This article, which first appeared on this website in the spring of 2002, is among the very first publicized statements of belief ever voiced by a self-professed Devil worshiper, and I am indeed the first person to have used the term "Diabolator" in the Satanist scene.*

DIABOLATRY is the religious worship of the Devil. Unlike Christians and people of other conventional religions, **Diabolators**, or **Devil worshipers**, do not believe the Devil to be a completely "evil" entity. Rather, the Devil is perceived to be a God of Knowledge and Enlightenment who is both the originator of all heretical thought and the ruler of the terrestrial, mortal world. He is the Red One of Darkest Brilliance, the Angel of Light who is God of this World and Prince of Darkness. He is *Diabolos*, the One Who Throws Across, the great Trickster who causes obstruction in order to test and initiate both mind and spirit.

Diabolators do not "worship" their God, the Devil, in the same way that Christians "worship" their god; there is no groveling or self-debasement involved, no concept of "sin" or "redemption." Diabolators honor and respect their chosen deity with pride. Rather than being a hapless slave to the Devil, the Diabolator sees him or herself as being one of the Devil's kindred. The Devil may be our Master, but in surrendering ourselves to the ultimate power of subversity in human spiritual experience, we pass into being as creatures possessed of true Self.

Diabolatry is not meant to have anything to do with killing animals or humans, or with committing any other senseless and "evil" acts. It is meant to be more of a meditative practice in which the practitioner learns to expand his or her self-awareness and to obtain a deeper and fuller understanding of the world in which we live. Whereas many white light religionists naively embrace the Light and seek to dispel the Darkness, the dark pagan Diabolator knows that one cannot know Light without knowing Darkness, and that knowing and understanding both leads to a well-balanced understanding of reality. In order to become something great, your present self must be destroyed and overcome; destruction and death lead to rebirth and renewal. Hence why the Underworld, "Hell," the realm of Death, is also seen in some pagan religions as the realm of spiritual rebirth.

Diabolatry is a form of modern Satanism that is set apart from

the others primarily by its belief in the Devil as a literal being, and in taking a devotional approach toward Him. However, it cannot be stressed enough that the Diabolator does not perceive the Devil to be exactly like what Christians perceive Him to be, nor does Diabolic worship necessarily involve any kind of human or animal sacrifice. To the Diabolator, the Devil is NOT the “Lord of All Evil,” but rather a dark and strangely benevolent God of carnality, intellectual power and human progress. He is a God of indulgence, individuality and a deeply passionate love of life -- both in its carnal and spiritual aspects.

Some Diabolators view the Devil to be an all-powerful and ever-present nature God, while others view Him as being more of a supernatural entity that is the source of all “isolate intelligence” in the universe. There are some who see Him as a fallen angel, and there are some who see Him as the God of the Universe. I myself see Him as the Old Serpent, a dark and multi-faceted presence that has roamed this world since prehistoric times and that rules over this earth and human carnal nature. Diabolators can mix and match different viewpoints of the Devil according to their own individual experiences with Him both inside and outside of ritual, but NO true Diabolator worships or even remotely acknowledges a being of “Pure Evil.”

Diabolatry is sometimes mistakenly thought of as “traditional Satanism,” though in essence this label is a misnomer. Were it to be “traditional,” it would have to be a religion that has been successfully passed down through familial bloodlines over a number of generations, perhaps even centuries. In actuality, most Diabolators are born into non-Satanic families and only discover their true religion around or after the time of adolescence. Also, there is no proof that “traditional Satanism” truly existed as an organized religion in itself before Anton Szandor LaVey first attempted to organize Satanism within the Church of Satan. Therefore, for the sake of honesty, we shall refer to “traditional Satanism” as Diabolatry, which we feel to be a more appropriate term.

Diabolators will also typically use the term “theistic Satanism” as a synonym for Devil worship. This is because the word “theistic” means “believing in a god or gods,” and in order to worship the Devil, you must first believe in Him as a god (or some other variety of supernatural entity). Therefore Devil worshipers are theistic Satanists and they will not compromise with anyone who wishes to convince them otherwise.

Diabolatry is also a useful term in that it is not partial to any one

name or face of the Devil. Terms like “Satanism” and “Luciferianism” can limit the scope of the practitioner’s perception, in that each label indicates devotion to one name and aspect of the Devil in particular (e.g., “Satan,” the dark and adversarial aspect of the Devil, or “Lucifer,” His bright and intellectual aspect). By using the term Diabolatry instead, the individual practitioner will have more room to work and experiment with the various aspects of our multi-faceted Lord of this World.

THE PRINCE OF DARKNESS

EVER since He first revealed Himself to human beings, the Prince of Darkness has continually prodded human beings to question all and any unfounded claims of authority. He has been behind every scientific discovery, and every progressive achievement. I believe it was He who enabled the discoveries of Galileo and Copernicus to withstand religious persecution and to bring forth the Enlightenment. I believe it was He who inspired the Founding Fathers of America to create our First Amendment guarantee of religious freedom. I believe it was He who led Charles Darwin to make the discoveries that would shatter the authoritarian rule of superstitious thought.

He is the God who invites us to become like unto gods, knowing the truth of “good” and “evil,” constructing our Towers of Babel, and moving ever farther and farther away from the blissful ignorance of Eden. It is He who instills within us a yearning for the faraway, the exotic and the unexplored; and it is He who puts the fear of Man into the hearts of the gods!

What’s more, He does not demand or even request worship from the majority of human beings. He does not even demand respect from all people. Unlike some gods, who crave worship and attention from human beings like spoiled little children, the Prince seems more than happy to work behind the scenes, and to remain elusive to the majority of humanity. They don’t call Him the Prince of Darkness for nothing!

I believe the Prince fully endorses the existence of atheism, Wicca, and (believe it or not) even the Abrahamic paths too. But He will not permit either of these paths to exist alone. And that, in my opinion, is the *true* reason why He is called “Devil” by the proponents of whatever “one true way”; not because of any truly harmful or destructive nature on His part, but simply because He forces all religions to **co-exist** -- *whether they want to or not!*

I would not presume to assert that the Dark Prince loves each and every human being, although it is clear that He must certainly appreciate humanity in general. Otherwise, He would not instill within us a lust for Knowledge that is forbidden to us by conventional opinion-makers. However, I feel completely safe in asserting that the Old Serpent loves those who love Him -- and His love is fiery, electric and transformative. I believe He especially loves women -- after all, He chose to reveal Himself to Eve first, not Adam!

For sure, we are but bumbling monkeys in His ancient eyes; but instead of condemning us for what we are, the Dark Prince just laughs and encourages us to follow our true wills, to become all that we can become. And because He is the absolute best god that a boy could ever have, I will always and forever praise His many names. I have sworn to serve Him in this world and in the next, and serve Him I will!

This one's for You, Ol' Dragon!

AZAZEL: THE SCAPEGOAT

ONE of the first manifestations of Satan, the Christian Devil, in Judaic thought was **Azazel**, a Horned God of the Hebrews who was associated with darkness and the desert wilderness. It was believed by the Second Temple Era Jews that Azazel was the one who had taught human beings the various arts of civilization, including weaponry, cosmetics, the sciences, the liberal arts and “witchcraft.” It was Azazel, also known as **Samael** (“Venomous God”), who tempted Adam and Eve with the Fruit of Knowledge in the form of a serpent. He was also the one who inspired the people of Babel to make the technological feat of building their Tower. It was by teaching these various forbidden arts and by inspiring humanity to “reach for the stars” and take control of their environments that Azazel had fallen out of favor with the Abrahamic deity, and it was for teaching human beings these “sinful” activities that Azazel was chained to a rock in the desert wilderness, much like Prometheus was chained to a mountain in Greek mythology. In fact, Azazel is very much like a combination of Prometheus and the Arcadian Pan: a dark and wild Horned God who is also paradoxically a bringer of light and civilization.

Azazel was primarily associated with the goat, representing worldly wisdom and stubbornness. His association with this particular animal comes from the Jewish Ritual of Atonement in which lots were cast for two goats, one who was to be sacrificed to Yahweh as a “sin offering,” and the other who was to be driven into the wilderness, alone, as an offering for Azazel. The purpose of sending the goat out into the wild rather than killing it was to banish or drive away the “sins” of the tribe. Azazel, having taught man the forbidden arts of philosophy, science, civilization and magic, was blamed for “tempting men away” from their meek subordination to the tyrannical Yahweh, thereby introducing “sin” into the human world. It is from the Ritual of Atonement that we get our modern day term “scapegoat,” and it is also from this that the Devil *really* gets His horns and hooves, not from the Greek Pan as so many neopagans like to believe.

Azazel is also associated with the serpent and the peacock. As Samael, the venomous one, it was believed by the Jews that Azazel had taken the form of the serpent that tempted Adam and Eve. The story of the serpent and the fruit is symbolic of Azazel’s encouragement of the human ability to think independantly about

morality and religion, rather than be blindly submissive to whatever one is taught to believe from birth. In a more primitive context, the serpent also represents sexuality (because it was after the serpent tempted Adam and Eve with the fruit that they had become aware of their nakedness) and regeneration (because the serpent sheds its old skin to reveal a new one). The significance of the peacock, with which Azazel is associated in the Arabic culture, is that the peacock is a beautiful and prideful bird, representing Azazel's own sense of beauty and pride before the Abrahamic deity.

The colors that are most immediately representative of Azazel's spirit are black (representing the night and darkness) and red (representing blood, carnality and the desert). Azazel was also known to the Jews by a variety of names: as Samael, He is a god of destructive and revolutionary power; as **Belial**, He is a god of the earth and of carnal, animal life; and as **Satan**, He is the Supreme Adversary of Yahweh (who is a self-proclaimed "jealous" desert god that desires to become the only god worshiped upon the earth). As Yahweh's arch-nemesis, Azazel is a spirit who inspires and encourages the human followers of Yahweh (as well as people who are not his followers, but who live in societies that are influenced by the Abrahamic religions and their respective cultures) to question and challenge the rules and dictations of this god and his dogmas. In a more general context, Azazel inspires and encourages the questioning of *all* dogmas and fixed ideologies for the sake of furthering the intellectual power of humans. It would seem that, whereas Yahweh demands all human attention and worship, Azazel is not so much interested in being glorified by humanity as He is in simply prodding human beings to think for themselves. After all, only one person in the entire Bible was ever invited to worship the Devil, and that was Jesus Christ himself.

Originally, the word "satan," which means "adversary" or "opposer" in Hebrew, was not a proper name but only a descriptive noun which was used to describe anything that was adversarial in nature, including Yahweh himself at times. It was specifically used to refer to a type of angel called *Ha-satan* that, although malicious and malevolent to human beings, was completely obedient to the will of the Abrahamic god, and that committed malicious acts upon human beings at Yahweh's command. The difference between *Ha-satan* and Azazel-Satan is that *Ha-satan* is a being that works malice against humankind, but completely in accordance with the will of the Old Testament god. Azazel-Satan, on the other hand, is the instigator of all *rebellion* and *obstruction* against Jehovah, and who is typically depicted in mythology as *befriending* humanity (e.g., when

He tempts Adam and Eve with the Fruit of Knowledge, when He teaches humans the various “forbidden” arts of civilization in Enoch, and even when He tempts Jesus with all the kingdoms of the world in exchange for worship in the New Testament).

The word “satan” was later attached to Azazel and spelled with a capital “S” shortly before the time of Yeshua ben Yosef (i.e., “Jesus Christ”), signifying some of the Jews’ belief that He had become the Supreme Adversary of Yahweh. This belief would not survive among the mainstream sects of Judaism, but it would continue to propagate within the new Christian religion. Azazel has been most popularly and generally known as “Satan” ever since. The word “Devil” also means “adversary” or “opposer,” as it comes from the Greek “diabolos,” which is equivalent to the Hebrew “satan.”

In medieval times, Azazel was also given the name **Lucifer**. Meaning “Light-bearer” in Latin, the word Lucifer was originally used by the Romans as a name for the Morning Star, which was actually the planet Venus. It was wrongfully associated with Him due to a misinterpretation of a certain passage in the biblical book of Isaiah which refers to a character named Heylel ben Shahar, or “Daystar, son of Morning.” In Isaiah, Heylel is quoted as saying, “I will ascend to heaven; above the stars of God I will set my throne on high; I will sit on the mount of assembly in the far north; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds, I will make myself like the Most High.” Thinking that Heylel ben Shahar was really the Devil, the Christian Church translated his name to “Lucifer” when the Bible was translated to Latin, and Lucifer has since become a popular name for Azazel in Western culture. But it has since been proven that the story of Heylel ben Shahar does not actually concern Azazel, but instead refers to a certain Babylonian king who thought himself to be divine. Therefore, the name Lucifer became associated with Azazel due to a misinterpretation of Isaiah, but it can still be considered an appropriate name for the Devil due to the fact that the word means “Light-Bearer” and Azazel Himself acts as a “Bringer of Light” in Hebrew mythology, teaching humankind the various arts of civilization.

In Islam, “Azazel” is still a name that is popularly used for the Devil. Other Islamic names for the Devil include **Iblis** (which means “Doubt” in Arabic) and **Shaitan** (the Arabic equivalent to “Satan,” meaning “adversary”). Among the Yezidi Kurds, Azazel is worshiped and revered as **Melek Ta’us** (variously translated as either “Peacock King” or “Angel King,” due to the fact that the word “ta’us” means both “peacock” and “angel” in Kurdish). The Yezidis also recognize Azazel as being the all-powerful **Lord of this World**.

Azazel has also become generally known in Western society as the **Prince of Darkness**. This term was originally intended by Christians to signify their belief in Him as the commander of all evil forces, but it can also be used to refer to Him as a noble being whose power and presence belong to the dark side of Nature.

**Hail Azazel-Lucifer!
The Shaitan,
The Melek Ta'us!
O mighty Lord of this World
Who is at once
The Prince of Darkness
And the Angel of Light!
Amen!**

ONE SATANIST'S RESPONSE TO A CHRISTIAN WORLDVIEW

HAVING been raised agnostic, I first realized I was a Satanist when I was a young pup in grade school. The first time I ever met anybody who called themselves a Christian and who was publicly outspoken about it was in sixth grade. This was a fellow student who was trying to get me to convert to his beliefs. He, his parents and their friends all tried to push their point of view on me, but for the life of me monotheism has just never made much sense. It has always made more sense to me to assume that there are many possible gods out there, seeing how so many different people in the world have claimed to have so many different spiritual experiences. The fact that you believe in divinity does not mean you believe in the same divinity as everyone else, and the fact that there are so many different ideas of divinity and none can be proven shows that one person's religion is just as good as another. I have always felt more comfortable assuming that there may very well be some truth behind the spiritual experiences of others, and that I have no right to tell anyone that what they experience isn't real (unless it can be somehow proven that they are just delusional).

So as far as I am concerned, Jehovah, Jesus Christ, the Buddha, the Norse gods, the ancient Egyptian gods and even L. Ron Hubbard are all real in some way. However, this does not mean that I agree with their respective worshipers as to what they are. Christians experience their Lord as a loving god who redeems them from their sins. Well I'm not sure about the redemption part, but I feel it is pretty safe to say that if a person feels love coming from their god, then I have no reason to assume that it isn't true. We aren't living in a comic book universe, after all; nothing in existence is truly, purely "Evil" in and of itself. However, I think the claim that Jehovah is the Lord of the entire Universe is quite an unreasonable one, as I see no reason to believe that the Creator of All Things would have any interest in wasting Its time revealing itself through the Bible, when It is constantly revealing Itself through Nature all the time. And the picture we get of the Creator from the impersonal ferocity of Nature is not at all benevolent in any humanly-meaningful sense, but more ambivalent at best. I would go so far as to theorize that perhaps the Creator is not even sentient.

No, I agree with Christians that theirs is a loving god, but I don't see any logical reason (a la Thomas Paine) to believe that he is the

one that rules the universe, or that he was even remotely responsible for my existence. It is also clear to me that their god, although loving, is certainly not “all-loving.” Obviously, even the Bible itself describes their god as being quite jealous and wrathful at times. I figure everybody must have their bad days, and not even Mr. J is a perfect, uncreated being.

If Jehovah the “god of love” is capable of wrath, what then does this say about his eternal arch-nemesis, Lucifer? Christians are always describing Lucifer as this absolutely evil cosmic rebel who wants to hurt Jehovah by working for humankind’s spiritual destruction. But many people who worship Lucifer say that they experience love from Him, quite like how Christians will say they experience love from Jehovah. Christians will say that Satanists are just being deceived by Lucifer to think that He loves them, and that He really only wants to destroy them in the end; but how do they know this is really true? What gives them the authority to judge the mind and will of the Prince of Darkness? The Bible gives them no such authority, for it is written from the perspective of Jehovah and his followers, not from Lucifer’s perspective. Reading the Bible gives you a terrific idea of Jehovah’s perception about Lucifer, but it does not represent what Lucifer really believes and stands for at all.

Of course Christians will see Lucifer as the “Evil One,” because He is the opposite of their god. But being the opposite of something does not necessarily mean you are “Evil.” Darkness is the opposite of Light, but there is nothing inherently evil about Darkness in and of itself. In fact, it can even have positive qualities: when things are dark, you want to go to sleep and your body begins building energy for the next day. When you are in the dark you can hide from danger. When you look upward into the nighttime sky, you can see all the things beyond our atmosphere that the sun won’t let you see during the day.

Just as Darkness has its positive qualities, Light can also have its negative qualities. Light can help us to see, but it can also blind us. It can keep us warm, but it can also burn and scorch us. There are dualities in all things that exist. Nothing is completely positive or negative in and of itself. We do not live in a universe that lies between an eternal conflict between “Good” and “Evil.” We live in a universe composed of varying shades of gray, in which “Good” and “Evil” must be determined by each individual entity for itself. This was Lucifer’s entire point in tempting Eve with that blessed Fruit. Sure, He wanted her to disobey Jehovah, and it is for this reason that Christians will scapegoat Him as the Father of all Sin. But the path to spiritual truth lies not in simply accepting whatever prepackaged

system we are given; rather, we must continually question and challenge the things we believe in. We must put our beliefs to the test and find what works the best for us, while we are under the most pressure. Faith is an essential ingredient in any form of spirituality, but doubt does not have to be its enemy. The path of Lucifer involves the understanding that we live in a mysterious world, and that there is far more to reality than can ever be expressed in a single book -- even one as large as the Bible.

What makes a religion like Christianity work is that it gives its followers what some Luciferians will call "the illusion of certainty." That is, it outlines a view of reality, the world and the supernatural that is considered to be "certain," and Christians are encouraged to think of their belief systems in such terms. Hence why so many people in the Christian persuasion are convinced that theirs is the "Only True Way" while all other "ways" are false at best and damnable at worst. While they are certainly entitled to such a view, I consider it much more reasonable to assume that very little is actually certain as far as spiritual matters go; we are surrounded by the Unknown on all sides. Christians choose to accept the Bible as a revelation of the "Truth" communicated to them by their god, whom they believe is the Creator of all. A Satanist chooses to look at any and all revelations, even those outside the Bible, as objectively as possible and to make their own personal judgments concerning the various deities that are believed to make such communications. A Satanist does this with the understanding that things are not always what they seem, and folks aren't always who they claim to be.

There is no single Satanic text that is recognized by all Satanists everywhere as a "true revelation of Satan." There have been Satanic texts, to be true -- the Yezidi *Mishaf Resh*, *The Satanic Bible* by Anton LaVey, *The Diabolicon* and *The Book of Coming Forth by Night* by Michael Aquino -- but not all Satanists agree as to which of these are truly inspired by Satan, or if any of them are inspired by Him at all. Or perhaps they all were, but their meanings are meant to be evaluated in context with each other. Who knows? In Satanism, there is no rule anywhere that says we have to put our faith in a single text. Satanists are allowed to wipe their bums with *The Satanic Bible* if they feel they disagree with it. In a religion which celebrates the Ultimate Rebel, this is only natural. Here, we value our own spiritual experiences and revelations over those of any other. I find what I believe Lucifer has communicated to me to be more valid than whatever Jehovah might have said to Moses back in the Old Testament days.

Once again, Christians will tell me I am being deceived. My

question is, “How are you so sure YOU’RE not being deceived?” And of course I am always given quotes from the Bible for answers, and none of these quotes proves anything to me. All it does is make my point all the more clear: no matter how many Bible quotes you can muster, all you have is your faith when it comes right down to it. And if it makes you comfortable to put your faith in the Bible, then all the more power to you. But me personally, I would rather put my faith in the spiritual experiences that I have had for myself ever since I was a young pup, and these experiences tell me that Lucifer ain’t half bad at all.

I WORSHIP DEVILS

I BELIEVE in the existence of Devils. But unlike most people who believe in Devils, I do not believe that they are these evil beings who want to run around and kill everybody. I believe in them as essentially benevolent deities of carnality, intellectual power and progress. They are dark yet beautiful spirits that, strangely enough, actually work for the advancement of humankind. They are not really these stupid fallen angels that want to destroy humanity and the world. Instead, they are mysteriously sentient forces that mastermind every deviation from dogmatic thought that occurs among human beings, and that inspire all of human advancement. They are the gods that rule the Earth. Even the Christian Bible itself refers to Satan as “The God of this World!”

The entire reason that people are led to believe that Devils are really these evil and destructive beings is because they are scapegoated by conventional religionists. The term “scapegoat” itself comes from an ancient Hebrew ritual practiced on the Day of Atonement. This ritual involved the sacrifice of two goats. One goat was ceremonially slaughtered as an offering to the god of Abraham, while the other was “laden” with the sins of the tribe and driven into the wilderness as a live offering to a Devil they called Azazel.

According to the apocryphal book of Enoch (which reflects the beliefs of the Second Temple era), Azazel was a spirit who left heaven and descended to earth because he lusted after mortal women. A whole bunch of them actually did this, but Azazel was their leader. And when these spirits came to earth, they taught and instructed human beings in several arts of civilization (including but not limited to various sciences, cosmetics and martial warfare). The conventional religious leaders of the Hebrews, however, blamed all “evil” in the world upon Azazel and his fellows for this very reason. Azazel didn’t actually do anything “bad” in any humanly meaningful sense; if anything, he helped human beings in much the same way that Prometheus did in Greek mythology. Yet he became a scapegoat for all that’s wrong in the world.

Azazel was not the first idea of a spiritual being that is the “supreme enemy” of the Abrahamic religions. The first was Leviathan, a gigantic serpent that is pretty much identical to [Apep](#) of ancient Egyptian religion. The religious symbolism of a “dragon of primordial darkness” who creates opposition against authoritarian religious regimes recurs throughout almost all cultures of the

ancient Middle East. This being was blamed by the Egyptians for bringing foreign invaders against their country, and He was also blamed by the Hebrews for destroying Jerusalem through the Babylonians. Later on, when the Serpent became known as “Satan” in Christianity, He would be blamed for opposing Christians through the Roman government. However, there is no evidence, outside of scripture, to demonstrate that this being is really responsible for causing foreign invasions or such. The people who suffered these events chose to ostracize and scapegoat this spirit so that they could make the harsh realities of this world more “bearable” for themselves. Human beings have an ugly history of scapegoating others - both their gods and their fellow humans - in order to make themselves feel better.

“Satan” was originally a common noun that simply meant “accuser” or “adversary.” It was not used to refer to a specific adversary of Yahweh, but to any being that acted in an adversarial manner to anyone else. Often, the term “satan” would be used to describe an angel sent by Yahweh to obstruct a human or humans in some way, such as the angel of the Passover, or the angel that wrestles with Jacob. Later on, particularly in the time that Christ supposedly lived, the Serpent Leviathan was given the name “Satan” as a proper noun, indicating the belief among Christians that He is the ultimate adversary of the biblical god. And by that point in time it was actually believed that this particular being rules the entire Earth. Even the New Testament itself refers to Satan as “the God of this World.”

Much later, it would be established as church doctrine that Satan was really a fallen angel with horns and cloven hooves that had rebelled against the Abrahamic god. It would appear that here, the ideas of the Serpent Leviathan and the angel Azazel were melded together. But remember that originally, Azazel left heaven by choice because He apparently liked women. And after the departure from heaven, He eventually decided He liked all human beings and shared divine knowledge with them, making them smarter and more civilized (but always while reminding them of their basic animal natures as well). Satan advances humankind, yet is blamed by the Abrahamic religions for all “sin.” Apparently, humanism forms a large portion of the Abrahamic idea of “sin.”

Other instances of Abrahamic opposition toward humanity occur throughout the entire Bible. The Hebrews have their god punishing Adam and Eve for eating the Fruit of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, which they were tempted to do by a snake. All the snake did was give Adam and Eve the power to determine moral truth for

themselves, apart from the help of any divine spirit. But apparently, the Hebrew religious leaders did not want their followers to believe it's possible to have morality without the Abrahamic god. However, there are millions of people in the world who do not worship Jehovah, or who don't even believe in him, yet who are good and moral people (often more good and moral than many self-proclaimed Christians). People can have morals without having the Bible. But conventional religious leaders do not want people to know this; they want people to think that they must surrender their souls to their god so they can be "morally cleansed."

I don't know about you, but something sounds suspicious here: the snake, who is often identified with Satan, gives Adam and Eve the power to know what is right and what is wrong by themselves. But this is defined as the "original sin," through which "death came into the world." Why should having the power of moral independence be considered "evil," and why should feeling guilty for having it be "good?"

The Hebrews also had their god knocking down the human architectural feat called the Tower of Babel. They also have him commanding his prophet Abraham to ritually sacrifice his only son Isaac as an offering for the Lord (and, even though he supposedly never intended for Abraham to really kill the kid, what kind of a god demands that parents be willing to murder their own children for him?). They later have him wiping out all the innocent newborn males of Egypt because one man (the Pharaoh) refused to do what the Hebrews wanted. Their scripture also claims that the Abrahamic god commanded the Israelites to kill every man, mother, and male child of their neighboring civilizations, and to enslave and molest the virgin girls. And later on, the Christians have their god bloodily sacrificing his own flesh-and-blood son and telling people that the man died for them, and they must believe in him or they will burn in hell eternally for the "sins" of one little lifetime. Sounds like a horrific act of terrorism used to frighten people into obedience, if you ask me.

And why is it so quickly believed that Jehovah is really the Creator god? I myself do not know if such a god exists or not, but if it does it cannot possibly be the Christian god. The Christian god is claimed to be a personal entity who has a specific interest in human affairs. I doubt very much that any Creator god that is ultimately responsible for the existence of everything would have such an interest, because there is a LOT of everything and human beings are like a speck of dust in the midst of the cosmos. I find it much more logical to think that a personal god interested in human affairs

would only exist on a smaller-than cosmic scale, meaning that any such god is lesser than the theoretical Creator god. This would mean that the Judeo-Christian god, who is always concerned with “saving” people from their “sins,” is not really the Creator but simply a lesser god. This perspective is more fully articulated on Diane Vera’s [Church of Azazel](#) website, specifically in her articles, [“The Here-and-Now Principle in Theology”](#) and [“Post-Copernican Natural Theology”](#).

I do not believe that the Old Serpent is really a “rebel” against the Creator. Fundamentalist Christians accuse Satan of wanting to be worshiped as the supreme God, but this is really only what they project onto their scapegoat. They are the ones who want their own god to be worshiped as the supreme God, for he is the one personal deity who is most well known in monotheistic religions today as “God” with a capital “G.” But if he is a personal being, he cannot be the supreme God; if he is not the supreme God, their claim of his being God is just that: a *claim*.

And yet conventional religionists have always used their scapegoats as “boogeymen” with which to frighten their followers into submission. People are made to think Satan is the one who is trying to destroy them, and that only fools them into continuing the age-old cycle of scapegoating others. If the Prince of Darkness is truly the opposite of what fundamentalists consider to be “divine,” then He must be a much more logical and humane god than theirs! And what’s funny is that this can be determined by studying Judeo-Christian mythology itself.

That’s essentially why I worship Satan, whom I also call Azazel, Lucifer, and Apep. For me, worshiping Satan is a deliberate “slap in the face” to all people who continue the tradition of scapegoating others. By worshiping the “Patron Saint of Scapegoats,” I am declaring all counter-subversion ideologies to be void. To me, Satan is a dark yet benevolent god who gets a bad rap for doing things that are helpful to humanity. He stirs human beings to fundamentally question all dogmas and fixed ideologies, thereby causing them to advance beyond the superstitious power that holds them back from progress. He is Dark, yet He brings Light. He is the ultimate Enemy of all tyrannical religious regimes, and He is the Promethean friend of Man. He leads us out from oppression, and He puts the fear of Man in the hearts of the gods.

THE DEVIL IS MY MASTER

I WOULD like to say a few words about the nature of my relationship with the holy Prince of Darkness.

Each individual Satanist's relationship with the Dark Lord will somehow be different. Even Satanists who agree on practically everything they can think of will most likely find at least a few major points of disagreement. This is because it is every Satanist's Devil-given right to question and disagree with all fixed ideologies -- especially including those of other Satanists -- and to formulate an understanding of the divine based purely upon their own research and experience. This naturally causes each of us to be somehow fundamentally different from each other in terms of our personal belief systems; and yet this differentiation is precisely what unites us and keeps us together as a (somewhat dysfunctional) family of spiritually-related human beings.

When it comes to my own personal relationship with the Prince of Darkness, there is one thing that makes me significantly different from many other Satanists I know. This one thing is the fact that, aside from all other names and titles for His Infernal Majesty, I prefer to refer to the Devil as "Master." That's right. I call the Prince of Darkness my Master and I worship Him as such, and I will neither serve nor bow to any other as such (whether mortal or divine).

Some Satanists seem to dislike it when I call Him Master. The idea of Satanism is that it is a religion of subversity based upon rebellion against oppressive forces for the sake of developing, securing and evolving one's own personal liberty. Taken in this context, it might seem a contradiction in terms to refer to Azazel as Master. How can a god who encourages you to think and act for yourself apart from the wills of others be your Master? Does not the term "Master" suggest one that exercises domination and absolute control over others? How can I be a true Satanist if I accept Azazel as my *Master*?

The answer is quite simple. Azazel is the ultimate power of subversity in human spiritual experience; He inspires us to question dogma, to go through "paradigm shifts" and to thereby achieve higher levels of intellectual understanding. It is only natural that, by being Satanists, we are rebellious and upsetting to people who practice religions that thrive on conformity and stasis (e.g., Christianity and Islam). Satanism is often described as a religion of rebellion rather than a religion of submission, and I agree entirely

with this; but at the same time, I believe that by being spiritually rebellious and subversive, I am IN FACT “submitting” myself to the very SPIRIT of rebellion and subversity against fixed dogma and blind faith. Azazel is not my Master in that He rules over my life with an iron fist and demands the complete subservience of my will. Rather, He is my Master in that by living according to my own will, I am being subservient to His subversity. Azazel does not tell me what I can or cannot do; instead, He inspires me to decide these things for myself, and by exercising my power to decide such things, I am SERVING Him. This paradox is one of the very many things that continually mystify me concerning the mighty Prince of Darkness.

When I invoke Him in my rituals, I unashamedly call Him the Master. And I do see myself as being subservient to Him; I refer to myself in my rituals as His “servant and friend.” However, my subservience to the Dark Lord translates into spiritual subversity and personal liberty. Therefore, although this paradox may seem confusing to others, I see no inherent contradiction in referring to our Deity as the Master.

I might also mention that one reason why I seem to take such pleasure in calling the Prince of Darkness my Master is because calling Him such seems to be regarded as “taboo” by other Satanists, and wouldn't you know that ALL taboos are Azazel's Happy Meals, ESPECIALLY those that are entertained by His own followers. The Prince of Darkness will always make sure there is an exception to every rule, and just when you think you've got everything all nice and neatly sorted out theologically, He will more often than not throw a wrench into the works somewhere and cause you to have to re-think your entire paradigm all over again (He apparently loves to make us go through paradigm shifts).^{*} Calling Him “Master” seems to be a blasphemy even among Satanists (as is calling oneself a “Devil Worshiper”), and this only entices me to break some more “Satanic taboos.” Therefore I proudly and loudly proclaim myself to be a loyal servant of the Master, and to Hell with those who would accuse me of not being a “true” Satanist.

* The statement that “just when you think you've got everything all nice and neatly sorted out theologically, He will more often than not throw a wrench into the works somewhere and cause you to have to re-think your entire paradigm all over again” may have been inspired by the following statement in John Allee's FAQ: “Just when you think you've got everything figured out and all your beliefs neatly categorized, the trickster devil comes along and whacks you upside the head with an apparent contradiction.” - Diane Vera

IMPORTANT ADVICE, AND
SOME HISTORY LESSONS

A HISTORY OF HALLOWEEN

HALLOWEEN. November Eve. The darkest night of the year, filled with mystery and enchantment, the windy whispering of ghosts, the cackling of witches and the inviting, childhood smell of burning pumpkinflesh. Often termed a “holiday,” it is more accurately thought of as a holy *night*, which marks the turning of the year in old Celtic customs, and the promise of new beginnings.

As far back as I can remember, Halloween has always been my very favorite time of the year. To be true, I always enjoyed getting presents at Christmastime, seeing the fireworks on the Fourth of July and flirting with girls on Valentine’s Day. But neither of these festivals ever left an impression quite so deep as the one marked upon my psyche by the Eve of All Hallows. For me, it is soothing when the summer dies, the days grow short and the shadows grow long. It is comforting when the night falls ever earlier each passing day, and when the leaves of the trees turn red and gold and fall off -- only to be carried away by icy cold winds that bear the scents of darkness and decay. It pleases my spirit most when I see all the beautiful orange pumpkins that are hoisted from the ground and carved into grinning, crescent skulls that glow in the dark. I even feel a shiver of anticipation race up my spine when I see all the cheap costumes, plastic skeletons, and witches’ hats hanging from their shelves in grocery stores, and when the television listings are suddenly filled with every cinematic horror imaginable.

Halloween, although descended from various cultural backgrounds, is primarily of Celtic origin. In ancient times, among the peoples of pagan Britain, it was known as the festival of **Samhain** (a Gaelic word which is pronounced “SOW-inn” and which means “the End of Summer”). Samhain, curiously enough, was sort of like a combination of our modern New Year’s Eve and Thanksgiving for its pre-Christian practitioners. It marked the end of the old year and the beginning of the new, as well as the end of summer and the first day of winter. The various Celtic tribes would come together at this time and they would herd their cattle and sheep down from the summertime pastures, to be kept in stables during the darkness of winter. All the crops would be harvested, for it was believed that the ambivalent and mischievous faery folk would soon blast the countryside and every growing plant with their icy breath, thus bringing the earth into hibernation until such time as the Sun God would be rejuvenated at Beltaine. For it was at this

time of year that the Sun God would grow cold, stern and faraway from his people, and although his light would shine upon the earth, it would not bless the earth with its life-giving heat.

The Celts would light great bonfires throughout the countryside, dress in animal skins and make merry on this dark night. There would be feasts and games aplenty, and some of the livestock and crops would be ritually sacrificed to the gods, as a way of giving thanks for the Celts' prosperity. Indeed it was thought that the gods were closest to the earth at this time. The Druids would hold fire rituals in which they would celebrate the lifting of the veil between the real and the unreal, by which the dead and the yet-to-be-born might look into our world and visit upon their living mortal kin. Spells and costumes would be employed in order to avert and frighten off the unfriendlier spirits that would roam the countryside on this night. And the Celtic youth would often take to practicing divinatory magic, most often to find out who their future wives and husbands might be.

The idea that Samhain was a festival honoring a Celtic God of the Dead who was also named Samhain has been propagated by many conservative Christian writers who are critical of Halloween and its pagan roots. This myth among conservative Christians goes back to a man named Colonel Charles Vallency, who wrote a six-volume set of books in 1770 which attempted to prove (for some strange purpose) that the Irish people once came from Armenia. In actuality, there is no evidence that any such god was recognized among the ancient Celts. The closest thing to a supernatural being that was specifically associated with the festival of Samhain was not a god, but a wicked faery known as the *Samhanach*. Not much is known about this obscure figure in Celtic folklore, but it is known that it had a taste for abducting small children (most likely for the purposes of eating them), that it could perhaps be appeased by the giving of offerings (perhaps an ancient origin of our modern day custom of "trick-or-treat", which first appeared in print in 1939), and that it only came out on November Eve. But evidently this entity was never actually worshiped as a god, much less a god of the dead.

One of the defining characteristics of Celtic spirituality was the belief that the soul resides within the human head. It is known that the Celts would often behead their enemies in times of war, and the heads would be kept on poles or upon altars. It was believed that when you brought home the head of an enemy in war, you maintained power over that enemy's soul, and you could even get it to give you advice concerning political, agricultural or community-related concerns. Skulls were sometimes placed around tribal fires

in order to keep the nastier spirits away. It is quite possible that this ancient custom became reflected in the later Irish custom of scooping out turnips with skull-like faces carved into them, in which candles (the flame of which represents the soul) would be placed. When the Irish would begin to migrate over to North America, they would continue this custom by using pumpkins instead of turnips.

When the Catholic church began to spread its influence through Britain and Ireland, it met with quite a bit of resistance concerning the Samhain festivities. At first, the Catholics attempted to subjugate the celebration of Samhain entirely by denouncing it as a Satanic festival. But even once they had converted to Catholicism, the British and the Irish refused to stop celebrating this night. So in the eighth century, Pope Gregory III (731 - 741) ended up adopting the festival into the church's calendar as **the Eve of All Hallows**, during which the souls of dead saints would be commemorated (the word "hallow" was a medieval synonym for "saint"). The church also began to teach that the purpose of lighting bonfires on this night was not to honor the old gods, but rather to frighten away the Devil and His Demons (as if Satan could really be frightened by something as harmless to Him as fire). But despite the new teachings and the new proposed purpose for November Eve, the common people continued to honor the spirits of their dead loved ones, and so it became necessary for the church to ordain the day of November the second as **All Souls' Day**. The term "All Hallows' Eve," which was sometimes written as "All Hallows' Even," would later be shorted to **Hallowe'en**, and then again to our modern day Halloween. This holiday is still recognized by the modern day Catholic church, for all its attempts to subvert its original pagan associations.

Interestingly enough, Martin Luther posted his Ninety-five Theses on the door of the Wittenberg Castle Church on October 31st, 1517. The religious reformation that he sparked would eventually do away with the celebration of Halloween for many Protestant Europeans, but nevertheless they would continue to celebrate the event of this October 31st as **Reformation Day**. The English would continue a secular version of the festival in the form of **Guy Fawkes Day**. This celebration marks the anniversary of a plot by English Roman Catholics to blow up Parliament, King James I and his heir on November 5, 1605. It was apparently believed by the conspirators that in the wake of the chaos that they hoped would ensue, the English Catholics could then take over the government. Unfortunately for them, their plot did not work, for one of their number, a man named Guy Fawkes, was arrested and he revealed the names of his fellow plotters under torture. When what would later

become known as the “Gunpowder Plot” was foiled, Parliament established November 5 as Guy Fawkes Day, a day of public thanksgiving. Bonfires, pranks, and dressing in costumes became trademark ingredients of the Guy Fawkes Day festivities. It is interesting to see that even Protestants would find ways to continue the celebration of Samhain, albeit in a secular and anti-Catholic manner. Guy Fawkes Day would even be celebrated here in North America by the English colonists, well until the American Revolution.

Immigrants from Ireland, Scotland and England would bring various Halloween customs to the U.S. throughout the following centuries, but it was not until the nineteenth century that Halloween became a popular phenomenon. This was due to the mass immigration from Ireland after 1840 due to famines. Various traditions became popular in Irish locales, such as the “Muck Olla” masquerade. “Muck Olla” was a supernatural boar in Celtic legends who was commemorated by a group of Irishmen who claimed to be his “followers.” Led by a man named Lair Bhain (“White Mare”), who wore a horse’s head, these “followers” would go from door to door in their neighborhoods and request food, drink or money in return for promises of prosperity during the following year. It was also during this time that it became popular to substitute pumpkins for turnips in the carving of Jack-O’Lanterns.

The term “Jack-O’Lantern” itself first appeared in print in the year 1750, in connection to an Irish folk tale about a man named Jack who had made a deal with the Devil. Jack supposedly tricked Satan and bargained with Him for the promise of never being dragged to Hell; but when the time came for Jack to die, he was refused entrance to heaven for making the deal. And when he tried to enter Hell (apparently thinking it was the next best thing, in terms of where one should spend their eternity), he was rejected by Lucifer, who said, “Sorry, but you made me promise not to let you in.” Jack was then forced to roam the earth for the rest of eternity, but the Old Goat took pity on him and gave him a burning coal with which Jack could light his way. Jack kept the coal inside of a turnip (or, in later versions, a pumpkin) and this is the origin of the term “Jack-O’Lantern.”

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Halloween began to develop somewhat of a reputation as a night of rough mischief among the lower classes. Poor city dwellers would use the night as a means of venting their frustrations through various acts of vandalism, which at one time were limited to tipping over outhouses and soaping windows. But by the 1920’s the malevolence of these

acts of vandalism had escalated, to the point of severe property damage, fires, and cruelty to both animals and people.

The danger of Halloween riots reached its apex on October 30, 1938, when Orson Welles and his “Mercury Theater of the Air” broadcasted a radio drama adaptated from H. G. Wells’ *The War of the Worlds*. Similar to Wells’ book, which was written as a fictional character’s eyewitness account of a Martian invasion of earth, Welles wrote and performed his play so that it would sound like a news broadcast reporting *real* events (in order to heighten the dramatic effect). The play essentially was a series of 1930’s dance songs, interrupted a number of times by fake news bulletins reporting the landing of an invasion force from Mars that apparently had no less than the ultimate destruction of the United States in mind. Although Welles made sure to include disclaimers at both the beginning and the end of the program, explaining that the program was intended as a bit of theatre, a great many listeners tuned in during the course of the broadcast itself. After listening to the frightened-sounding “news reporters” and a number of menacing sound effects, large numbers of people packed the roads, hid in cellars, loaded guns, and even wrapped their heads in wet towels as protection from the Martians’ “black smoke” (a kind of poison gas). Some people even went so far as to commit suicide, figuring that the end of the world was literally at hand, and that they would rather die by their own hands than be horribly butchered by extra-terrestrial invaders.

After this, the United States got sucked into World War II, and this changed a great many things about American culture. After having split the atom and unlocked a whole new arsenal of weaponry never before imagined, the U.S. emerged from the war as one of the two dominant world superpowers. Americans were no longer typically frightened by such gothic horrors as vampires and werewolves; science had become a new religion unto itself. So during the late 1940’s and the 1950’s, the violent side of Halloween seemed to simmer down considerably, and it became regarded more as an innocent children’s holiday. Halloween festivities became mostly limited to school and family activities, and trick-or-treating became a nationwide custom.

However, the 1960’s would bring a new paranoia among American parents, and this was the fear of deranged adults who specifically sought to harm innocent trick-or-treaters. Urban myths began to circulate about razor blades hidden in apples and candy coated in rat poison. In the early 1970’s, this fear would become combined with the beliefs of conservative fundamentalist Christians

that Satanic cults roamed the country and plotted to kidnap and sacrifice children on Halloween night. In the wake of this, community safety standards were further stressed concerning the practice of trick-or-treat. In some areas, it was required that the children trick-or-treat during the daylight hours, before it got dark. In other areas, trick-or-treating became banned entirely.

It was during this time that fundamentalist Christian concerns about the Satanic implications of Halloween became popularly publicized and even believed in some communities, as demonstrated through the publications of such books as Mike Warnke's *The Satan Seller*. Even today it is still propagated by such people as the evangelical comic artist Jack Chick that Satanists like to hand out candy that has been poisoned or somehow made dangerous to children. It is also commonly believed among such people that Halloween, being the "high holy day" of Satanists, is the one night of the year that the most animals and human children are horribly butchered as "offerings" to Satan. Fundies will say that Satanic power is glorified through the masquerading as evil creatures or the decoration of homes, schools, businesses and churches with occult symbols (e.g., skeletons, ghosts, Jack-O'Lanterns, etc.). It is claimed that "Those who oppose Christ are known to organize on Halloween to observe satanic rituals, to cast spells, to oppose churches and families, to perform sacrilegious acts, and to even offer blood sacrifices to Satan." These anti-Satanic beliefs were further perpetuated during the "Satanic Panic" of the 1980's, during which a number of hypnotized mental patients claimed to have been "ritually abused" as children by Satanists, and their respective psychiatrists actually *believed* them (apparently throwing out all their training in skepticism in favor of monetary advancement through sensationalism).

One particularly distressing example of this mentality is what happened in the town of Jamestown, New York in the year 1987. People in the town began to believe that a number of teenagers who had held a Halloween party in an abandoned warehouse were actually involved in a secretive Satanic cult, and that they had been sacrificing animals at the party. The religious community, outraged, began flooding the local newspaper with letters explaining their concern about the growth of "Satanic activity" in the area. The humane society began receiving phone call after phone call, each informing them of various dogs and cats that had supposedly been ritually slaughtered. People actually began to walk the streets of the town at night, ready to beat up any "Satanists" that were supposedly running around after sundown. The kids who had been at the

Halloween party also received various threatening phone calls. After an extensive investigation, it was found that there was absolutely *no* Satanic cult running around in Jamestown, and that there indeed had never been. The teenagers in the abandoned warehouse were no more than kids with strange clothes and haircuts, and no evidence of any animal mutilation was ever found.

But despite the foolishness of fundamentalist Christian propaganda against Halloween, the holiday is still a highly popular event on many people's calendars. It has become a mostly secular holiday for the majority of people, to which there is not much more than dressing in costumes, eating candy and watching scary movies. Horror movies have indeed become an extremely important Halloween franchise, most especially since the release of John Carpenter's *Halloween* in 1978.

Written and directed by Carpenter, *Halloween* is perhaps the single most viewed film during the Halloween season, as well as the single most successful independent film ever made. The story plays on various "urban myths" about escaped mental patients and evil adults seeking to harm children on Halloween. It concerns a seemingly catatonic mental patient who was institutionalized for having silently murdered his older sister on the Halloween night of 1963. Fifteen years later (on Halloween Eve of 1978), the mental patient suddenly becomes violent and breaks out of prison, only to return to his hometown with the intention of continually re-committing his past crime. As he is pursued by an obsessed psychiatrist (played by the highly esteemed Shakespearean actor Donald Pleasence), the masked madman silently stalks three babysitters and the children they are watching on Halloween night. After a spine-tingling climax, it is discovered that the killer happens to be something other than human.

The film shocked and scared audiences out of their wits, to the point where it warranted a large number of sequels and (inferior) imitations. The best of its sequels, contrary to popular opinion, is the highly demonized *Halloween III: Season of the Witch*, which has a completely different theme from the 1978 original. Released in 1982, this story plays upon the fear of witchcraft as a sinister influence on Halloween festivities, in the form of a modern day warlock who plots for the wholesale extermination of every child in America with murderous Halloween masks. Although belittled by most fans of the *Halloween* series for the absence of any connection to the original film's characters or plot, *Halloween III* is perhaps the most innovative and inventive of the sequels, due to the fact that it is the only one that does not imitate the original. It will definitely be sure to go

down in history as the *first* film ever to feature a *correct* pronunciation of the Celtic word “Samhain.” For any of my readers who enjoy to watch a good scary movie or two on Halloween night, I would strongly recommend *Halloween* and *Halloween III: Season of the Witch*, if nothing else.

And now that I have finally explained some of the history behind Halloween (and made a couple of viewing recommendations to boot), I shall explain the particular significance of Halloween to Satanism. Contrary to the claims of fundamentalist Christians, Halloween is typically *not* regarded as the “high holy day” by Satanists. Rather, Satanists traditionally consider the birthday of the individual Satanist to be the most important holiday. This was established by Anton LaVey, who wrote in his *Satanic Bible* that “Every man is a god if he chooses to recognize himself as one.” Therefore, according to the standards of LaVey, the birthday of the individual is the most important holiday because it is the day that the individual -- who is regarded as their own godhead -- was brought into this world.

However, being a Devil Worshiper instead of a LaVeyan Satanist, I am not so inclined to view my own date of birth as being of religious importance. Granted, I look forward to my birthday as much as anyone else looks forward to theirs, but to me, Halloween is the most important Satanic festival. Obviously I do not agree with fundamentalist Christians that animal or human sacrifice are necessary (or even desirable) aspects of Satanic practice. But I do happen to agree that when people dress in costumes, go trick-or-treating, and decorate their homes with various Halloween symbols (which I also consider to be “occult”), they are indeed glorifying the Prince of Darkness and His ways, however unknowingly. I share the ancient Celtic belief that, as Samhain, Halloween represents a “gateway” between the carnal world and the spirit world, through which the spirits of the dead and the yet-to-be-born are temporarily free to pass and visit upon the living. Also, although I am prone to using the same calendar as do most other Westerners, I do happen to view the night of October 31st as being a sort of “New Year’s Eve.” This is because I literally spend three-hundred and sixty-four days of the year waiting eagerly for Halloween, and as soon as it is over, the cycle of anticipation begins afresh.

However, I have a more mystical reason for viewing it this way, as well. To me, it is no accident that midnight, the darkest hour of the night (also called “the Witching Hour”), is considered to be the beginning of a new day. Likewise, Halloween, the “darkest” night of the year (in the sense of being the most supernatural and occult-

oriented night of the year -- even from a secular standpoint), is the beginning of a new year. It represents the victory of darkness over light. It is the night when the Devil roams the earth and possesses people to make merry and give in to their darker, "unrestrained" selves, most often by wearing these darker selves on the outside as costumes. Halloween is the one night of the year when grown adults are allowed to act like children, and we are allowed to temporarily do away with everyday reality and be whatever we truly want to be, in the deepest, darkest heart of our imaginations. Halloween is literally the Season of the Witch, a time for myth and magic, for ghost stories and the occult. It is the night when the creatures of the wild make ready to hibernate for winter, and to sleep and live in dreams until the call of spring wakens them to life and lust. Halloween, to me, is the Devil's Night, pure and simple.

For any theistic Satanists who are wondering what special things they can do to celebrate Halloween as a Satanic holiday, [click here](#) to read some suggestions.

And with that, I hope that all of the people who read this article -- whether they are Satanist or another religion -- have a safe and happy Halloween. Hail Satan!

Written at Hallowtide of 2005.

THE SATANISM SCARE

WITCHHUNT MENTALITIES IN MODERN TIMES

DURING the 1980's, a severe epidemic of cultural paranoia broke out all across the continental United States. This paranoia would later become called both "the Satanism Scare" and "the Satanic Panic." The hysteria centered around an intense fear of "Satanic Ritual Abuse," a term which has been applied to the alleged systematic abuse of children as a part of Satanic worship. In the years before the turn of the millennium, several cases of "Satanic Ritual Abuse" were brought to public attention all across the country. People were being told by psychiatrists, law enforcement officials and television personalities that a top-secret international conspiracy of Satanists was ultimately responsible for the majority of child abuse, murders and/or kidnappings that occurred within the United States. During this time frame, many innocent people were accused of being "Devil worshipers" who participated in this unholy plot to deflower and corrupt the youth of America. Indeed, "the Satanic Panic" was essentially another Salem Witch hysteria -- except it happened not in some Puritanical village of the 1600's, but in "civilized" twentieth-century America (as well as in other English speaking countries, including Great Britain, Canada and Australia).

The idea of Satan worshipers murdering children is not a novel concept; in fact it goes back as far as the Middle Ages at least. Late-medieval witchfinder manuals such as *The Malleus Maleficarum* propagated the common belief that "witches," who were defined as servants of Satan, would drink the blood of unbaptized infants and devour the bodies of infants. It was also believed that they would convert the bodies of children into soup, or bake them in ovens, or convert their bones into ritual instruments. It was even claimed that Satanists would offer *their own* children to Demons. In actuality, such "counter-subversion" ideologies had been implemented against the Jews and even Christians in the past (prior to the ascent of Christianity as a major political power in Western Europe). However, after the Protestant Reformation, it became almost common practice for people to become accused of being witches and having committed vile acts such as these, with little to no incriminating evidence at all. Such accused persons would subsequently be tortured and/or executed horribly. This practice of using imagined criminal deviancy to persecute others would become even more intensified when such groups as the Puritans would begin to take

hold over the British government. And it is from this practice that our modern term “witchhunt” is derived.

During the 1600’s, when the Americas were becoming colonized by European immigrants, the witchhunts would continue. Perhaps the most famous cases of witch hysteria in North America are the Salem Witch Trials of 1692. The hysteria began when a Puritanical preacher named Samuel Parris was invited to serve as the village minister for Salem, Massachussets in 1688. Parris and his family, including a slave woman named Tituba, subsequently moved to the village of Salem. While living there, Parris’ daughter Elizabeth and another girl named Abigail Williams began to behave strangely, as exhibited by such behavior as screaming, seizures, and trance-like states. Shortly thereafter, several other girls in Salem Village began to exhibit such behavior. Local physicians were unable to determine any physical cause for these apparent symptoms, and it was therefore concluded that they were being tormented by means of witchcraft. After being pressured to identify the “witches” who were working their magic against them, the girls identified three women, one of whom was the slave woman Tituba. Tituba, in an attempt to gain the favor of the Salem authorities, went so far as to testify that there was an entire conspiracy of witches working to implement a diabolical plan in Salem, and thus did the Salem witch hysteria explode.

Shortly thereafter, other people of the town began to claim that they were the victims of harmful witchcraft. The witchhunt escalated, and many people became accused, including several faithful churchgoers and people of high standing in the community. Those that were accused were jailed and put on trial, based on flimsy and intangible evidence (such as “witchmarks” on their bodies and the reactions of the afflicted girls, who claimed to be able to see the “spectres” of those tormenting them). And while some of the accused would die miserable and lonely deaths in their respective cells, others would be made to die at the gallows. The hysteria would not come to an end until the Governor of Massachussets would decree that reliance on “spectral” and intangible evidence would no longer be allowed in trials.

Such witchhunts were inspired by, and contributed to, the earlier medieval beliefs about witchcraft and Devil worship, which claimed that practitioners of such would commonly torment and/or abuse young children in various ways. These beliefs would also lead to the witchhunts of the 1980’s, which would subsequently become known as the “Satanic Panic” or the “Satanic Ritual Abuse” scare.

The myth of Satanic witches murdering children in organized

cults exploded into the consciousness of American pop culture with the 1968 release of Roman Polanski's film *Rosemary's Baby*, and the 1976 release of Richard Donner's film *The Omen*. In these films, worshipers of Satan are portrayed as taking great delight in the murder of young infants. During the 1970's, popular myths began to circulate among fundamentalist Christian congregations that an organized network of Satanists existed throughout the United States, and that this network was dedicated to working harmful acts of malice against children. These myths were most particularly tied to Halloween festivities, concerning the handing out of candy apples with razor blades hidden inside of them, or candy coated with rat poison. To this day, fundamentalist propagandists such as the comic artist Jack Chick continue to spread these rumors about Satanist practices on Halloween.

But the "Satanic Panic" did not really begin until 1980, with the publication of a book entitled *Michelle Remembers*. This book was a written account of various therapy sessions administered to a woman named Michelle Smith by a psychiatrist named Dr. Lawrence Pazder. Part of Smith's therapy involved putting her under hypnosis, as a means of uncovering the cause of her mental disturbances. During the therapy sessions, Smith began to recount episodes of a horrific childhood, in which she had been an unwilling participant in a murderous "Satanic cult." She claimed that she had been systematically abused by the people in this cult, including her own parents, and that various acts of inhuman decadence were committed by the group in the name of Satan -- including, but not limited to blood drinking, animal sacrifice, and murder. Smith also claimed that she had been visited by the Devil face to face, and that she had been rescued from the cult through the personal intervention of both the Virgin Mary and Jesus Christ himself.

One would think that a trained professional in the practice of psychiatry would naturally consider such revisited "memories" to be pathological delusions. However, Pazder was so utterly convinced of the reality of Smith's claims that he helped her to write a book on the subject -- *Michelle Remembers* -- in order to "warn" the world about this intergenerational cult of Satanic murderers and child abusers. What is particularly interesting about the developments between Dr. Pazder and his "survivor" patient is that the two of them decided to divorce their respective partners and to marry each other, soon after the publication proved successful.

It would seem that very few people chose to give *Michelle Remembers* the skeptical analysis that it really deserved, at least at the time of its initial publication. Pazder and Smith even received

the support of the Roman Catholic Church when they were invited to the Vatican. They also received plenty of support from fundamentalist Protestant Christians, whose political influence had been steadily growing ever since the 1970's. The majority of Christian readers did not seem to find very many of Smith's claims to be even remotely absurd. In fact, they took it as proof that Satan was not only a real and active force in the human world, but that any and all who followed Him were completely devoted to the enterprise of molesting and murdering children. It was even believed that Satanists would do these things to their very own children. What resulted soon after the publication of *Michelle Remembers* was the birth of an army of modern-day crusaders who were devoted to fighting against "Satan's underground" for the glory of Christ.

Since the more literalist Christians believe that the Bible is the infallible "Word of God," they take the existence of Satan as an objective fact. And because they believe that Satan's purpose is to continually mock and invert "God" (Jehovah), then they also accept that Satan would have His own organization of followers, who are dedicated to performing various acts of "evil" -- just as the Christian God has his church. When the book *Michelle Remembers* finally found its place on bookstore shelves, it required very little else for literalist Christian readers to interpret the book's claims as solid facts. And if *Michelle Remembers* was not enough for some religious zealots, its critical success also invited the publications of several other books that made similar claims, such as *Satan's Underground* by Lauren Stratford and *He Came to Set the Captives Free* by Rebecca Brown. Each of these "true" accounts were based upon the "repressed memories" of mental patients who came to be known as "Satanic Survivors."

What is particularly interesting is that there were no documented cases of "Satanic Ritual Abuse" (SRA) prior to the publication of *Michelle Remembers* in 1980. All documented cases occurred afterward, and very little hard evidence has ever been discovered to substantiate the outrageous claims that are made in these cases. But this did not distress very many Evangelical Christians in the very least. One such Christian, a man named Mike Warnke, claimed to be an ex-Satanic High Priest who had been directly involved in the "Satanic Ritual Abuse conspiracy." Warnke had written a book in 1972 entitled *The Satan Seller*, in which he claimed to have led over 1,500 other Satanists in the area of San Bernardino, California. According to this publication, Warnke was a homeless child who kept drifting from family to family until he was

initiated into a supposedly Satanic cult. After joining the cult, he became addicted to various drugs and was made a High Priest who commanded over followers in at least three different cities. He also claimed to have been granted such authority by none other than the infamous Illuminati itself. And then, after becoming too dependent on drugs, Warnke was supposedly kicked out of the cult. He would subsequently join the army, and while in the service, Warnke decided to convert to Christ.

After becoming a born-again Christian, Warnke soon became recognized among the Evangelical Christian community as a prominent authority on the occult and witchcraft. He was so highly esteemed that law enforcement officials actually asked him for assistance in criminal investigations when the “Satanic Ritual Abuse” scare actually began in the 1980’s. Warnke would also appear on such television shows as “20/20,” “The Oprah Winfrey Show,” “Larry King Live,” “Focus on the Family” and Pat Robertson’s “The 700 Club.” In each program Warnke was encouraged to share his “expert knowledge” on the practices of Satanism, and hardly any of his claims were ever questioned; the need for their validation was never even brought up. Warnke pitched in with the “Satanic Survivors” crowd and reinforced their claims about the supposed Satanist conspiracy to an already increasingly paranoid public. Although it has since been proven that Warnke’s claims about being a Satanist were essentially nothing more than a case of colorful storytelling, Warnke is still loved and respected by many Christians today.

The aforementioned television shows were also quite instrumental in furthering the Satanism Scare of the 1980’s. Most particularly influential was a program entitled “The Devil Worshipers” which aired on the news program, “20/20.” The show aired one evening in 1985 and featured “Perverse, hideous acts that defy belief. Suicides, murders and the ritualistic slaughter of children and animals.” Naturally not a single piece of information in the program was verifiable in any sense, but many viewers became unthinkingly convinced of “the truth.” Before too long, other television shows, including everyone from Oprah Winfrey to Sally Jesse Raphael, would showcase their own specials about “Devil worship” and the criminal tendencies of its secretive practitioners. Perhaps the one talk show host who was the most influential in furthering the paranoia was none other than Geraldo Rivera. Between the years 1987 and 1995, Rivera had at least four programs which were dedicated to the subject, and in each one Rivera made claims like the following:

“Estimates are that there are over one million Satanists in this country...The majority of them are linked in a highly organized, very secretive network. From small towns to large cities, they have attracted police and FBI attention to their Satanic ritual child abuse, child pornography and grisly Satanic murders. The odds are that this is happening in your town.”

Rivera's programs featured law enforcement officials who had become designated “Satanism experts,” and who essentially took what they “knew” about Satanism from such self-appointed authorities as Mike Warnke. Claims were made left and right that the invisible Satanist network was responsible for thousands upon thousands of ritualistic child murders and disappearances every year. One would think that if such a number of people were being ritually slaughtered every year, some amount of hard evidence would turn up somewhere -- such as bodies. But the fact of the matter is that no such evidence has ever been found, even after extensive investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Yet the claims were still unthinkingly accepted by many viewers, who became absolutely convinced of the horrifying “reality” simply because Rivera had featured serious-looking people from law enforcement in his program.

Shortly after Rivera's first special aired, the town of Jamestown, New York became immersed in the paranoia. People in the town began to believe that a number of teenagers who had held a Halloween party in an abandoned warehouse were actually involved in a secretive Satanic cult, and that they had been sacrificing animals at the party. The religious community, outraged, began flooding the local newspaper with letters explaining their concern about the growth of “Satanic activity” in the area. The humane society began receiving phone call after phone call, each informing them of various dogs and cats that had been ritually slaughtered. People actually began to walk the streets of the town at night, ready to beat up any “Satanists” that were supposedly running around after sundown. The kids who had been at the Halloween party also received various threatening phone calls. After an extensive investigation, it was found that there was no Satanic cult running around in Jamestown, and indeed there never had been. The teenagers in the abandoned warehouse were no more than kids with strange clothes and haircuts, and no evidence of any animal mutilation was ever found.

This was not the last time that Jamestown would become so

immersed in the Satanism scare. Only a few months later, on Friday the 13th in May of 1988, the scare erupted again when news got around the town that a Satanic cult was planning to kidnap, rape and murder a blonde-haired blue-eyed girl as part of their “Satanic holiday.” People who did not actually believe the story at first were eventually convinced by the belief their loved ones demonstrated, and soon the entire town fell to panic. Yet the sun rose on Saturday the 14th, and not a single blonde-haired, blue-eyed girl had gone missing or turned up dead.

Although it is true that no substantial evidence has been found to prove the existence of the “secret Satanist network” (let alone the number of murders that said network is supposed to have committed each year), this has not stopped several people from looking for such evidence, and indeed finding it -- in some of the wildest stretches of the imagination ever demonstrated. Fundamentalist Christian leaders would go so far as to accuse children’s cartoon shows -- such as *Masters of the Universe*, *The Smurfs* and *My Little Pony* -- as being Satanic propaganda tools, used to indoctrinate the minds of children with an interest in the occult. Role-playing games such as *Dungeons and Dragons* were also considered suspect; it was believed that by participating in such games, children were being opened to the demonic powers of Hell, and were thus driven to acts of suicide and violence. Several case studies have been made of how playing *Dungeons and Dragons* can effect the minds of children, and the psychiatrists who conducted such experiments seem to agree that the only thing of which the game is guilty is enlarging the imaginations of children. No evidence has ever been found that participating in such games will lead a child to suicide.

Perhaps the one thing that has received the most attention from Christians as a “tool of the Devil” is rock and roll music, or more specifically the heavy metal subgenre. The term “heavy metal” was first coined in the late 1960’s when a British rock band named Black Sabbath began rising in popularity. Featuring the lead singer Ozzy Osbourne, Black Sabbath was distinguished from earlier rock bands due to its use of gothic and infernal imagery in its music. Whereas previous bands mostly fixated on “boy meets girl” lyrical content, Black Sabbath was the first “dark” sounding rock band that talked about the Devil, demonic possession, resurrection from the dead and witchcraft. It would seem that for a time the members of Black Sabbath possessed a passing interest in Satanism and the occult, but soon after the release of their first album, they became accused by Evangelical Christians of writing such music in order to seduce

youth into worshipping the Devil. When this came to pass, singer Ozzy Osbourne and the other members quickly began to change their tune, claiming that the reason for their Satanic lyrical content was to present a *warning against* the practice of the occult, rather than an endorsement of such. Nevertheless, Black Sabbath's infernal, bluesy guitar riffs and "evil" lyrics would inspire an entire generation of rock musicians to follow suit, as well as to continually press the envelope further and further.

Bands such as England's Venom and Denmark's Mercyful Fate not only chose to continue the tradition of referencing Satan in their lyrics, but they even went so far as to openly sympathize with Him -- giving Christians all the more reason to condemn heavy metal as a tool for the Satanic recruitment of youth. In the case of Jamestown, New York, it was strongly believed by the local religious community that heavy metal music had been responsible for "corrupting" the teenagers into dabbling with Satanism. The imagined association between heavy metal music and "Satanic Ritual Abuse" became so strong that some Christians, such as the Reverend Fletcher A. Brothers, founded "heavy metal de-programming centers" such as the Freedom Village. Teenagers who listened to heavy metal music and who dressed in black would often be sent to such places as the Freedom Village, where they would be deprived of any personal belongings which were considered "Satanic," and they would be forced to dress in uniforms, participate in daily prayers and essentially be re-programmed to be Christians.

One thing that is especially frightening about the "Satanic Panic" of the 1980's is this: these myths about "Satanic Ritual Abuse" were commonly believed even among such alternative religious groups as the Wiccans. Brad Hicks, a Neopagan who was president of a non-profit civil rights group, as well as the author of many pro-Pagan pamphlets and articles, was one of the first public figures to doubt the various claims being made about "Satanic Ritual Abuse" during the early 1980's. He spent a great deal of effort trying to combat these myths, and in return for this, he was apparently "demonized" by his fellow Pagans for even daring to defend the accused. Hicks says the following on his personal [website](#):

But at every step of the way, everybody who came up to us said the very same things, in almost exactly the same words. "All of these women can't be lying, it doesn't matter if they are lying because society is going to kill every Satanist in America any day now, the Satanists brought this on themselves because whether or not they're guilty of this crime they're all bad people, and if you don't stop standing up for people accused of being

Satanic Ritual Abusers then when they come to kill all the Satanists then every single Witch in America will die, and it'll be your fault for confusing the two in people's minds!"

It would seem that when the "Satanic Panic" was in full sway, the majority of Wiccans here in the United States were more than happy to contribute to various fears about Satanism, if only as a means of promoting their own religion as a "socially acceptable" alternative to the mainstream.

It was not until 1989 that the various claims being made about "Satanic Ritual Abuse" finally began to be put to the test, most specifically by a man named Kenneth Lanning. Lanning is a Supervisory Special Agent at the Behavioral Science Unit in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In 1992, Special Agent Lanning wrote a very important document which dealt specifically with his investigation of "Satanic Ritual Abuse." The document is known as the [Investigator's Guide to Allegations of Ritual Child Abuse](#). A more [complete version](#) of the document was published in 1992.

In his document, Lanning points out the fact that many law-enforcement officials were too quick to believe that the allegations about "Satanic Ritual Abuse" were true without critically questioning the sources. He pointed out how even officials who did not go to church, who knew that media accounts of various criminal cases were often blown out of proportion, and who scoffed at tabloid television accounts of bizarre occurrences would automatically assume the allegations to be true. He seems to be of the opinion that faith and religious belief had a lot to do with this; many police officers would assume that the claims about Satanism were true simply because they themselves believed in the existence of Satan. Those who were not religious would also assume that the claims about Satanism were true, apparently because the word "Satan" just hit an emotional button for them.

Lanning also wrote about the ambiguity of describing certain forms of child abuse as "ritualistic." He felt that using this terminology was problematic due to the fact that people in various religions around the world subject their children to ritualistic activities, such as the Catholic mass. Many ritualistic acts -- whether they are Satanic or not -- are simply not crimes. Therefore, how can exposing a child to Satanist rituals be in and of itself illegal, since religious expression is protected by the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution? Lanning also points out that, although touching or mutilating a child's genitals for sexual pleasure is indeed illegal,

circumcising a child for religious purposes (as is done by Jews) is most certainly *not* illegal. Therefore, it is possible that someone could wish for their child to be circumcised as part of a Satanist ritual. Would this count as an example of “Satanic Ritual Abuse”? Indeed it would not, for such an act would be protected by the Constitution.

Lanning also points out that, while people were quick to characterize certain kinds of criminal behavior as “Satanic,” “occult” and/or “ritualistic,” there were several kinds of criminal behavior that could also be described as “Christian.” Some examples include parents who beat their children to death because they will not follow their Christian beliefs, or parents who refuse life-saving medical treatment for a child because of their Christian beliefs, or parents who starve and beat their children to death because they believe the children are possessed by demonic spirits. He also includes individuals who bomb abortion clinics and/or kidnap abortion doctors because their Christian beliefs tell them that abortion is murder, and child molesters who read the Bible to their victims in order to justify sexual acts with them. Lanning received several counter-arguments that the Christians who commit such crimes as these have only “misunderstood” and “distorted” their religion, while Satanists who commit crimes are following their religion to the letter. In response to this, Lanning made the following point:

Who decides exactly what “satanists” believe? In this country, we cannot even agree on what Christians believe. At many law enforcement conferences The Satanic Bible is used for this, and it is often contrasted or compared with the Judeo-Christian Bible. The Satanic Bible is, in essence, a short paperback book written by one man, Anton LaVey, in 1969. To compare it to a book written by multiple authors over a period of thousands of years is ridiculous, even ignoring the possibility of Divine revelation in the Bible. What satanists believe certainly isn’t limited to other people’s interpretation of a few books. More importantly it is subject to some degree of interpretation by individual believers just as Christianity is. Many admitted “satanists” claim they do not even believe in God, the devil, or any supreme deity. The criminal behavior of one person claiming belief in a religion does not necessarily imply guilt or blame to others sharing that belief. In addition, simply claiming membership in a religion does not necessarily make you a member.

The fact is that far more crime and child abuse has been committed by zealots in the name of God, Jesus, Mohammed, and other mainstream religion than has ever been committed in the name of Satan. Many people,

including myself, don't like that statement, but the truth of it is undeniable.

Afterwards, Lanning goes on in his document to define “Satanic murder” as a murder that is committed by two or more individuals who rationally plan out the crime, and whose *primary* motivation for such is to fulfill a Satanic ritual calling for the murder. And to this date, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been unable to identify even *one* documented Satanic murder, by this definition, in the United States of America.

It should be clarified that Lanning does not discount the possibility that someone could abuse a child while using Satanism or Satanic themes as a device with which they can manipulate the victim; but he makes it clear that this would *still* not mean that all Satanists everywhere are naturally disposed to such behavior. Even *Christianity* can be used as such a manipulative device; but do all Christians abuse children as a tenet of *their* ritualistic practices?

There has been at least one example of a person who *did* use Satanism as a manipulative device for child molestation. This person was a man by the name of Russell Smith, also known as Reverend Sorath, who was a law enforcement officer, as well as the founder of his own Satanist group, the Order of Perdition. In 2002, it was discovered that Russell Smith had been sexually molesting his own daughter, and upon being discovered in this vile behavior, Smith grabbed his daughter and made a run for it across the country. As a matter of fact, Smith's story was told on *America's Most Wanted*, and John Walsh made sure to point out that Smith was a member of a “Satanic cult” and that he “practiced child molestation as part of his rituals.” Smith was soon apprehended and is now doing time in jail for his crimes. An investigation of Smith's group concluded that he was the only member of the group who was in fact a pedophile, and no other members were charged with any crimes.

The Russell Smith case initiated what is perhaps the most disturbing chapter of the “Satanic Panic” hysteria, and that is when the *Satanists themselves* began to accuse each other of pedophilia and “Satanic Ritual Abuse.” At this time, John Allee, the founder of the First Church of Satan in Salem, Massachusetts, was becoming a highly visible and active leader within the Satanist subculture. Allee, being one who preferred to challenge people's ideas and make them think, included a variety of controversial links on his website as a means to “whet the beginner's appetite for research” and “start many a discussion and debate.” Some of these links included a suicide website, a Nazi propaganda archive, a marijuana reform website and various others. However, Allee made the rather

unfortunate mistake of including one particular link on his website that would cause him to become yet another victim of the “Satanic Panic.” This was a link to the website of the North American Man-Boy Love Association (NAMBLA).

In his online article, [The NAMBLA Files](#), Allee states that he never supported all of NAMBLA’s ideas; rather, he believed that their issues should not be conveniently ignored, but rather discussed openly. However, despite Allee’s stated beliefs in free speech and “free thought,” many people who saw this link on his webpage began to have doubts about his integrity. Allee made sure to include the following disclaimer on his links page:

“List does not necessarily reflect affiliation or endorsement by the FCoS! Use your critical faculties! Draw your own conclusions!”

However, this did not stop other Satanists from wondering about Allee’s motives for including such a link as the NAMBLA website, and allegations were soon being made against him, by *Satanists*, that he was a child molester. This became further intensified in the wake of the Russell Smith case, for it seemed at that time that Satanists were so frightened of the word “pedophile” that they would accuse any Satanist who even *breathed* it of being one themselves. Granted, Allee’s own controversial flair was a major factor in the development of his character assassination; he even admits that he has made statements which are “explosive,” and when such controversial statements are made, people will more often react in line with their emotions than they will with either logic or reason. But regardless of this, the fact remains that there was never any *hard evidence* that Allee was a pedophile, and for a person to be guilty of a crime, there must be *proof* that a crime was even committed.

I used to believe that Satanists were somehow exempt from jumping to illogical conclusions based upon such a lack of evidence, but this situation proved that such a belief is inherently incorrect. For I myself was one of the people who came to believe that Allee was a child molester, until Diane Vera finally made me realize that there was a sufficient lack of evidence to prove such a belief. But the process of my coming to believe in the pedophilia allegations is actually quite similar to the account of what happened in Jamestown, New York during that infamous Friday the 13th of 1988.

In that situation, an entire town of people fell victim to a wave of panic that was based on hearsay and premature conclusions. It was prematurely concluded by some of the townsfolk that, because they had been listening to heavy metal music at a Halloween party, some

of the town's young people were automatically Satanists. It was likewise assumed that since there was "Satanic activity" going on in the area, a victim of ritual murder would turn up sooner or later. The townspeople who did not actually believe these things at first eventually *became convinced*, by the strong convictions of their loved ones and their neighbors, that the town was really being besieged by murderous Satanists.

Likewise, in the 2002 matter with John Allee, an entire community of people fell victim to a wave of panic that was based on hearsay and premature conclusions. It was prematurely concluded by some Satanists that, because John Allee had a link to the NAMBLA website on his links page, he was automatically a pedophile. It was likewise assumed that, since there was "pedophile activity" going on within the subculture, a victim of child abuse would turn up sooner or later. The Satanists who did not actually believe these things at first eventually *became convinced*, by the strong convictions of fellow Satanists, that the Satanist subculture was really being besieged by a child molesting Satanist.

The reader should need no further evidence that even Satanists can fall victim to a mob mentality, and that even Satanists can wrongfully accuse *each other* of "Satanic Ritual Abuse." But thankfully, just as it has been proven by Special Agent Kenneth Lanning that most claims about "Satanic Ritual Abuse" are completely unfounded, it has also been proven that the claims about John Allee's own involvement in "Satanic Ritual Abuse" are completely unfounded.

If there is a lesson that is to be learned from all of these various events, and from the long and detailed history of beliefs that people have had about murderous, child molesting Satanists, it is surely that the entire idea of "Satanic Ritual Abuse" is extremely DANGEROUS. It is dangerous due to the fact that it motivates people -- even Satanists -- to be overly concerned about *imagined* forms of child abuse, thereby diverting their attention from *genuine* cases and causes of abuse. It is dangerous because it leads us to jump at shadows and to accuse our own brothers and sisters of heinous crimes that have never happened. It is dangerous because it eclipses the belief in the idea of "Innocent until proven guilty," and therein lies *the death of critical thought*.

If you or anyone you know has reason to believe that someone may be sexually abusing a child -- no matter what religion the person may be, and no matter what context in which the child might be sexually abused -- it is your duty as a *human being* to weigh your suspicions with the evidence. A person is innocent until they are

proven guilty in a court of law. If there is no evidence of a crime being committed, then there is no case. Even if your next door neighbor is a Satanist who makes his or her children participate in Satanic prayers and daily Black Masses, you do *not* have a case for accusing them of “Satanic Ritual Abuse” until you can produce some hard evidence that the children are being harmed. Even if a Satanist should include a link on his or her website to a questionable group like NAMBLA, you do *not* have a case for accusing them of “Satanic Ritual Abuse” until you can produce some hard evidence that the person in question is in fact harming any children! Human beings, being the often simple creatures that they are, will often make sweeping overgeneralizations about various groups of people that they do not like. Such overgeneralizations are completely immoral and harmful, and even if you make them in the name of “God” and Jesus Christ and goodness, you are committing a crime against your very humanity! Even if you make them in the name of *Satan*, you are *still* committing a crime against your very humanity!!

“Innocent until proven guilty” is a good principle to keep in mind not only regarding accusations of serious crimes, but also in one’s dealings with people in general. We should try to avoid jumping to conclusions of any kind about our fellow Satanists -- especially about people we’ve met only on the Internet and not in real life. I would suggest being skeptical about all rumors and especially about anything that any Satanist leader says about any other Satanist leader, given the high degree of competitiveness amongst Satanist leaders these days. Also, in your own personal dealings with other Satanists online, please try to avoid both extremes of being either (1) overly trusting or (2) paranoid. Don’t be too quick to trust *anyone* with personal information or anything else important. Take your time getting to know people before you consider them to be friends. At the same time, when some friend of yours seems to disappoint you, don’t be too quick to jump to the conclusion that the person really is guilty of whatever. Too many people in the Satanist scene have lost friends and gotten into bitter feuds over really stupid misunderstandings.

By the blessed wisdom of the Great Dragon, may all who have read this article be touched, and may their eyes be opened, so as to know “Good” and “Evil,” and to live and breathe like unto the gods. Amen!

A WORD OF INSPIRATION TO MY FELLOW SATANISTS

IF you are a theistic Satanist or Devil worshiper, you have probably been told at various times, by fundamentalist Christians, that our Prince and other demons wish for nothing more than to hurt and destroy us. Such claims are part of a rising trend among some Christians, who make these claims in an effort to intimidate theistic Satanists into converting (or, in some cases, re-converting) to the Christian faith. These people believe that they are doing a good thing and that they are helping people by making these claims, but as a Diabolator I perceive this behavior as nothing less than a form of religious terrorism. My particular interest in writing this article is to reach out to any theistic Satanists out there who have been forced to withstand such attacks against our God, and who may now be harboring feelings of doubt or confusion, caused by this talk about demons hating us and wanting to kill us.

To my fellow theistic Satanists:

Do not be afraid. Contrary to what Christian fundamentalists and fanatics would have you believe, the Prince of Darkness is a good spirit who loves His children dearly. I have known and felt His love for at least the past seven years. I have invoked Him many times in ritual, and each time I have felt the presence of a wise and ancient spirit who loves me completely, and who wants nothing more than for me to attain happiness and to be successful in life. Instead of telling me that I am a sinner for being the creature of this earth that I am, and making me beg forgiveness for sins that I have never even committed, this spirit embraces me for all that I am - both for my good qualities and for my deficiencies, at the same time. This spirit teaches me to rejoice in my flesh, and to think for myself, and to determine truth and error for myself, and to be who and what Nature has made me to be, instead of what some Bible-thumping preacher wants me to be. And do you know who this spirit is, friends?

His names are many. He is Azazel, the goat of the wilderness, who inspires man to build his cities and to take charge over his own destiny. He is Belial, the god of this world and of earthly happiness and achievement. He is Satan, the supreme enemy of all blind dogmatism and conservatism. He is Lucifer, the majestic Nightspirit who brings the Light of Dawn. He is the Prince of Darkness. And do you know what He stands for, this Prince of Darkness?

He stands for YOU, and for YOUR power to take charge over your own life, to be the best human being that you can be, and to find happiness here on earth, instead of in some faraway imaginary paradise. He stands for YOU and for the beautiful child of Nature that YOU are.

If there are any Satanists out there who are feeling confused or hurt by the claims that have been made against our Prince by fundamentalist Christians, I assure you; there is no truth in these claims whatsoever. Our Prince is a mighty spirit, and our enemies have good reason to fear Him. But those who love Him have no reason to fear, for we are of His essence. And like Him, we shall forever be strong in the darkest hours of the Night.

May the Dark Prince bless and keep you all.

FOR SATANIST READERS WHO
HAVE BEEN AROUND A WHILE

“SATANISM” VERSUS “DEVIL WORSHIP”

Author's Note: I would SIN-cerely like to thank [Boboroshi, SOD of the COE](#), for the great deal of help given in revising and improving the clarity of this document.

It has come to my attention that the subject of Devil Worship has once again become a heated debate in some corners of the Satanist scene. I would like to take this time to voice my thoughts on just what I consider Devil Worship to be, and what my position in this long-standing debate actually is.

Now I consider myself a Satanist, for a variety of reasons -- I agree with a bit of Crowley, a bit of LaVey, a bit of Aquino, and even a bit of King Diamond -- but I identify with the term first and foremost because I believe in a supernatural being named Satan, and I religiously worship Him as my god. To be true, this definition of the term “Satanist” is not entertained by the majority of Satanists, as most would seem to have a problem with the tricky subjects of theism and “worship.” Hence, in this context, I am perhaps more specifically described as a [Theistic Satanist](#) (theistic meaning “to believe in a deity”). But even though I accept the term “Theistic Satanist”, I actually *prefer* the term “Devil Worshiper.” This automatically brings up two very important questions:

(A) Who/what is the Devil, and

(B) How does one worship the Devil?

First, I will explain my understanding of what the word “Devil” means. Naturally the word can have many possible meanings and is often used to refer to any number of things. The word itself is etymologically derived from the Greek “diabolos,” which means “One who throws across,” describing a person or thing that creates obstruction for someone or something else. When it is spelled with a lowercase “d,” it can be used to describe more than one mythological character (e.g., the Egyptian Set, the Persian Ahriman and the Buddhist Mara can all be called “devils”). However, when the word is spelled with a capital “D,” then more often than not it is being used to refer specifically to the spiritual entity that Christians have traditionally referred to as Satan, Lucifer, the Prince of Darkness, the God of this World, *and* the Devil.

Now many people involved in modern alternative religions (and even some who are *not* involved in such) will distinguish between such names as “Satan” and “Lucifer” as belonging to entirely

separate entities or concepts. "Satan," it is said, is simply the Jewish concept of an adversarial angel that works *for* Yahweh (as in the book of Job), while "Lucifer" is merely a Latin name for the planet Venus in its role as the morning star. While it is true that these are the original meanings behind these two terms, the fact remains that both names have been *adopted* by the Christian tradition -- along with such titles as "Prince of Darkness," "God of this World" and "Devil" -- as names for a *single entity*. And despite whatever arguments about the historical origins of these terms, *this* is indeed how the terms are most generally used in modern Western culture -- whether the historical purists like it or not.

Disregarding whatever original meanings and implications these various terms might once have possessed, Christians have traditionally used them to describe a single supernatural being who is essentially described in their theology as being (1) the instigator of all differentiation from and obstruction against "the Word of God," and (2) the ruler over the terrestrial world in which we live. More simply, this entity is most often described as a "God of Evil." However, I consider the term "Evil" here to be far too simplistic and subjective. It is not a noun, but an *adjective* which expresses a subjective value judgement imposed upon something that is really neither "good" nor "evil" in and of itself, but beyond such moral terminology. However, I would say that I view this entity as being "good" in the sense that it continually entices the subjective mind into determining "good" and "evil" -- i.e., truth and error -- by and for itself, as a functioning individual entity. This, rather than the alternative: allowing the subjective mind to be pressured or "bullied" into accepting externally-imposed determinations of truth and error (e.g., "the Word of God," etc.) which may run contrary to objective reality.

I would also describe this entity as "good" in that it tempts us to entertain a healthy appreciation of the carnal, mundane world in which we live, as well as of our very own flesh and blood (rather than seeing such things as obstacles to "spiritual enlightenment" or "salvation"). However, I recognize that even though I see these things as "good," I am just as guilty of imposing my own subjective value judgment upon these things as Christians are of imposing *theirs*. The value judgments are opposite to one another; (1) placing emphasis on self-determined morality, or moral/intellectual independence, rather than upon divine revelation of a prescribed morality, is considered sinful by Christians; and likewise, (2) placing emphasis on living for this world and one's life in the flesh over any concept of life after death is also considered to be a wayward path.

Both are “of the Devil,” and on this I would happen to agree. Rather than “re-defining” the Devil, I am simply *re-evaluating* Him -- re-interpreting what He is and what He does as being “good” rather than “evil.” Indeed, just looking at the Christian Bible itself, one can find plenty of things that Jehovah does that can be described as evil in a modern context, and even some things that Satan does that can be considered either good or ambiguous at best in a modern context.

Regardless of the original usage of the terms “Satan,” “Lucifer” or “Devil,” these terms are used synonymously by Christians for the very same entity, and it is this entity that I worship -- even though I believe that this entity *will also* answer to other, non-Christian names (including the names [Apep](#) and [Set](#)).

Now that I have explained what I mean by “Devil,” I will go on to explain what I mean by “worship.” To me, the word worship means simply “to express ardent love and devotion to someone or something.” This is the definition that can be found in Webster’s dictionary. Other people might have other definitions for the word worship, but when I describe myself as a Devil Worshiper, I mean that I am:

A person who expresses ardent love and devotion to the supernatural being who is maligned and feared by Christians as (1) the author of all heresy and unorthodoxy and (2) the ruler of the terrestrial world.

(As differentiated from someone who simply “grovels before the God of Evil” -- whatever “Evil” is supposed to mean herein).

This is to say that “Devil Worshiper” and “Theistic Satanist” are really synonyms. They mean the same thing. If you’re not comfortable with the term “Devil Worshiper,” you don’t have to use it -- but you should indeed respect the persons who do decide to identify with this term, for the simple fact that they DO worship the Devil, and what they do IS a kind of Satanism.

Some people in Satanism have gotten into this ugly habit of using the term “Devil Worshiper” as a scapegoat term. Many Satanists, in attempting to defend their religion, will claim that the crazy people in Satanism are not really Satanists, but “Devil Worshipers.” They further claim that Devil Worship is something completely separate from Satanism and even un-Satanic.

Most of the crazy people in Satanism call themselves Satanists, not Devil Worshipers. In fact even the Norwegian Black Metal Circle, which is perhaps the most notorious criminal Satanist organization in history thus far, officially identified themselves as “Satanists” and

NOT as “Devil Worshipers.” (Some of them later identified as Odinists and Neo-Nazis.) Not all of the crazy people in Satanism even believe that Satan is an actual being, much less a being to be worshiped; thus, scapegoating such people as these with the term “Devil Worshiper” does not make any consistent sense.

It also makes the people in our subculture look extremely ridiculous when Satanists make public statements such as “Satanism is not Devil Worship, and Devil Worship is un-Satanic.” As far as most people outside of our religion are concerned, Satanism and Devil Worship are synonyms. To a Satanist like myself, they ARE synonyms. I have actually spent a great deal of time talking to some Christian apologists over the past several months, and even they think this “Satanism vs. Devil Worship” debate is absolutely hilarious. As far as they are concerned, the Devil Worshipers are the “true” Satanists because we are the only ones who admit to worshiping the Devil. When Satanists try to say that Devil Worship is NOT Satanism but something else, it makes us come across as sounding very stupid and naive to outsiders.

Another problem is that, by attempting to isolate the crazy people in Satanism and glue a new term onto them and say that “They aren’t really Satanists, they’re this new term we’ve glued onto them,” we actually make things worse for ourselves in terms of public relations. Every religion has its share of crazy and irresponsible people who cause trouble. Satanism is no exception, although a great many Satanists these days seem to think that Satanists are somehow “morally superior” to people in other religions, to such a degree that anybody who commits a crime or a wrong cannot possibly be a Satanist. (!) When we Satanists say such things and use such reasoning with the public, we are not only making ourselves look more ridiculous, but we are also making it look like we’re trying to hide something from the public. A better strategy would be for us to admit that such people ARE Satanists (or at least that they identify as such) and that we Satanists, like other religions, have our fair share of rotten vegetables. Naturally it is important for us sane Satanists to distance ourselves from the insane Satanists and to point out the differences, but we cannot prevent the insane Satanists from calling themselves Satanists. We don’t own a copyright on the word.

It always strikes me as funny that so many Satanists are more than happy to point out the various horrible things that have been done in the names of Christianity and Islam and to use such things as “evidence” that all people in these religions are psychopathic monsters; yet at the same time, Satanists generally do not want to

admit that such psychopathic monsters can exist even in OUR religion. Just as a Christian will say that the Inquisitors were not really Christians, a Satanist will say that the members of the Black Metal Circle “weren’t Satanists.” The Satanist of course expects that his wish for the Black Metal Circle to NOT be considered Satanism will be well-met, but at the same time he continues to drag out the Inquisitors as a prime example of “what Christianity stands for.” This hypocrisy is absolutely revolting, and using the term “Devil Worshiper” as a scapegoat term for the psychopathic monsters in our midst is EQUALLY as revolting.

Now of course, when you are an atheistic Satanist, it makes perfect sense that you would want to differentiate between atheistic Satanism and Devil Worship. Naturally, an atheistic Satanist is truly NOT a Devil Worshiper. But atheistic Satanists also do not own a copyright on the term Satanism, and there are plenty of Theistic Satanists willing to argue with them if such a claim is ever made. It is not only wrong, but flat-out detrimental for Satanists to claim that “Devil worship is NOT Satanism.” It would be much better and more truthful to say that “There are many kinds of Satanism and Devil Worship is just *one* of them.”

So of course it is logically consistent for atheistic Satanists to want to distance themselves from the term Devil Worshiper. But what really gets me scratching my head is when THEISTIC Satanists start yelling their heads off about how “evil” and “spooky” Devil Worship is. Some of these people, who believe in Satan and worship Him (or at least revere Him somehow), claim that the word “Devil” is “too Christian” and that by allowing yourself to be called a Devil Worshiper, you are in fact trapping yourself in a “Judeo-Christian mindset.” This strikes me as being very silly, especially when one remembers that “Satan” and “Devil” are both commonly used in Western culture (which is predominantly *Christian*) as synonyms for the same entity. If you think that the word “Devil” is too “Christian,” then why continue using the term “Satan”? Or even “Satanist” for that matter?

The Prince of Darkness, whether His followers like it or not, is an adversarial spirit who apparently enjoys creating trouble for the Judeo-Christian/Islamic paradigm. I believe, as do many other Theistic Satanists, that Satan is actually a pre-Christian pagan god of some sort, and that He transcends the limitations placed upon Him in Judeo-Christian mythology. However, this does not mean that the modern day importance of His Judeo-Christian aspects should be denied. If you ignore these aspects entirely, then you might as well just be a pagan and not a Satanist at all. This is because the Prince of

Darkness, as *the Devil*, enjoys creating obstruction and opposition against perceived orthodoxies -- and the most prevalent orthodoxies in Western culture happen to be those of Christianity. And if you take away the part about creating obstruction and opposition against perceived orthodoxies that are relevant to modern Western culture, by trying to ESCAPE the terms that modern Western culture most generally uses for such, are you really following the same deity?

Whether you believe that Satan was originally Set or Ahriman or Prometheus or Pan, you have to admit that the names SATAN, LUCIFER and DEVIL are perhaps the three most well-known (and *relevant*) names for His Majesty in today's Western culture. This is inescapable. If you have an abhorrence for Judeo-Christian names for this entity, then you are defeating the entire point of calling yourself a Satanist. Satanists who complain about the term "Devil Worshiper" sounding too "Christian" ought to realize that the very word "Satanist" itself was FIRST COINED by the Christians. The term "Satanist" really does not sound any more positive or negative than the term "Devil Worshiper" as far as the general public is concerned. In fact, sensationalist news articles that report about "Satanic crime" make a point of using the word "Satanist" instead of "Devil Worshiper" -- simply because it takes up less space on a newspaper.

Some have even argued that Devil Worshipers are all just "reversed Christians" who believe that the universe is eternally divided between two supreme powers -- basically the same "Good vs. Evil" nonsense, just reversed. The truth of the matter is that the term "Devil Worshiper" really does not preclude any particular ideology or paradigm to which the individual practitioner "must" adhere. It simply describes something that one *does*, and makes no inherent mention of any particular ideology or paradigm. There are many possible interpretations of who and what the Devil is and how one should worship Him, which therefore means that there are many different possibilities concerning what a Devil Worshiper can believe. Some might see the Devil as one god among many (polytheism). Some might see Him as the only god that exists (monotheism). Some might see Him as being one with all things (pantheism), and some might actually see Him as one of two gods locked in cosmic combat (duo-theism). The term "Devil Worshiper," by itself, really is not limited to either of these possible paradigms, and it should be regarded as being open to all of them. If reference to a particular paradigm is desired, it will be necessary to make use of an additional adjective in conjunction with the term "Devil Worshiper" -- e.g., "polytheistic Devil Worshiper," "pantheistic Devil

Worshiper,” “monotheistic Devil Worshiper,” “duo-theistic Devil Worshiper,” etc. Therefore, claiming that *all* Devil Worshipers are necessarily duo-theistic is a completely bogus claim.

In reality, there are no more justifications for the use of terms like “Witch,” “Satanist,” or “Devil Worshiper” as descriptions of religious rivals, whether within any single religious group or among extended siblings. The practice of such slander should be seen for the sociopolitical maneuvering that it is and eshewed as repugnant, while a reflection of *self-description* should be regarded with the proper respect that it deserves.

I sincerely hope that more Theistic Satanists will become interested in identifying themselves as Devil Worshipers, and that together we can become a more visible subcategory within Satanism. No more should we allow for the term “Devil Worship” to be used as a scapegoat term by our fellow Satanists.

So come on all you Devil Worshipers! Come out of the closet! Let’s worship the Devil and rock and roll!

SATANIST APOLOGETICS

THE word “apologetics” is derived from the ancient Greek word *apologia*, which means, “an apology.” It does not mean “an apology” in the modern sense of the word (e.g., “I’m sorry”). Rather, it means “an apology” in the ancient sense of the word -- which is to make a reasoned defense of something or someone. In ancient times, the word apology referred to the case a lawyer would make on behalf of his client.

The term “apologetics” is most often used in the context of Christianity. Christian apologetics, essentially, is the defense of the Christian faith in the “marketplace of ideas.” Specifically, the point to Christian apologetics is to train an individual Christian in responding to questions and/or attacks made against their faith. Christian apologists are taught to view such situations -- i.e., when they are questioned or attacked -- as opportunities to share the “Truth.”

I would like to propose the idea of Satanist apologetics. That is, I propose the idea of determining a systematic method of making reasoned defenses of Satanism in the “marketplace of ideas.” However, there would be a very strong difference between Satanic apologetics and Christian apologetics. The ultimate motive behind Christian apologetics is to spread the faith by making convincing arguments that would seem to neutralize competing ideologies. In my view, the ultimate motive behind Satanist apologetics should NOT be to spread the faith, but rather simply to defend it -- just as the word “apologia” indicates. We would not be attempting to convince people that Satanism is the correct religion, or that Christianity and other religions are “incorrect.” Our point in practicing Satanist apologetics would be simply to address various claims that are made about our religion -- such as the babykiller myths --and point out the illogical bases for these claims by preventing evidence to the contrary.

In the past I have made observations of what usually happens when Satanists speak with Christians. What usually seems to happen is this: the Satanist, feeling angered and resentful due to pre-existing Christian biases against Satanism, essentially structures his/her arguments against the Christians as attacks on their faith. More often than not, the attacks become personal, sprinkled with all manner of personal insults and blasphemous statements. Of course it is only natural that a Satanist would want to make blasphemous

statements, but such is actually detrimental for all of us in general. All that it does is make us look like a bunch of angry kids. When a Satanist approaches his/her Christian opponents in such a manner, he/she really does NOTHING to combat the pre-existing Christian biases that he/she feels resentful toward. All he/she does is FEED the pre-existing biases, making the situation worse for Satanists.

In recent months I have spent a great deal of time conversing with Christians, and I have elected to employ a different methodology in formulating arguments against their claims. I have observed that the situation will, more often than not, be automatically improved if the Satanist in question walks into the situation with (1) a friendly and polite attitude, and (2) a willingness to refrain from using personal insults and/or blasphemous language. When a Satanist enters into a debate with one or more Christians, it is **extremely important** that the Satanist go out of their way to remain cool, rational, and respectful at all times. EVEN when the Christians do not reciprocate this attitude.

Satanists typically think in terms of “Do unto others as they do unto you.” Which would suggest that when a Christian is mean to you in a debate, you are automatically obliged to reciprocate their nastiness. This simply does NOT work. All that it does is pour more gasoline into the fire. A much better strategy is for the Satanist to continue asserting themselves politely and respectfully, no matter how much nastiness they are subjected to. The reason why? It is certainly NOT to “turn the other cheek.” The reason why is because OTHER people who may be overhearing the conversation, or reading it in a forum, will tend to side with the person who is behaving most rationally. If the Satanist gives in to the nastiness coming from the other side, this only makes it look to third-party observers like everything that is generally believed about Satanists is actually true. If the Satanist remains respectful, even when his/her respect is not reciprocated, any third-party observers will likely notice that the Satanist is behaving more rationally than his Christian opponent(s). And by doing this, the Satanist helps to improve the image of Satanism in people’s minds considerably.

Another important point is that the Satanist needs to make it abundantly clear to his/her opponents that he/she is NOT trying to “convert” them. If you get into an argument with a Christian opponent, the best thing is to tell them, upfront, that you respect their right to their belief. Tell them that they have a **fundamental right** to believe as they do, and that you have no problem with them exercising that fundamental right. Tell them that your purpose in discussing Satanism with them is NOT to somehow “prove” that

Satanism is right and Christianity is wrong. Make it specifically clear to them that your purpose is ONLY to debunk the common myths about Satanism. The point is not to make them agree with your religious beliefs, and it will be necessary for you to make this clear to them (you should probably get used to having to repeat yourself). The point is simply to prove to them that, as ridiculous as they might find our religious beliefs to be, we are human beings just like them, and we deserve to be treated and thought of as such. Trust me, if you make this clear to a Christian that you are having an argument with, and you make it clear to them RESPECTFULLY, your debate with them will be much more successful than it would be otherwise.

Another thing: refrain from making any theological assertions. In many discussions with Christians I have had to describe my belief system to them, and indeed I have done this. But in doing this, I have managed to refrain from asserting my beliefs as objective facts. I have been extremely careful in voicing my beliefs as being my own subjective opinions. Of course, to me they are NOT subjective opinions -- but as with persons of all other religions, there is very little objective evidence with which I can defend my beliefs. Therefore, I have found that it is best to avoid asserting beliefs as objective facts. Refraining from doing this protects you from having to prove any assertions. When a person makes an assertion, the burden of proof is automatically placed upon THEIR shoulders. In acting as a Satanist apologist, it is highly important that you do not allow the burden of proof to be placed on your shoulders, and you can avoid this by preventing yourself from making any theological assertions during the discussion. (This is not to say that you shouldn't make any assertions at all -- obviously it is a good idea to assert that Satanists are generally law-abiding citizens, but this can be easily proven. You have only to direct them to such resources as The Satanic Bible, the Temple of Set's General Information and Admissions Policy letter, and James Lewis' "Satanism Today.") Remember, the point to Satanic apologetics is NOT to argue over theological beliefs, but simply to argue against the supposed criminal deviancy of Satanists.

A good thing about voicing your beliefs as subjective opinions is that, if an opponent demands that you "prove" to them that your beliefs are true, you can point out to them that you never asserted your beliefs as objective facts in the first place. Therefore, the burden of proof is not on your shoulders. If, and ONLY if, your opponent argues that Christianity has a stronger basis due to having Biblical evidence on its side, then you can demand that THEY

present you with proof of THEIR assertions. You can quite easily counter such an argument by pointing out that there is no objective evidence to prove that the Bible presents a completely factual account of spiritual reality, and that the very bedrock of Christianity -- and indeed of any theistic religion -- is faith. You can then point out that your opponent is choosing to put their faith in what essentially amounts to just another subjective opinion. If your opponent argues that you do the same thing -- that all you have is your faith and your subjective opinions -- then you can easily say, "That makes us even."

MY DEVIL WORSHIP

THE OLD DRAGON

IN conventional religion, it is **the illusion of certainty** which keeps people chained; “I know this because the Bible tells me so,” “I know that because the Koran says so,” etc. It is the folly of religion that it is built upon speculations of cosmic reality which are dogmatically asserted to be objective facts, without any evidence. And such a mentality leads to cognitive stagnation. Any attempts to subvert such stagnation (as in “playing Devil’s advocate”) are met with fierce and irrational tribalism. By challenging the “certainty” of the Bible, you are not just “blaspheming against God”; you are threatening (and, more importantly, TEMPTING) the quarantined imagination with the prospect of the Unknown. In their attempts to tame, sanitize, and “exorcise” the Unknown, most human animals cling to their petty dogmas and doctrines; for it is the “illusion of certainty” which keeps the Demons at bay (or so they think). In the most extreme forms of this phenomenon, we find such explicitly dangerous manifestations as militaristic theocracy and “jihad.” Such it has been since humans first found time to wonder what happens to the Sun after it sets each evening.

But the Old Dragon, in His might, rises from the limitless depths and sneaks into the minds of human critters, putting all sorts of weird and unforeseen thoughts into their imaginations. He does this through all manner of things; He communicates to us through the natural world, through animals, through our families, our friends, our televisions, our computers, our radios. Perhaps He even gets to us through the shades of the dead. Either way, He plants thoughts in our minds, sowing the seeds of discord and dissent; ever tempting us to question what we hold to be certain. His interest is in subverting any and all notions of cosmological certainty, and to continually remind us that, although knowledge is power as they say, knowledge is **fluidic**. By having the “ideological rug” swept from under our feet, we are forced into a process of continuous re-orientation with ourselves and all things. And this continuous re-orientation, though maddening, allows for mutation, selection, and evolution; for only the thoughts and worldviews which are best adapted to the ever-changing circumstances of reality may survive His intervention.

Those who hand the end of the rug to our chthonic Rug-Puller and invite Him to work His will upon us may be initiated into ever higher levels of wisdom; for only by accepting the fluidic nature of human knowledge, and only by constantly testing the limits of such,

may our intellectual power be made to evolve. But those who attempt to banish the Old Dragon with inane incantations to their petty gods of “revealed truth” become lost in their frustration. They may be in the majority, and they may have the sympathy of whatever norms are currently in place; but it is always those few who hand the end of the rug to the Rug-Puller who determine the majorities and the norms of the **future**. The Old Dragon is only destructive and “evil” to those who cling desperately to their speculations of “absolute certainty”; to the seeker who constantly lusts to shed his own self-created light upon the mysteries of this world, the Dragon is nothing short of **divine**.

And whether we believe in or worship the Old Dragon or not is inconsequential to Him; in fact, it serves His purposes all the more smoothly if we do not. Some of us just can’t help ourselves. :-)

MY DEVIL WORSHIP 101

THE following is cannibalized from a post I made elsewhere, in which I described some crucial aspects of my belief system and the particular teachings that I have passed on to my apprentice, Drogoth. I should point out that he's not really my apprentice anymore; having been in this hair-brained idea of a "tradition" for almost three years now, Drogoth has proven that he is capable of handing down the teachings to someone else and that he is a model example of what I look for in a fellow Devil worshiper. So I have long since recognized him as my brother and equal in the faith.

(LOL, "faith" is a funny word.)

Anyway, the following is a brief description of some of the things I have taught my brother in the faith, and what we intend to teach other unsuspecting young lambs that happen to come our way, heh heh heh!

====

Our beliefs have elements of Deism, hard polytheism, and the African-based Diaspora religions. Our rituals are based purely and simply on expressing reverence for the Prince of Darkness and various demons, and communing with them while in prayer. We don't really practice any sort of ceremonial magic, nor do we even do anything as complicated as a traditional black mass; you might call us "Satanic Quakers" because we believe simplicity is best. (LOL, how 'bout "the Society of Fiends"?)

(On the other hand, we do get rather loud sometimes. It's not unusual for us to crank up a Kiss album on the car stereo while we go running through the woods at night, screaming like banshees and acting like we're possessed. Also, we enjoy making ritual sacrifices to Satan all the time - in the form of fried chicken, watermelon, and pumpkin pies.)

The central idea of our belief system is that, while more popular gods want to enslave our minds and our bodies to their perverse dogmas, the Old Dragon wants us to exercise our freedom of both. Therefore, anything that you do that gives you mundane pleasure is not only an act of pleasing yourself, but also an act of worshiping the Prince. And if this sounds too easy, this is where the exercising the freedom of your mind part comes in. We believe that the Prince of Darkness continually puts us into situations in which we are FORCED to re-think everything we believe - including the things we believe about HIM! It's important to Him that all dogmas be challenged,

including those that center around Himself. So we will often find ourselves poring over philosophy books and debating over various metaphysical questions. It tends to become quite restless; in fact, you could call it a sort of Hell. Thank Satan for the carnal aspect, at least that part's easy enough!

But seriously, I believe that the Dark One truly wants all dogmas to be questioned, including (especially!) Satanist dogmas. And so I teach my student that it's okay to experience moments of doubt in Satanism, or to question one's faith, and that these are GOOD things. By questioning our faith and challenging our own ideas, we are also worshiping the Prince of Darkness. And by going out and getting OTHER people to question their faith and challenge their ideas, we are also worshiping Him. As Devil worshipers who call Satan our Lord and Master, we believe very firmly that it is our mission in life to make both ourselves and other people THINK as much as possible. You might say that we enjoy desecrating "mental graveyards." And trust me, this has an ugly habit of earning us more enemies than friends...

We also believe that the Prince of Darkness wants us to do what we can to fight persecution, wherever it might exist. So whenever we find a Christian saying false things about Satanism or Wicca or whatever, we point out the facts. Whenever we find an atheist saying false things about Christianity, we point out the facts. Whenever we find a Wiccan saying false things about Satanism, we point out the facts. Even when we find a **Satanist** saying false things about Christianity, we point out the facts. This also has an ugly habit of earning us quite a few enemies.

When my student first approached me about wanting to be taught by me, I didn't know what to say. All I could think about was how difficult it has been, being a Satanist. Having friends become my enemies, losing potential lovers because I follow a "spooky" path, and perhaps most difficult of all, having the ideological rug pulled out from under my feet whenever the Old Dragon apparently thinks I've grown too complacent in my beliefs. The first thing I told my student was, "I have to be honest with you. This is a very difficult path to follow. You're going to lose friends. There will be many times when you will really feel like you're alone. There will be times when you won't even be completely sure of what you believe. There will be times when you will be forced to live with your uncertainty."

Well, he decided he wanted to dedicate himself anyway, so I initiated him all right...And it's been almost three years now. Just a few months ago, he told me, "Boy, when you told me how hard this was going to be, you sure as Hell weren't lying!"

LIONS AND SATANS AND CHRISTS, OH MY!

NONE of the gods we humans worship are really cosmic gods; they are just spirits who form relationships with people. Some of these spirits are friendly to humans, while some of them are unfriendly. There is not a one-to-one correspondence between these spirits and the names we use for them; different spirits can answer to the same name, and some of them may even pretend to be each other *for whatever reason* (e.g., in order to create further conflict between human followers). It is evident that not all of the spirits like each other; in fact, many would seem to be outright opposed to each other.

In trying to understand the spirits that we individually have relationships with, we have to use whatever terms are most meaningful for us as individuals. And in our attempts to determine whether somebody else is following the same spirit we do or not, we have to remember that “By their fruits ye shall know them.”

The spirit I have felt in touch with my entire life is a dark spirit; I have always felt closest to Him during the nighttime hours and the autumn and winter seasons. Even before I realized He was there and before I could put a name to Him, I subconsciously knew that *something* was there.

It wasn't until I met my first Bible-thumping Christian that I began to recognize the presence of this spirit for what it is. When this Christian explained to me the nature of the particular spirit he had his relationship with, I knew right then and there that his spirit represented many of the things which I am against. I told him, “If this is what your god is like, then I'd rather worship the Devil.” And I was joking at the time, but later I would realize that in the deepest part of myself, I was actually serious. The spirit that I feel in tune with is against everything that the fanatical Christian spirit wants. Therefore, it makes sense for me to call this spirit Satan, since that is what fanatical Christians call the chief spirit who is against theirs.

Later, I would discover that this spirit of mine also likes to be called Set, even though I don't think it is identical to the ancient Egyptian spirit that was called by that name. It also likes to be called Azazel. I believe this spirit enjoys being called by a wide variety of names, all of them relating to darkness and the unknown.

However, in recent years I have come across some people who claim to worship Satan, but who disagree completely with the things that my spirit would seem to stand for. In fact, some of these people

actually agree with many of the things that *the spirit of fanatical Christianity* stands for. It is as if they actually follow the spirit of fanatical Christianity, but they call it “Satan” instead of “God.” And for all intents and purposes, this spirit seems more than happy to play the part of “Satan” for them. It is evident that the spirit I follow is not the only spirit who can answer to the name “Satan,” even though I may feel that I have better reason to call my spirit Satan than these other people do.

Perhaps the most significant way in which I can tell these people follow a different spirit is that, rather than opposing religious fanaticism outright, they *mimic* it. These Satanists proclaim that the *Al-Jilwah*, a religious text written by the Yezidi Kurds (which is only the introduction to a larger text known as the *Mishaf Resh*), is the “Word of Satan” to which all Satanists must adhere. They say that anyone who does not accept the *Al-Jilwah* as such are not really Satanists. Anyone or anything which counters or disagrees with the *Al-Jilwah* is treated as a spiritual threat.

They also claim that intellectualism is an *obstacle* to understanding Satan, rather than a useful tool for understanding Him (of which He approves). Instead of viewing Satan as an anarchic spirit of heresy and liberty, they preach that He is an authoritarian ruler who demands strict obedience and conformity of belief. What’s more, they believe that Satan requires blood sacrifices to be made in His honor.

And although they are quick to voice an uncompromising hatred for any and all persons who claim to follow the god of the Bible, they actually do *nothing* to combat Christian fanaticism in real-world terms. In fact, it can be said that they *contribute* to Christian fanaticism, by giving the fanatical Christians precisely what they want: a group of Satanists who regularly kill animals in their rituals.

I believe that people who have relationships with spirits will be moved and “animated” to think and behave in certain ways which are consistent with the wills of those spirits. And judging from the way that these Satanists feel moved and “animated” to think and behave, the spirit they follow (if they have indeed contacted one *at all*) is completely different from the one that I follow.

The spirit I know as Satan encourages me to refrain from viewing any and all so-called “channeled texts” as being statements of absolute truth. He encourages me to not feel threatened by people who think differently from myself. He fills me with a passion for the pursuit of intellectual power and independence, rather than for rejecting such as an “obstacle.” He strikes me as a Trickster spirit who likes to inspire “spiritual lawlessness” rather than “spiritual

authoritarianism.” He encourages me to befriend those Christians, Muslims and Jews who are not subject to religious fanaticism. He has not *once* ever demanded that I kill an animal or make any kind of blood sacrifice for Him; in fact, I get the idea from Him that He would not be too happy with me if I did.

And perhaps most important of all, He inspires me to do everything I can to fight against religious fanaticism in all of its forms, especially among the people in my own religion. First by refusing to mimic it; and secondly, by endeavoring to speak out against those who preach it, and to provide as best an example for others as I can.

The fact that I am being moved to think and believe differently from these so-called “orthodox” Satanists (which I feel is a contradiction in terms!), indicates to me that the spirit I call Satan is most certainly distinct from the one which they follow. “By their fruits, ye shall know them.” And just as I can tell that a person is *not* moved by the same spirit by which I am moved, I can also recognize when a person is being moved by the same spirit.

I feel that the Satan by which people such as myself are moved is much, much closer to being the “real” Satan than that of the “orthodox” Satanists. This is because Satan is traditionally regarded as the enemy by Christian and Islamic fundamentalists of nearly all kinds (whereas the more liberal Abrahamics typically do not even believe in Satan, and thus apparently do not experience Him as an enemy). Even from the Biblical perspective, Satan works to *oppose* what is perceived as being “the one true way.” In my view, any Satanist who *reinforces* fanatical Christian views of “the one true way” is not truly being moved or “animated” by the spirit that these fanatics have traditionally called Satan.

Just as I am not moved by the same spirit by which my fanatical counterparts are, there are Christians in the world who do not seem to follow the same spirit that *their* fanatical counterparts follow. Such Christians seem to believe in some of the very same things I believe in, such as gay rights and freedom of religion. And they are not any less passionate about their relationship with the spirit they follow than I am about mine. Some of these Christians have suggested that they and myself are actually following the same spirit, and that I am just foolish for calling it Satan.

I find this to be false; I just know in my gut that the spirit I follow is not the same one that any Christian calls “Jesus.” Spirits that answer to the name “Jesus” seem to be oriented chiefly with light, and even if they are associated with some of the same things as my spirit, they are nonetheless more focused on such things as

forgiveness, redemption, and the idea of resurrection after death. The Jesus that some people follow would seem to be agreeable with my Satan in some respects (e.g., a belief in treating people right, and in being compassionate to others), but this does not mean they are identical.

The spirit I follow is much more oriented toward darkness. Although I may believe in such things as forgiveness and being good to people, these do not form the basis of my relationship with the Satan I know. Instead, individuality, carnality, and intellectual independence are the basic cornerstones of this relationship.

Some Christians may find these cornerstones to be agreeable with their own worldviews, but they are not actually considered to be cornerstones of their faith. Rather, these ideas take a level of secondary importance behind the Christian cornerstones of forgiveness, redemption and resurrection after death. Conversely, the ideas of forgiveness and goodness take a level of secondary importance to my own cornerstones, while I do not consider the idea of resurrection after death to possess any importance at all.

Another point is that the Satan I follow is a wild and *anarchic* spirit, while the Jesus that more progressive Christians follow would seem to be a much gentler and more *restrained* spirit, but who does enforce some rules. For instance, the spirit they call Jesus is believed to be the “one and only true god,” and the only “god” that can grant people true spiritual happiness and fulfillment. In the Bible, the character of Jesus claims that he is “the way” and that those who do not know him will never find “the kingdom of heaven.” This implies that the Jesus spirit is advertising himself to be worshiped by entire masses of people.

But in my experiences with the spirit I call Satan, I do not believe that He has ever wanted to be worshiped by entire masses of people. Rather, my Satan seems to be most at home with just a *minority* of worshipers. He seems to prefer remaining “behind the scenes” and elusive from the majority of humanity. He does not attempt to advertise Himself as the “one true god.”

And whereas the spirit of progressive Christians is best associated with calm and orderly church services on bright Sunday mornings, the spirit I follow is best associated with wild and bacchanalian Witches’ Sabbaths in dark, deserted areas. Even the “wild” church services of the more charismatic Christians do not hold a candle to the unrestrained frenzy of a good Satanic spiritual experience.

Therefore, I take any Christian’s claim that I am “more suited” to following Jesus with a grain of salt. Their Christ is simply *not* the

dionysian party animal that my Devil is, and I'm sorry, but if I'm going to worship a spirit as my god, it had better be a dionysian party animal spirit! And I sure don't see Jesus participating in any witches' orgies... (Dark Lord forbid!)

It would seem that not all Satanists are really following the same "Satan," and not all Christians are really following the same "Christ." Considering my pluralist view of the spirit world, and my belief that there is not a one-to-one correspondence between spirits and names, this only makes sense. It would appear to be completely impossible to know *for sure* who is following whom these days. But I feel that we must each use the names and titles that are most meaningful to us regarding the spirits by whom we feel moved, and that we can recognize others who follow the same spirits we do "by their fruits."

A COMPARISON OF THE EGYPTIAN APEP WITH THE CHRISTIAN SATAN

INTRODUCTION

FOR many years, I have researched many different world mythologies in the hope of someday proving that Satan, the Christian Devil, was originally known under a different name by a pre-Christian civilization. My research was particularly focused upon the study of ancient Egyptian religion, for I was determined to find a link between Satan and the Egyptian god Set that would prove substantial.

I am certainly no professor of archaeology, nor do I even have any kind of degree in the subject. But I have conducted my research for almost ten years now, and I can safely say that I still have not found any evidence to prove any such connection between Satan and Set. In fact, it would seem that identifying the Christian Satan with any particular pagan deity is a rather risky venture that requires a leap of faith.

However, during my research, I have come to believe that there may be a connection between Satan and another Egyptian deity who was called **Apep**. And, while I am skeptical of most Satanist identifications of Satan with other deities, I feel it is sensible to identify Satan with Apep in particular. Although even this identification requires a leap of faith, I believe that my leap of faith in this regard is significantly smaller than those of some other Satanists.

The purpose of this document is to explain my reasoning for identifying Satan with Apep, to explain my reasons for thinking such an identification to be sensible, and to cite my sources for my conclusions.

APEP

Apep was believed, by the ancient Egyptians, to be a powerful Snake Devil of darkness and rebellion who lived in the underworld, or in some accounts, the waters of Nun (i.e., primordial chaos). According to some versions of the mythology, he was present in the world even before the Sun God rose up from chaos to create the Earth. This is expanded upon by Caroline Seawright in her online article, [Apep, Water Snake-Demon of Chaos, Enemy of Ra...](#):

Apep (Apepi, Aapep, Apophis) was a demon of the underworld, in

the form of a giant water snake. It was believed that he was created when Nit spat into the primeval waters of Nun. He was the enemy of the sun god, trying to stop him as he travelled on his barque through the underworld each night. He was so powerful that little could defeat him, and even then, he was back again the following evening to threaten Ra. He was a demon outside of ma'at, the opposite of order, a demon of darkness and chaos.

Seawright also mentions that Apep was called "Evil Lizard," "Enemy of Ra," "World Encircler" and "Serpent of Rebirth." In his book, *Egyptian Magic* (pg. 171), E. A. Wallis Budge mentions a long list of names that were given to Apep in the *Egyptian Book of Overthrowing Apep*:

"Tutu (i.e., Doubly evil one), Hau-hra (i.e., Backward Face), Hemhemti (i.e., Roarer), Qetu (i.e., Evil-doer), Amam (i.e., Devourer), Saatet-ta (i.e., Darkener of earth), Iubani, Khermuti, Unti, Karauememti, Khesef-hra, Sekhem-hra, Khak-ab, Nai, Uai, Beteshu, Kharebutu the fourfold fiend," etc.

There are similarities between Apep and other "chaos dragons" of Near Eastern mythology, such as the Sumerian Tiamat and the Hebrew Leviathan. A comparison can even be made with the Norse Midgard Serpent, whose name was Jörmungand. But there are also major differences.

For instance, there is nothing in either Hebrew scripture or in Norse mythology to indicate that either Leviathan or Jörmungand were regarded as sentient entities. No ancient texts have been found in which either of these creatures are depicted as possessing the ability of speech - a characteristic that often implies personal intelligence in mythology.

And in Sumerian mythology, Tiamat only posed a threat **before** the creation of the world; the creator god Marduk fashioned the world from her remains, so she was never considered to pose a **present** danger in the Sumerian mythos. Stephanie Dalley's translation of the Sumerian *Epic of Creation* describes this in some detail:

The Lord [Marduk] trampled the lower part of Tiamat,
With his unsparing mace smashed her skull,
Severed the arteries of her blood,
And made the North Wind carry it off as good news.

His fathers saw it and were jubilant: they rejoiced, arranged to greet him with presents, greetings gifts.

The Lord rested, and inspected her corpse.
He divided the monstrous shape and created marvels (from it).
He sliced her in half like a fish for drying:

Half of her he put up to roof the sky,
Drew a bolt across and made a guard hold it.
Her waters he arranged so that they could not escape.

But the Egyptian Apep was considered to be a **clear and ever-present danger** in all levels of Egyptian society. He posed a genuine threat to the Sun God, Ra, and his company of gods, for it was believed that each night, when the Sun God descended into the underworld (which was the Egyptian way of explaining nightfall), the Snake Devil would attempt to disrupt the passage of the solar barque. He even attempted to devour the Sun God, as is remarked upon by Egyptologist Lewis Spence in his book, *Ancient Egyptian Myths and Legends* (pg. 131):

In Apep we have a figure such as is known in nearly every mythology. He is the monster who daily combats with, and finally succeeds in devouring, the sun.

And unlike Leviathan or Jörmungand the Midgard Serpent, Apep was hardly just a giant snake. He was a conscious entity, an actual god, and the opposition he posed toward the Egyptian pantheon was **deliberate**. This can be seen from the following quotation from an Egyptian text, mentioned in *Myth and Symbol in Ancient Egypt*, by R. T. Rundle Clark:

[Apep cries out, after being bashed up by Set, that he will conform to the divine will:]

“I will perform your will, O Ra, I will act properly, I will act peacefully, O Ra!”

[During the fight with Horus, Set loses his testicles ... Apep then taunts Set with this:]

“But what you felt is worse than the sting of the scorpion. What Ma’at did to you was so dire that you will suffer from its effect forever! You will never go courting, you will never make love!”

Obviously, Apep would not be depicted as speaking, like the other gods are, if the Egyptians did not imagine him to be sentient as the other gods were imagined to be.

It is said that at times, Apep would temporarily win against Ra, which was the Egyptian way of explaining such things as solar eclipses and thunderstorms. E. A. Wallis Budge writes in his book *From Fetish to God in Ancient Egypt* (pp. 126 - 127):

[Apep] was believed to cause thunder and lightning, hurricanes, sand storms, rain storms, eclipses, fog, mist, and darkness.

Because of this, it is fairly typical for most modern Westerners to dismiss the idea of Apep as simply the creation of a primitive imagination, which bears no real theological meaning. But Apep was far more than just symbol of darkness and thunderstorms.

THE SONS OF THE SUN

The Sun God, Ra, was believed by the Egyptians to be the ultimate Creator of all things, upon whom all order and goodness in the universe depended. Without Ra, it was believed that the entire world would collapse back into a primordial state of nothingness. And it was believed by the Egyptians that this is precisely what Apep intended by attempting to overthrow the Sun God.

However, we must also consider that Ra was not just a Sun God for the Egyptians; he was also a patron of divine kingship. Ra, and other solar deities such as Horus (who were often identified with each other as the same deity, as in the composite deity Ra-Horakhte - "Horus of the Two Horizons"), were perceived to be the primary deities of societal order, the "world-fashioner" and lawgiver gods, who established the role of human government within the perceived "natural order of things" (i.e., Ma'at). The sun god was believed to have been incarnated within the very first Pharaoh of Egypt, and because of this, he was considered to be the founder of Egyptian government. Lewis Spence wrote:

Undoubtedly the best parallel to the worship of Ra in Egypt is to be found in that of the sun in ancient Peru. Just as the monarch of Peru personified the sun on earth, and acted as his regent in the terrestrial sphere, so the Egyptian monarchs styled themselves 'sons of the sun.' In both instances the solar cult was eminently aristocratic in character. This is proved by the circumstance that the paradise of Ra was a sphere more spiritual by far than that of Osiris, with its purely material delights. Those happy enough to gain the heaven of the sun-god were clothed with light, and their food was described as 'light.' The Osirian paradise, again, it will be recalled, consisted of converse with Osiris and feasting with him. Indeed, the aristocratic caste in all countries shrinks from the conception that it must in the afterlife rub shoulders with the common herd. (Spence, 134)

The Pharaohs were not only considered to be kings by the Egyptians; they were believed to be **gods incarnate**, meaning that their rulership was essentially a theocracy. Again, this is demonstrated by the following quotes from Time Life Books' *TimeFrame 3000 - 1500 BC: The Age of God-Kings* (pp. 57 - 59):

The word *pharaoh* means simply "great house," and one of the missions of the first pharaohs was to establish their spiritual supremacy over all the other influential houses of the land . . . The tale of primal conflict and restitution not only provided a religious

rationale for the power wielded by the pharaoh but also helped fuel a royal obsession with death and mortuary rituals.

At no time in the history of Egyptian civilization was Egyptian government completely separate from religion. Not only were the Pharaohs considered to be gods, but the priesthoods also possessed political power. The modern American phrase, "Separation between church and state" would mean nothing to an ancient Egyptian.

We may ask ourselves why the Egyptians would have considered it such a difficult task for the sun to rise, especially in the climate of Egypt. One might better understand this type of thought originating in northern Europe. There is no doubt that the Egyptian's fear of Apep definitely included a fear of nighttime darkness; but evidently, this was not all there was to it. Considering that the Pharaohs were believed to be incarnations of the Sun God during life (i.e., you had to worship the Pharaoh in order to worship the Sun God), then Apep's opposition to Ra was not just some distant battle to consume the sun itself, but a clear and present danger against **all of the avenues** through which the Sun God intervenes in the human world. And since the Pharaohs were one of these avenues, and perhaps the most **essential** one at that, then Apep would be just as opposed to them as he was to Ra himself.

Ra was evidently understood to be more than just the sun itself in the Egyptian imagination. The sun was merely one of his manifestations in the visible world (another being the Pharaohs); he was also an invisible being (Amen) who acted as the patron of kingship and society. And, of course, the Egyptian society was very theocratic in nature. So it is evident that the Egyptians' fear of Apep was a fear that **society itself** would collapse due to the destruction of the gods. And here, "gods" includes political leaders.

Therefore, Apep's opposition against Ra, and his continual attempts to overthrow and devour the Sun God, were not just a cute mythological way of explaining eclipses and thunderstorms. The Egyptians believed that Apep would be satisfied with nothing less than overthrowing the universe **as they knew it**.

APEP IN EGYPTIAN RITUAL

We know that Apep was not simply dismissed as a fairy tale by the Egyptians themselves, because each and every night, the priesthood of Ra would conduct rituals which were believed to ward off the influence of Apep and to assist Ra in his victory. Such rituals would include making images of snakes out of wax, spitting on the images, reciting abusive prayers against them, and burning and

mutilating them. This ritual was to be performed each night at sundown, as well as at midnight and just before the dawn. In E. A. Wallis Budge's *Egyptian Magic*, the Egyptologist again quotes from *The Book of Overthrowing Apep* (pg. 81):

If thou wouldst destroy Apep, thou shalt say this chapter over a figure of Apep which hath been drawn in green colour upon a sheet of new papyrus, and over a wax figure of Apep upon which his name hath been cut and inlaid with green colour; and thou shalt lay them upon the fire so that it may consume the enemy of Ra. And thou shalt put such a figure on the fire at dawn, and another at noon, and another at eventide when Ra setteth in the land of life, and another at midnight, and another at the eighth hour of the day, and another towards evening; [and if necessary] thou mayest do thus every hour during the day and the night, and on the days of the festivals . . . and every day. By means of this Apep, the enemy of Ra, shall be overthrown in the shower, for Ra shall shine and Apep shall indeed be overthrown.

Whereas the other Egyptian gods had to conform to the laws and limitations of Ma'at, Apep was the only Egyptian god who was believed to exist **entirely outside** of Ma'at; that is, he was believed to exist apart from the natural order.

Although it was believed that Ra typically vanquished him, Apep was so powerful that he could never be completely defeated. He would always return again each night for a new battle with the Sun God. And he was so powerful that apparently, the Egyptian gods **required the help of human beings** to keep him at bay. Hence the popularity of such exorcism-like rituals as the one mentioned above.

COUNTERING AN EGYPTIAN-BASED RECONSTRUCTIONIST VIEW OF APEP

The members of the [House of Netjer](#), an Egyptian-based reconstructionist group which refers to its religion as "Kemetic Orthodoxy" ("Khem" is the name the ancient Egyptians used for their own country), say the following about Apep in their online Glossary of Netjeru:

Apep (GR Apophis) - (actual translation unclear; the Romans believed it to mean "He Who Is Spat Out") While outside of the creation of Tem and thus technically not a part of Netjer [i.e., the Kemetic Orthodox idea of "God"], Apep is yet a part of the universe; that part which constantly seeks its dissolution and destruction.

I would counter this statement by elaborating that Apep constantly sought the dissolution and destruction of the universe **as**

the Egyptians understood it. The Egyptians indeed believed that the world would end if the Sun God were annihilated; but in my view, the removal of their primary deity does not necessarily mean **literal** dissolution and destruction of the universe outside of an Egyptian theological worldview.

The entire Egyptian cosmology works upon the assumption that what its primary deity claims about himself is true -- i.e., that he is the Creator, the primary source of all order in the universe, and the highest of all gods that exist. His subsequent claims about Apep are also assumed to be true; Apep is supposedly a threat against the entire universe. But all this is really no different from the biblical god, who also claims to be the Creator and the source of all order in biblical scripture. And **his** subsequent claims about Satan are also that He is a threat against the divine order, which must constantly be opposed.

In other articles on this website, I challenge the popular views about Yahweh. Here, I will challenge the popular views of Ra. Why is it assumed by Kemetic pagans that what the Egyptians believed about Ra is true? Because Ra personally revealed it to them? Or because Ra personally revealed it to an ancient Egyptian that they have never met? If either of these is the case, why is it assumed that Ra was **telling the truth**?

I believe that if there is indeed a Creator god at all, It is highly unlikely to take even a remotely personal interest in human beings. And I believe that any spiritual being that evidently does take a personal interest in human beings must surely be a smaller-than-cosmic entity. This viewpoint is called [Post-Copernican natural theology](#).

It may be argued that Ra is somewhat of a less personal Creator god than Yahweh, but this does not serve any argument against my point. Ra would still have to take somewhat of a personal interest in humans if he were to reveal himself as “the Creator” at all to the ancient Egyptians, and this is exactly as he is depicted in the mythology. For instance, the narrator of the Egyptian creation story is supposedly the Sun God himself. But assuming that this is truly an inspiration from some kind of spiritual being, how is anybody really sure that this spiritual being is really what he says he is?

I do not agree with the ancient Egyptians that Ra created himself, or that he “split apart” the ocean of “nothingness” so that he could create the entire world, or that all order in the universe depends upon his existence, or that the lack of his existence would spell out the ultimate annihilation of all things. Even if Ra really

does have anything to do with the sun literally (as opposed to just using it as a personal symbol for his cult), it has been proven since the days of Copernicus that the universe does not revolve around our sun anymore than it revolves around ourselves. Sure, the destruction of the sun would be the subsequent destruction of us -- but the entire universe? No. The universe would go on just fine without us, **and** our sun.

If Ra is not the Creator god, then this means that the universe will **not** collapse if he is overthrown by Apep. If anything, it means that a spirit trying to control his flock through deception will be overthrown, and the humans he once controlled through superstition will be freed from his grasp. In this light, Apep's work against Ra may very well mean the end of the world -- but only for worshippers of Ra.

As a Devil worshiper, I think that any personal deity who claims to be the Creator is a liar, and I would sooner trust the god who is believed to oppose him, who does not make any claims about himself, and who allows himself to be scapegoated by everybody. I put my faith in Satan over Yahweh because, unlike Yahweh, Satan doesn't make claims about Himself, and He allows people to scapegoat Him all they want. Even according to the traditional Christian beliefs, Satan does not care whether human beings believe in Him or not. In my perspective, this demonstrates that Satan's ego is made of much stronger stuff than Yahweh's, which would appear to be quite fragile.

Likewise, Apep apparently never bothered to make claims about Himself to a cult of followers in Egypt. He seems to allow Ra and the other gods to spread whatever beliefs about Him they want. And He apparently does not care whether people believe in Him or not, as they do not have to believe in Him for Him to battle the Sun God. For the same reasons that I am inclined to put my faith in Satan over Yahweh, I am also inclined to put my faith in Apep over Ra, or any other self-proclaimed "Creator god."

Apep was considered to be a force that was **alien** to Egypt, and which brought foreign influences that continually threatened the stability of the Egyptian lifestyle and worldview. The Egyptians also feared Apep because he was essentially trying to overthrow the rulership of Deity in human politics. He therefore represented not only a fear of the destruction of the entire universe, but also a xenophobic fear of foreign influences, and a theological fear of **secularism**. To the Egyptian imagination, the idea of government apart from the gods -- i.e., secular government -- was quite unthinkable. It naturally would have painted images of apocalyptic

death and destruction in their minds. But it has since been proven in recent centuries that secular government is **not** exactly the end of the world.

The House of Netjer website goes on to say:

Apep is characterized as an 'evil serpent' in some texts, but it must be remembered that for Kemetics this is not a personalized evil, such as the Christian or Islamic concepts of "devil."

Why would the Egyptians have depicted Apep as a character who speaks, as with their other gods, if they did not perceive him to be some sort of personal entity? Why would they believe that Apep was a clear and ever-present danger, which they were required to **personally** help the Sun God in fighting through rituals, if they did not believe that Apep was somehow personalized? Such an idea is inconsistent. If one believes one must personally take a role in fighting the "evil," then that "evil" naturally becomes personal to them. Therefore, the Egyptians most certainly **did** see Apep as a personalized "evil." And as I shall explain in further detail below, the Egyptian concept of Apep is indeed **strikingly** similar to the New Testament concept of Satan.

THE DEMONIZATION OF SET

The only one of the Egyptian gods who was believed to be powerful enough to fight Apep face-to-face was Set. Before he became demonized, Set was believed to be Ra's divine protector in the solar barque, and much like the Norse god Thor with the Midgard Serpent, Set would be the one to actually wrestle with Apep. For instance, Set is quoted as saying the following to Apep in Clark's *Myth and Symbol in Ancient Egypt*:

"Apep, O Enemy of Ra! Turn your face away! Ra hates the very sight of you." [Apep's head] is then cut off, hacked in pieces and thrown away on either side of the roads ... "Your head is crushed, O Groundling! Your bones are broken up and your flesh cut in pieces. Ra has consigned you to the earth, O Apep! Enemy of Ra!"

But war between the cults of Set and Horus, and the forceful establishment of rulership by the Horus cult, led to Set becoming demonized within the Egyptian imagination:

Thus the ruler of Naqada in Upper Egypt derived his authority from the truculent god Seth, pictured as a fierce, long-snouted beast, and the chieftan of a nearby Nekhen secured strength and cunning from the falcon-god Horus. In time, myths associated with these local deities were combined to form a compelling legend that told of a bitter power struggle and celebrated the emergence of a god-king

for all Egypt. (McNeill, 57)

Afterwards, the foreign Hyksos invaders, who identified Set with their own god Sutekh, took over the Egyptian government. Due to the strong Egyptian distaste for foreigners (much less being ruled by them), Set became further degraded as a “god of evil” within the Egyptian imagination. Later, he would be blamed for the murder of Osiris, who had previously died of drowning:

It was probably about the Twenty-second Dynasty that the worship of Set began to decline, and that he took on the shape of an evil deity. The theory has been put forward that the Hyksos invaders identified him with certain of their gods, and that this sufficed to bring him into disrepute with the Egyptians. (Spence, 101)

At this time, Set, who had previously been the divine protector against Apep, became **aligned** with Apep in the Egyptian imagination. In some cases, some of the Egyptians apparently believed that Set was merely an aspect of Apep (or quite possibly vice versa). But whereas Set was sometimes worshiped as a positive deity, there is **no evidence** that Apep was ever worshiped at any point in Egyptian history. All the available evidence shows that he was only ever worshiped **against**.

According to [A History of Christianity in Egypt](#) on the [Tour Egypt](#) website, the final dethroning of the god-king Pharaohs was by the Roman Empire, well prior to its conversion to Christianity. The ancient Egyptian beliefs had already been effectively destroyed long before the cult of Christ was born. This is why the Egyptians were so quick to convert to Christianity when Mark went proselytizing down there in the early part of the first century AD. It was also because many of the beliefs of Christianity were already familiar to them (e.g., resurrection of a god-man, judgment of the soul after death, etc.).

It does not require that much of a stretch of the imagination to think that “Satan the Great Red Dragon who makes war against the Woman who is clothed with the Sun” (Revelation 12) would have sounded familiar to the Coptic (i.e., Egyptian) Christians, or that they would have identified such with “Apep the Dragon of Darkness who makes war against the Sun God.” The fact that the Dragon is described as “red” in Revelation may also have reminded them of Set, particularly in his demonized role as an aspect of (or replacement for) Apep in Osirianism. It is interesting to note that the kingship of the Pharaohs was finally overthrown by the Romans, whose government would be described as being under the control of “Satan the Great Red Dragon” by the early Christians. This will be

explained in further detail below.

SATAN IN THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS

In the Old Testament, the concept of Satan as we currently know it is non-existent. The “satan” of Job is hardly an adversary of the Jewish god, but merely an angel who serves him, and who works to test the faith of Yahweh’s followers. From the online [Jewish Encyclopedia](#):

Yet it is also evident from the prologue [of Job] that Satan has no power of independent action, but requires the permission of God, which he may not transgress. He can not be regarded, therefore, as an opponent of the Deity; and the doctrine of monotheism is disturbed by his existence no more than by the presence of other beings before the face of God.

By the time of the New Testament, a completely new idea of Satan from that of the Old Testament emerges. In the NT, Satan is described as a “great dragon” (Revelation 12:9) whose **number one goal** is to create and encourage competition against the Christian church, to **secularize** it, and to lead people away from the god of the Bible. Or, as Revelation 12:9 says, to “lead the world astray.” He is not a mere servant who tests Christ’s followers; he is an “evil dragon” who has declared war against Christ and the saints. How and why did this change in the understanding of Satan occur?

One of the common traditional Christian terms for the Devil is “that Old Serpent” or “that ancient Serpent” (Revelation 12:9, 20:2). Now, if you ask any Bible-thumping Christian where this terminology comes from, they will most likely tell you that it is a reference to the Genesis story, in which Satan, as a serpent, tempts Adam and Eve to eat the Fruit of the Tree of Knowledge (Genesis 3:1), thereby condemning them and their descendants to lives of sin and godlessness.

However, this does not make any historical or scriptural sense. Nowhere in Genesis does it actually identify the serpent with Satan. This idea that the snake was Satan was a **much later** development that did not reach full fruition until **well after** the advent of Christianity. From *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, edited by Mircea Eliade:

Genesis (3:1ff.) mentions the serpent but not Satan; in Romans (16:20), however, Paul suggests that the serpent was Satan, an association already made in apocalyptic literature. This would imply that Satan tempted Adam, but the consensus of early Christian

tradition was that Satan fell after Adam (Russell, 1977, p. 232). There may be good reason for believing that not until Origen in the third century CE was it clearly established that Satan's sin was pride, that he fell before Adam's creation, and that he was the serpent in the garden of Eden.

According to Bernard McGinn, a Professor of Historical Theology and History of Christianity at the University of Chicago, one of the major elements that led to the conceptualization of a "Devil" in Judeo-Christian thought was the tradition of the ancient combat myths, concerning a creator god's struggle against the "dragon of chaos." In other words, the stories of Marduk battling Tiamat, Ahura Mazda battling Ahriman, Ra battling Apep, and Zeus battling Typhon were adapted by the Jews to serve their own religious purposes. McGinn writes in his *Antichrist: 2000 Years of the Human Fascination With Evil* (pg. 26):

The use of such mythic language is heightened in the Psalms (for example, Ps. 77:16 - 19), where we find the monster named as Leviathan (Ps. 74:14 - 15, Ps. 104:26) or as Rahab (Ps. 89:9 - 10). The book of Job also refers to both Rahab (9:13) and Leviathan (3:8, 7:12, 40:25 - 41:25) as opponents of God. Perhaps the most powerful use of the mythic paradigm comes in Isaiah 51:9 - 10, where Yahweh's imminent deliverance of his people from their exile in Babylon is placed in the perspective of the cosmogonic struggle:

"Awake, awake! Clothe yourself in strength, arm of Yahweh. Awake, as in the past, in times of generations long ago. Did you not split Rahab in two, and pierce the Dragon through? Did you not dry up the sea, the waters of the great Abyss, to make the seabed a road for the redeemed to cross?"

The distance between this text and the apocalyptic, future-oriented use of the mythic combat pattern [in the book of Revelation] is not great.

In other words, these Near Eastern and Mediterranean "combat myths" about a creator god battling the Dragon of Darkness were also adapted by Christians for their own religious purposes, as will be further elaborated upon below.

However, McGinn points out that many of these ancient combat myths were similar only in fragmentary ways, which is undoubtedly true. If we compare the New Testament Satan to the other dragons of the earlier combat myths, we find some major differences between them. As I have already mentioned, the Sumerian Tiamat was believed to have been already defeated before the beginning of time, and was therefore not considered by the Sumerians to be a clear and present danger. The same holds true with the Greek

Typhon, who was defeated and buried beneath the Earth by Zeus prior to the creation of humans. And neither the Hebrew Leviathan nor the Norse Jörmungand were considered to be **sentient** entities who **consciously** opposed their respective enemies.

ZOROASTRIANISM AND THE PERSIAN AHRIMAN

The idea of a full-blown Devil would not enter the Judaic imagination until after the Babylonian Exile, when Zoroastrian dualism inspired some of the Jews to believe in a powerful supernatural adversary of their god. From Robert E. Hume's *The World's Living Religions* (pg. 200):

Of all the other nine extra-Biblical living religions, Zoroastrianism is the only one from which a definite religious belief has been borrowed and included in the Bible. Consistently throughout the Old Testament down to and including the Isaiah of the Exile, the ultimate source of everything, including evil, is represented as the God Jehovah. But a distinct change took place after the Exile. A comparison of two parallel accounts of a certain experience of King David will show that a post-exilic document (1 Chronicles 21:1) substitutes 'Satan' for 'Jehovah' in the pre-exilic account (2 Samuel 24:1). Thus Satan is not an original feature of the Bible, but was introduced from Zoroastrianism.

According to L. Michael White on [PBS.org](https://www.pbs.org), the Jews had been largely successful in most of their wars up until the Babylonian Exile. But then they were enslaved by the Babylonians under King Nebuchadnezzar, who in 586 B.C.E. destroyed Solomon's Temple and the city of Jerusalem. Afterwards, some of the Jews -- it is not known precisely how many -- were subsequently deported to Babylon.

Forced to admit defeat and to worship their god in a foreign land, the Jews began to question the legendary promises that Yahweh had supposedly given to King David (2 Samuel 3:18). There is no doubt that some of them may have thought that Yahweh had abandoned them, while others thought he was punishing them for their sins. But there was also the greater fear that there might be another god who was even more powerful than Yahweh. Thus did the trauma of having witnessed the destruction of their temple and their holy city turn inward and become theological reflection. (It is interesting to note here that, ever since the Babylonian Exile, the cities of Jerusalem and Babylon are continually used throughout post-exilic scripture -- even in the Christian book of Revelation -- as symbols of the opposition between Yahweh's chosen people and their enemies.)

Babylon was later conquered by the Persians, who released the Jews and helped them to rebuild their city. The Jews subsequently viewed the Persians as having been sent by Yahweh to save them. In particular, Isaiah 44 and 45 refer to Cyrus, a Persian king, as “God’s anointed one.”

The Persians at this time were Zoroastrians, dualistic believers in a cosmic god of goodness (Ahura Mazda) and a cosmic god of evil (Ahriman). Since the Jews believed the Persians had been sent by Yahweh to save them, then naturally they would have taken some inspiration from the Zoroastrian religion. And the idea of a powerful spiritual opponent that works to overthrow the “good” god’s people began to catch on. It provided an explanation as to why Jerusalem was destroyed: because the Babylonians were receiving help from Yahweh’s ultimate spiritual opponent, who is described in the post-exilic scriptures as a mighty dragon.

Similar to Tiamat and Apep before him, the Persian Ahriman was another “dragon of darkness” who had to be battled in order to establish some semblance of order in the world. But as in the other cases, the similarities between Ahriman and other Near Eastern dragon myths are fragmentary. Unlike Tiamat, the battle of Ahura Mazda against Ahriman was not an event in the distant past that had led to the creation of the world. Instead, it was an ongoing battle, like the battle between Ra and Apep, which would supposedly come to an end during a great apocalyptic showdown. This is attested to by Carol and Dinah Mack in their book, *A Field Guide to Demons, Faeries, Fallen Angels, and Other Subversive Spirits* (pg. 167):

The battle between these two has been predetermined to rage for a specific amount of time. The time is divided into eras, each of which lasts thousands of years. After the fourth age of these eras, there will be three saviors who will destroy the forces of Evil. Eventually Ahura Mazda will triumph and the new world will be restored to his rule.

But the mythology of Ahriman is also significantly different from that of Apep. Unlike Apep, Ahriman was largely associated with plagues, diseases, and physical ailments of the flesh, as is explained in Charles W. Waddle’s [Miracles of Healing - The Place of Magic and Miracle](#):

The belief in evil spirits, demons, magic, etc., and the same sort of prayers, incantations, charms, and formal ceremonies to ward off evil or to cure disease, are to be found here as in the Atharva-veda. We are told (61, pp. 219, and 229) how Angra Mainyu, a helper of Ahriman, created 99,999 diseases to afflict men and how they were

defeated by the 10,000 healing plants which Ahura Mazda brought down from heaven, by Airyaman's permission, for the use of Thritha a priest of the god of life and health.

In fact, Ahriman is significantly different from the Judeo-Christian Satan as well. This is because the Zoroastrian religion had a pretty straightforward definition of "good" and "evil"; "good" seems to have been associated in Zoroastrianism with concrete physical benefit to humans (as in medicine), while "evil" was associated with concrete physical harm to humans (as in plagues).

On the surface, this may seem similar to Judeo-Christian notions of "good" and "evil," but it actually is not. For one thing, Satan is never associated specifically with plagues or diseases in the New Testament; the worst things He does in the New Testament is possess people and drive some of them insane (Matthew 8:28, 9:32). In fact, it is **Yahweh** who is reported to send plagues against people (Psalms 105; 135:8, 9; Acts 7:36; Exodus 9 - 12, 29, 30; 1 Samuel 6:4, 5; Leviticus 26:21; Deuteronomy 28:59; Revelations 11:6, 15:1, 6-8; 22:18, 19). If anything, Yahweh is sort of a combination of both Ahura Mazda and Ahriman (e.g., he is identified as "good" like Ahura Mazda, but he is believed to send plagues and harsh judgments against mankind like Ahriman). But Satan is never really associated **purely** with concrete physical harm; more to the point, His alleged number one goal is to "lead people astray" from Yahweh (Revelation 12:9), a **spiritual** "evil" that is considered far worse than any sort of physical injury.

After all, Satan does not exactly own a corner on the market of nastiness in Christian scripture; there are several examples of Yahweh demanding both animal and human sacrifice (Genesis 22:2, Exodus 29:14), as well as ordering genocide and the destruction of human civilization (Genesis 6:17) throughout the entire Bible. In Christian scripture, both Yahweh and Satan are capable of performing both beneficial **and** harmful acts upon humans on a concrete, physical plane. The primary reason why Satan is considered "evil" is simply because He opposes Yahweh and leads people away from worshiping him. And it is even said that He will take the form of an "angel of light" (2 Corinthians 11:14) in order to accomplish this. After all, you can attract more flies with honey than with vinegar.

Ahura Mazda, in contrast to Yahweh, was believed to be an all-benevolent deity who was responsible for everything that was beneficial to humanity on a physical level. Ahriman, in contrast to Satan, really **was** believed to own a corner on the market of nastiness; all physical ailment was said to come from him. So

Ahriman is not only different from the Christian Satan in terms of being associated with plagues and diseases, but he is also different in terms of how “evil” is defined in Zoroastrianism and traditional Christianity. It would appear that Zoroastrianism has a human-centered definition of “evil” (i.e., “If it is harmful for humans, then it is evil; if it’s beneficial for us, then it is good”), while traditional Christianity has a “God”-centered definition of “evil” (i.e., “It doesn’t matter if it seems beneficial **or** harmful to humans; if it’s against God’s will, it’s evil - if it **comes from** God’s will, then it’s good”).

The definition of “evil” was apparently also different for the Egyptians as well, for the “good” god Ra most certainly was not an all-benevolent deity on a physical level. There is a legend in which Ra, during his years as the first Pharaoh of Egypt, became laughed at and ridiculed by his mortal subjects. He grew so displeased with this that he sent the goddess Hathor, in the form of Sekhmet the Lioness, to go out and slay all human beings everywhere. Not only did she happily carry out the Sun God’s orders, but she also enjoyed drinking the blood of her mortal victims:

Long ago there dwelt on earth Ra, the sun-god, the creator of men and things, and ruler over the gods. For a time men gave to him the reverence due to his exalted position, but at length he began to grow old, and they mocked him . . . Now Ra was very wroth when he heard their blasphemy . . . Then did all the gods and goddesses give counsel to Ra that he should send his eye down among men to smite them sorely. And the eye of Ra descended in the form of the goddess Hathor, and smote the men in the desert and slew them . . . All night [she] waded in the blood of those who had been slain . . . (Spence, 167)

Eventually Ra ended up having second thoughts about his decree, and he managed to prevent Hathor from killing everybody by getting her good and drunk. Nevertheless, this legend demonstrates that Ra, like Yahweh, had somewhat of a genocidal streak, and was certainly not “all-benevolent” in a human-centered sense. And in much the same way that Satan is “evil” in traditional Christianity, Apep was really “evil” in terms of challenging the god who was thought to be the highest. So although the concept of a Devil became imported into Judaism through Zoroastrianism, the Christian idea of Satan is much more similar to Apep than it is to Ahriman.

GREEK INFLUENCE UPON THE JUDAIC IMAGINATION

L. Michael White goes on to describe how, after the Jews became influenced by the Zoroastrian culture, Alexander the Great overthrew the Persians and conquered the entire Middle Eastern world. He enforced Hellenistic culture upon the peoples that he conquered. At this time, the book of Enoch was produced, in which Jewish monotheism and a belief in rebellion against Yahweh by supernatural beings were combined for the first time.

From the story of the Titans seeking to overthrow Zeus and the gods of Olympus, the Jews derived their story of Azazel and the Watchers, a group of angels who descend to the Earth, mate with mortal women, and instruct humankind in various arts that Yahweh has supposedly made forbidden to them. It is relatively easy to see that this story may have been strongly influenced by the Greek myth of Prometheus as well.

The Jews originally did not see the Greeks as oppressors, but as benign rulers. But this changed after the Maccabean Revolt around 200 B.C. A Greek king named Antiochus IV had ascended to the throne, and he became a far more oppressive ruler than his predecessors. The Jews were resistant to some of his policies, and to make a demonstration of his power, Antiochus IV blasphemed and vandalized their temple with the “abomination of desolation.” Among other things, he put a pig’s head on the altar of sacrifice. This in turn incited a Jewish revolt against the Greek authorities.

For the first time since their war with Babylon, the Jews found themselves facing an enemy that wanted not only to defeat them, but also to destroy their culture and traditions. In the minds of the Jews, the Greeks became human embodiments of the supernatural forces that sought to overthrow Yahweh, who would be collectively personified by the seven-headed chaos serpent alluded to in their post-exilic scriptures.

The Jews won their war and succeeded in forming a new independent Jewish state, which existed for roughly the next hundred years. But they would later get into a civil war, and the city leaders asked for the Romans to help them in settling the dispute. The Romans ended up occupying the Jews and absorbing them under their own rulership.

ROME AND CHRISTIANITY

According to the online [Illustrated History of the Roman Empire](#), the government of Rome was not established upon any core belief system that prohibited the toleration of other belief systems. Because of this, the foreign cultures that Rome brought under its occupation found it relatively easy to continue living and practicing according to their own religious traditions. This included not only the Jews, but also the cults of Cybele, Osiris and Isis. So long as the people who were made citizens of Rome demonstrated loyalty to the state, they were allowed to worship whatever gods or practice whatever beliefs they liked.

It is sometimes thought that, when Rome was brought under the rulership of the emperors, it came to resemble Egypt in that the emperors were worshiped, much like the Pharaohs were. However, this is not exactly the case. In actuality, an emperor was declared to be a “divus,” which was something like a genius spirit, only **after** his death. The dead emperor would then be worshiped and given sacrifices beside the other gods during popular festivals. Worship of dead emperors was instituted as a means of demonstrating loyalty to the state, but the worship of a living emperor as an incarnate deity was often **not** considered acceptable.

Also, Rome was far less xenophobic than was Egypt, as is proven by the fact that Rome was willing to absorb so many different foreign cultures into its empire. And despite the emperor worship, Rome would appear to have been the closest thing to a secular state that the ancient world had at that point in history.

Mainstream Judaism seemed to blend in well with the surrounding Roman culture, but after a while, Jewish reform groups began to crop up and incite rebellion against the Roman government. One of these groups claimed to have been founded by Jesus Christ, who was believed by his followers to be the Messiah.

The Christians called their namesake “the King of the Jews” and preached that, although he had ascended to the heavens, he would one day return and overthrow the Roman government. He would subsequently install his own theocratic kingdom, the “New Jerusalem” (Revelation 3:12) over the Earth, in which all who refused to accept Jesus as their savior would be thrown into the “lake of fire.”

Because of these beliefs, the Christians became seen as rebels and insurrectionists, and they were persecuted violently at times by

the Roman government. Due to this development, the Roman government became interpreted in Christian apocalyptic texts (such as Revelation) as a vehicle through which the great opponent of Yahweh worked to oppress Yahweh's people. In Revelation 12, the seven-headed dragon is specifically named as Satan.

So let us review what we have so far:

(1) The ancient Egyptians believed in a powerful supernatural being named Apep, whom they identified as a great dragon, and whom they believed sought to permanently overthrow the Sun God.

(2) The Egyptians believed the Sun God to have been the founder of their civilization, which was extremely theocratic in nature; therefore, Apep's attempts to overthrow the Sun God were also considered to be a direct attack against his visible agents in Egyptian government and civilization -- namely, the Pharaohs.

(3) The Romans eventually conquered the Egyptians and overthrew the kingship of the Pharaohs once and for all; they also came to occupy the Jews.

(4) The Jews, after being conquered by the Babylonians and saved by the Persians, began to believe in a powerful supernatural adversary against their god, to whom they alluded in their post-exilic scriptures as a seven-headed dragon.

(5) This dragon would become blamed for the destruction of Jerusalem, the theocratic Jewish city-state.

(6) Throughout Jewish history after the Babylonian Exile, enemies of Jerusalem and "God's Chosen People" would become demonized as agents of the great dragon.

(7) The newborn Christian cult also believed in the existence of a great dragon, whom they specifically identified as Satan; they believed the dragon makes war against Christ, the saints, and Jerusalem, and that it would seek the ultimate destruction of Jerusalem during the battle of Armageddon.

(8) Rome was the closest thing the ancient world had to a truly secular state, and was considered by the early Christians to be a vehicle through which the dragon works His will upon the world.

(9) The Christians believed that Christ would one day return and establish a theocracy under Yahweh that would replace Rome; the center of Christ's government would of course be "the New Jerusalem."

(10) Christ, like the Pharaohs, was considered to be the ultimate human representative of a Creator god, who was the only source of light, order and "goodness" in a world that was constantly under "attack" by the "evil" dragon.

DOMINIONISM AND THE CONCEPT OF JESUS

It is interesting to note that the Egyptians' perception of Apep as being dangerous to the entire universe was significantly due to their highly theocratic culture. It is also interesting to note that the Pharaohs were finally dethroned by the Romans, who were perhaps the closest thing to a secular state in its time. And finally, it's extremely interesting to note that the Roman government was identified with the great red dragon Satan by the early Christians. These things are interesting because they suggest a recurring theme of theocracy versus secularism, with theocracy being symbolized by a god-king, and secularism being represented by a dragon of darkness.

When Christianity was adopted by the Roman Empire as the state religion, the Roman government became more and more theocratic, until the Christian church finally became the primary political power of Western Europe after the fall of Rome in 476 C.E. For many centuries, the church was the only source of political stability within Western Europe. Secular government would not arrive into people's minds until well after the Middle Ages, and quite naturally it was opposed by both Catholic and Protestant churches in Europe.

After the Enlightenment era, the idea of secular government became steadily more popular, even among many Christian groups. This in turn led to such things as the American Revolution, which brought about the birth of what Islamic fundamentalists today call "the Great Satan."

Today, secular government has become the norm in Western culture. But in recent decades, a particular variety of Christian known as the Dominionists have been exerting more of an influence within American society. Dominionists are Christians who believe in re-establishing Christianity as a political and theocratic power within American government. From the [Ontario Consultants on Religious Tolerance](#):

[Dominionism] represents one of the most extreme forms of Fundamentalist Christianity thought. Its followers, called Dominionists, are attempting to peacefully convert the laws of United States so that they match those of the Hebrew Scriptures. They intend to achieve this by using the freedom of religion in the US to train a generation of children in private Christian religious schools. Later, their graduates will be charged with the responsibility of creating a new Bible-based political, religious and

social order. One of the first tasks of this order will be to eliminate religious choice and freedom. Their eventual goal is to achieve the “Kingdom of God” in which much of the world is converted to Christianity. They feel that the power of God’s word will bring about this conversion. No armed force or insurrection will be needed; in fact, they believe that there will be little opposition to their plan. People will willingly accept it. All that needs to be done is to properly explain it to them.

All religious organizations, congregations etc. other than strictly Fundamentalist Christianity would be suppressed. Nonconforming Evangelical, main line and liberal Christian religious institutions would no longer be allowed to hold services, organize, proselytize, etc. Society would revert to the laws and punishments of the Hebrew Scriptures. Any person who advocated or practiced other religious beliefs outside of their home would be tried for idolatry and executed. Blasphemy, adultery and homosexual behavior would be criminalized; those found guilty would also be executed.

Today it is not unusual for us to hear in televangelist programs, such as “The 700 Club,” that “This was originally a Christian country!” and “We need to take America back for Christ!” Not only is this trend for theocracy disturbing, but the opposition toward it, and the encouragement of secularism, is believed to come purely from Satan Himself.

Of course, there are also fundamentalist Christians in the world who do not subscribe to the beliefs of Dominionism, and whose churches are perhaps wrongly considered “theocratic.” They place greater authority on following Jesus and the Bible rather than on remaining loyal to an institution or a public figurehead. And instead of trying to Christianize the political world, they view themselves as an isolated enclave in what is essentially Satan’s domain (for Satan is described as “the God of this World” in 2 Corinthians 4:4), belonging truly to “the kingdom of heaven” (Matthew 7:21) which is “not of this world” (John 18:36).

However, we must keep in mind that in the more apocalyptic forms of Christianity, it is strongly believed that when Jesus returns to Earth, he will establish a one-world theocratic government beneath Yahweh. And we must also remember that Christianity in its earliest forms was an extremely apocalyptic belief system, having grown specifically out of Jewish apocalypticism. Just the idea of Jesus Christ itself is very much like the views of the Egyptians toward their Pharaohs. Jesus is considered by fundamentalist Christians (even non-Dominionists) to have been “the Creator” and the Highest of all supernatural beings incarnated in human form. And, just as

Apep was dedicated to subverting the authority of “the Creator” in the person of the god-king Pharaohs, Satan is dedicated to subverting the authority of “the Creator” in the person of the god-king Jesus. The recurring theme of theocracy versus secularism, with theocracy represented by a god-king and secularism represented by a dragon, remains an extremely important feature of many (though not necessarily all) modern Christian movements today.

COUNTERING SATANIST IDENTIFICATIONS OF SATAN WITH SET

Many Satanists try to identify the Christian Devil with earlier, pre-Christian pagan deities. And some of the identifications they make are not only far-fetched, but absolutely absurd.

Perhaps the number one deity who is identified with Satan by Satanists is the Egyptian god Set. This is usually based upon the claim that the Hebrew word “satan” (meaning “adversary”) is somehow derived from *Set-hen*, an Egyptian cult title which supposedly means “Eternal Set.”

The problem with this assertion is that there is simply no documented Egyptological evidence to support such a belief. First of all, I have never been able to locate the cult title *Set-hen* in any archaeological resource that is available to me. I am willing to allow that perhaps there may be some evidence of this out there **somewhere**, but until I find documented proof, I will remain skeptical.

To my knowledge, the person who first popularized this idea that “Satan came from *Set-hen*” was Dr. Michael A. Aquino, the founder of the Temple of Set. I emailed Dr. Aquino privately through his website, and I asked him if he would be willing to share what his sources are for this postulation. Unfortunately Dr. Aquino, being busy, did not have time to find the information I needed. So I still have not seen any evidence that *Set-hen* was even a name that was used in Egypt. At least, not yet.

It seems to be thought, by the Satanists who identify Satan with Set, that such an identification makes sense because Set was “the original Devil.” To be sure, most Egyptological books that you can pick up at your local Waldenbooks typically refer to Set as “the god of evil” and the murderer of Osiris, without any elaboration on the original positive roles this god played in Egyptian religion. In my opinion, this is due to the fact that most Egyptological books really only skim the surface of Egyptology, and they offer oversimplified views of what the Egyptians believed. Most of them do not mention, for instance, that the Osirian cult evolved at a relatively late period

in Egyptian history, and that therefore Set's role in the Osirian cult was a much later development.

So due to the common misinformation about Set and Egyptian religion in general, it is often supposed that Set was always a Devil-god, and that he was always the chief Devil-god of Egypt. Such is provably false, however, when one considers that Set was originally a positive deity who was prayed to for strength in battling Apep. He was originally Ra's bodyguard and the helmsman of the solar barque, and Apep was the original (and chief) Devil-god before Set.

Many of the Satanists who identify Satan with Set do this so that they can say, "Before He became the fallen angel of Christianity, the Prince of Darkness was worshiped as a **good guy** who **protected** the universe from a monster called Apep." My reasons for disagreeing with this motivation are fourfold:

(1) I don't see the Prince of Darkness as the sort of entity who has ever wanted to be worshiped by large numbers of people. I would not expect Him to have ever been worshiped in any ancient culture. Therefore, if we are to identify Him with a pre-Christian deity at all, it makes the most sense to me that He be identified with a deity that was never worshiped. And Apep, unlike Set, was evidently never worshiped.

(2) Although it is natural for Satanists to believe that Satan is somehow "good" (and indeed we have good reason to believe so), I don't believe Satan has any wish to be popularly understood as a positive deity by the masses. I think He is perfectly happy to play the role of a bogey for conventional religionists. And I feel that, by attempting to make Him popularly seen as a positive deity, we would be whitewashing Him. So if we are going to identify Satan with a pre-Christian deity, I think it ought to be with a deity that was also **consistently** seen as a bogey in the respective culture. Set was not always seen as a bogey, but Apep was.

(3) There were times when the rulers of Egypt were worshipers of Set. As with the Pharaohs who were believed to be incarnations of the Sun God, Setian Pharaohs were believed to be incarnations of Set. Therefore, the cult of Set was **every bit as theocratic** as that of the Sun God. Even mythologically, Set was **defending** theocracy by defending the Sun God from Apep. I do not perceive the deity I worship to be a theocratically-inclined deity at all; I believe that the Prince of Darkness is absolutely **opposed** to theocracy. Therefore, I think it is nonsensical to believe that the Prince would ever have allowed Himself to be worshiped by a theocratic cult in ancient times. Identifying Him with Apep makes a great deal more sense in this respect, precisely because Apep was never worshiped by **any**

cult, and He was **always** perceived to be adversarial toward the Egyptian theocracy.

(4) There is simply no hard, concrete evidence that the Christian idea of Satan was really influenced by Set at all. However, there is a reasonable amount of evidence to suggest that the Christian idea of Satan was influenced by the dragon combat myths, and the one dragon combat myth that resembles Satan the most is Apep.

RECONCILING THE APEP-SATAN THESIS WITH POLYSATANIC THEOLOGY

As I indicate in my article, [Lions and Satans and Christs, Oh My!](#), I am a polytheist who believes not only in more than one god, but also in more than one Devil. I also believe that not all people who claim to worship the Devil are really worshiping the same one. In my article, I suggest that the best way to differentiate between different Devils is by observing the ways that theistic Satanists or Devil worshipers behave in response to their spiritual experiences.

If a Devil worshiper feels that the Devil they follow desires a lot of human attention and worshipers, and wants to be recognized as the “one true god,” then they are following an altogether different entity from the New Testament Satan. The New Testament Satan is a character who leads people away from the “one true god” concept, and who is more than happy to have human beings become atheists or pagan polytheists. There is a famous old saying: “The greatest trick the Devil ever played was in convincing us that He doesn’t exist.” This establishes the traditional Christian view that Satan does not care whether people believe in Him or not; so long as He can lead them away from being under the thumb of the god-king Jesus, He is happy to let them practice whatever non-Christian beliefs they like.

This is extremely different from the “Satan” worshiped by some other Satanists. A minority of theistic Satanists will claim that Satan is “angry” that He is not acknowledged and worshiped by the majority of humankind, and that some day in the future, He will make an apocalyptic demonstration of His power. All who then refuse to worship Him will be punished, and He will subsequently establish a theocratic kingdom over the Earth. Their emphasis on theocracy and one-true-wayism is what differentiates their Devil from the New Testament Satan.

Since the word “satan” is not really a name, but simply a title (meaning “adversary” in Hebrew), then it would be foolish to say

that “there is only one Satan.” Absolutely anyone or anything that takes some kind of adversarial role can be acknowledged as a “satan.” Therefore, I try to avoid getting into theological pissing contests by claiming that the Satan I worship is the “one true Satan.” However, I believe I am on solid ground when I assert that the Satan I follow is the Satan of the New Testament, and that the Satan some of these other Satanists worship is a completely different entity.

Both the New Testament Satan and the Egyptian Apep have strong connections to secularism and “godlessness.” Because of this theme of theocracy versus secularism that is evident in Egyptian, Jewish **and** Christian religion, I feel confident in asserting that the New Testament Satan and the Egyptian Apep are one and the same entity. I must further assert that, whatever spirit the theocratically-minded Satanists may be following, they are not following Apep either. In terms of the question, “Which Devil do you follow?”, I assert that the Devil I follow is the Devil of the New Testament, whom I believe is identical to the original Devil of ancient Egypt.

THE ADVANTAGES OF IDENTIFYING APEP WITH SATAN

There are a number of advantages of identifying the Egyptian Apep with the New Testament Satan:

(1) There is no evidence that there was ever a cult of Apep, and no evidence that he was ever worshiped in Egypt. Therefore, in choosing to identify the New Testament Satan with Apep, a worshiper of the New Testament Satan cannot claim that they are “reviving an ancient religion” that “predates Christianity.” This is an unverifiable claim that is made by distressingly many theistic Satanists. It is important for theistic Satanists to admit that our subculture is a relatively new phenomenon and not some ancient religion in disguise. Identifying the New Testament Satan with Apep, as opposed to identifying Him with other deities like Set or Enki or Ptah, prevents us from being able to claim that we are practicing a pre-Christian religion.

(2) Since Apep was never worshiped, Satanists who identify their Satan with Apep will not have to waste time trying to reconstruct an ancient belief system. For instance, we don’t need to concern ourselves with what sort of rituals might have been practiced by the priests of Apep, or what holidays they may have practiced. This is because there were no rituals or priests or holidays dedicated to Apep specifically. Identifying the New Testament Satan with Apep gives us a great deal of room to play around with new

ideas, rather than having to chain ourselves to old ones. This is in fact quite agreeable with the role Apep played in ancient Egyptian religion as a bringer of strange and foreign influences.

(3) Apep was never described in ancient Egyptian mythology as a “fallen angel,” or a created being who rebels against the Creator. In Egyptian religion, Apep was considered to be an **uncreated** being who exists entirely apart from the Egyptian Creator deity. Satanists who wish to divorce themselves from the “Satan as a fallen angel” concept may find an identification with Apep to be invaluable for this very reason.

(4) Identifying the New Testament Satan with Apep gives us a means of connecting with the Prince of Darkness that is not limited to the Judeo-Christian mythos, but which also refrains from dismissing the Judeo-Christian mythos entirely. Because of the recurring themes of theocracy versus secularism, and because of the fact that Rome (a) conquered the Egyptians and (b) was associated specifically with the dragon by the early Christians, it does not require that much of a stretch to believe that Apep **succeeded** in dethroning Ra and the Pharaohs through the Romans, and that after beating the Egyptian gods, He has now turned His attention toward the Judeo-Christian god. Even today, Apep works through modern day forces of secularization against Dominionists and other theocratically-inclined religionists.

(5) There are no Neopagan religious groups dedicated to the worship of Apep. Since Apep was never worshiped in Egypt and was always considered a devil, modern Egyptian-based Neopagan groups seem to have no interest in claiming Him as a member of their pantheons. Therefore, Satanists who choose to claim Apep as an alternate form of the New Testament Satan will not have to deal with any angry Neopagans telling them that “You can’t do that!” And even if they do, all they have to do in response is to point out that Apep was never considered to be a member of any ancient Egyptian pantheon, **ever**. Therefore, His name is **not** the property of Kemetic pagans.

CONCLUSION

There is considerable evidence that the Christian idea of Satan was indeed influenced by the “dragon combat myths” of the Mediterranean and Near East. And when we compare these various “dragon combat myths” to the Christian mythology about Satan, the one dragon character that most resembles Him is Apep.

Apep, like Satan, appears as a conscious entity that deliberately

seeks to overthrow “divine authority,” who is everywhere and encircles the entire Earth, who never rests from His quest against absolute control by the gods, who must be continually fought and prayed against, and who can never be completely vanquished or destroyed (or at least, not until some purported apocalypse scenario). He is accused of trying to destroy the entire universe by a god that claims to be the Creator; and yet, like Satan, Apep makes no claims about Himself.

Both Apep and Satan are described as great dragons who behave as adversaries to “the established divine order” (whether it be Ma’at or “the Word of God”). Both are **sentient** entities who are believed to **consciously** create opposition. They both have to be continually re-defeated, not only by Yahweh or Ra, but also by human priests in the form of exorcisms. And like Apep, Satan was never worshiped - or at least, not until recently.

They are both chiefly considered “evil” simply because they oppose a god who is considered to be “the Highest.” And neither of the gods they oppose - neither Yahweh nor Ra - were considered completely benevolent in their respective religions. Both Apep and Satan threaten to secularize human society, for Apep sought to overthrow “the Creator” in the forms of the Pharaohs, and to thereby secularize Egypt. And in similar fashion, Satan seeks to overthrow “the Creator” in the form of Jesus Christ, and to thereby secularize the Church. And what is Jesus Christ but another kind of Pharaoh, a god-king who rules in “the kingdom of heaven”?

It requires a leap of faith to identify the Christian Satan with any pre-Christian deity; this much is certainly a fact. However, regarding the evidence of Satan’s origin in Judeo-Christian thought, His ties to the “dragon combat myths,” and the major similarities between Satan and Apep in their respective mythologies, I feel very secure that my leap of faith is not anywhere near as large (or baseless) as some others.

And on that note, I give praise to the Great Dragon of the Apocalypse, who is called Satan in today’s world, but whom I believe was known in the ancient days of Khem as Apep.

HAIL APEP SAATET-TA, SNAKE GOD OF HELL! ALL PRAISE UNTO THE GREAT DEVOURER WHO VANQUISHED THE EGYPTIAN SUN GOD RA, AND WHO OFFERS THE VERY SAME FATE TO THE TYRANT GOD YAHWEH! HAIL LORD APEP, THE MASTER OF THE WORLD!

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Budge, E. A. Wallis. *Egyptian Magic*. Dover Publications, Inc., 1971.

Budge, E. A. Wallis. *From Fetish to God in Ancient Egypt*. Dover Publications, Inc., 1988.

Clark, R. T. Rundle. *Myth and Symbol in Ancient Egypt*. Thames & Hudson, 1991.

Dalley, Stephanie. *Myths From Mesopotamia: Creation, The Flood, Gilgamesh and Others*. Oxford University Press, 1989.

Eliade, Mircea. *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. MacMillan Reference Books, 1993.

House of Netjer. "Apep," from the "Glossary of Netjeru."
<http://www.kemet.org/glossary/apep.html>, 2002.

Hume, Robert E. *The World's Living Religions*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, rev. ed., 1959.

Illustrated History of the Roman Empire. "Roman Religion."
<http://www.roman-empire.net/religion/religion.html>, 2005.

Jacobs, Joseph. "Satan" from the online Jewish Encyclopedia.
<http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?artid=270&letter=S&search=Satan>, 2002.

Mack, Carol K. *A Field Guide to Demons, Fairies, Fallen Angels, and Other Subversive Spirits*. Henry Holt and Company, LLC, 1998.

McGinn, Bernard. *Antichrist: 2000 Years of the Human Fascination With Evil*. Columbia University Press, 2000.

McNeill, John R. *TimeFrame 3000 - 1500 BC: The Age of God-Kings*. Time-Life Books, 1987.

Pollard, Nigel. *Roman Religion Gallery*.
http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ancient/romans/roman_religion_gallery_06.shtml, 2006.

Robinson, B.A. "Dominionism, a.k.a. Christian Reconstructionism, Dominion Theology, and Theonomy."

<http://www.religioustolerance.org/reconstr.htm>, 2005.

Seawright, Caroline. "Apep, Water Snake-Demon of Chaos, Enemy of Ra..."

<http://www.thekeep.org/~kunoichi/kunoichi/themestream/apep.html>, 2004.

Spence, Lewis. *Ancient Egyptian Myths and Legends*. Dover Publications, Inc., 1990.

TourEgypt. "A History of Christianity in Egypt: Birth and Early Growth." <http://interoz.com/egypt/chiste1.htm>, 1997.

Waddle, Charles W. "Miracles of Healing - The Place of Magic and Miracle."

http://www.logoi.com/notes/miracles/miracles_of_healing_17.html, 1909.

White, L. Michael. "Apocalypticism Explained: The Political History of the Jewish People."

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/apocalypse/explanation/jews.html>, 2006.

MY VIEWS ON “MAGIC” AND MYSTICISM

“MAGIC”

WITHIN the Satanist subculture, it is popularly claimed that the practice of “magic” or “magick” is a central asset to any Satanist belief system. In his *Satanic Bible*, Anton Szandor LaVey devotes a large portion of the book to his teachings about “magic.” And the belief in “black magic” is of course a central theme to the Temple of Set’s body of doctrine. On virtually any Satanist website that you find while browsing the Internet, you will find at least an essay or two about “Satanic magic” and how you can practice it.

My readers will perhaps be surprised to note that I am probably one of the few Satanists who *does not* believe in “magic” or “magick.” Furthermore, I do not consider a belief in or practice of “magic” to be central to my Satanism by any means. The purpose of this document is to explain why I am dubious of this thing called “magic.”

There are various definitions of “magic.” The dictionary defines magic as “the art that purports to control or forecast natural events, effects, or forces by invoking the supernatural.” It also defines magic as either, “the practice of using charms, spells, or rituals to attempt to produce supernatural effects or control events in nature,” or “the charms, spells and rituals so used.”

Helena Blavatsky, in her book *Isis Unveiled*, wrote that “magic considered as a science is the knowledge of the principles and the way by means of which the omniscience and omnipotence of the Spirit and its control over the forces of Nature can be acquired by the individual, even though he is still within his own body. Considered as an art, magic is the application of this knowledge to practice.”

Agrippa von Nettesheim wrote in *Ceremonial Magic*, “Sacred ceremonies and the rites surrounding them have such virtue that even if they are not understood or scrupulously observed, they are nonetheless effective and clothe us in divine power if they are carried out with faith.”

And Eliphas Levi wrote, “Magic is the traditional science of the secrets of nature, which comes to us from the magicians. Through it, the adept is invested with a sort of relative omnipotence and can act in a superhuman fashion.”

Celebrated occultist Aleister Crowley described magic as, “The

science and art of causing change to occur in conformity with the will.” In his *Magick in Theory and Practice*, Chapter XIV, he wrote:

What is a Magical Operation? It may be defined as any event in nature which is brought to pass by Will. We must not exclude potato-growing or banking from our definition. Let us take a very simple example of a Magical Act: that of a man blowing his nose.

Anton Szandor LaVey, who is perhaps considered the primary authority on “magic” by most Satanists, defines magic in *The Satanic Bible* as “The change in situations or events in accordance with one’s will, which would, using normally accepted methods, be unchangeable.” He further states that magic is not scientifically explainable, but science has always been, at one time or another, considered magic. And the Temple of Set, of course, defines magic as “consciously-directed alteration of one’s environment through obscure natural (Lesser Black Magic) or non-natural (Medial Black Magic) means, or apprehension of the Forms/Principles of the natural/non-natural universe (Greater Black Magic).”

PRAYER VERSUS “MAGIC”

Magic is often compared to religious prayer. Prayer is defined by the dictionary as a reverent petition that is made to a deity. The idea of prayer is to ask a deity to intervene on your behalf. If the prayer is answered, it is due to the assent of an external being with an independent will. And this deity can also deny the requests; when a person does not get what they prayed for, it is often said that “It must not be [my] God’s will that I should get what I wanted.” Or perhaps the deity is just trying to get them to stop being lazy and find a way to make their own wish come true. A person who prays believes that we can *not* exert control over the spirit world, but that we are at its mercy.

Magic, in contrast, is allegedly quite different. Instead of making a petition to a deity, the magician claims that he or she can effect changes in reality either by (1) “tapping into” some cosmic or occult force, (2) using the force or power of their own will, or (3) commanding a spirit or spirits to do their bidding. The idea of magic is to control or manipulate unseen forces and to use them to accomplish one’s own goals. And if the magician fails to get what he wants by his art, it is considered to be because of some defect in the casting of his spell. A person who practices magic believes that we are not at the mercy of the spirit world, but that we *can* exert

control over it in some way.

All of the above definitions for magic propose this element of *human control* over spiritual, cosmic or occult forces. Now, when people hear me say that I do not believe in magic, they often take offense and think that I am telling them I do not believe in a spirit world. Often, people are confused that I can believe in a deity, but not in magic. The fact of the matter is, I *do* believe in the existence of a spirit world and of spiritual experiences. I believe that it is probably quite true that many people who call themselves magicians are having valid spiritual experiences of one kind or another. It is not the belief in the supernatural that I take objection to; it is this idea of *human control* over the supernatural that I find faulty.

Crowley claimed that magic is creating change in accordance with your Will. And according to him, even a mundane act like planting potatoes counts as “magic.” I’m sorry, but I do not see anything magical about planting potatoes at all. Defining absolutely *any* intentional act as “magic” seems pointless to me. This is just superimposing *mystical language* onto something that is perfectly explainable *without* such language.

LaVey’s definition of magic seems just as problematic. “The change in situations or events in accordance with one’s will, which would, using normally accepted methods, be unchangeable.” Just what does this mean? That’s pretty ambiguous, and it sounds like it could literally mean anything. Using normally accepted methods, I can’t convince my next door neighbor to act like a rational human being. But if I go at her with a crowbar, I can sure as hell get her to leave me alone. Probably for good. Does beating my neighbor within an inch of her life fit under the definition for “magic” in this context? As long as it’s intentional, I’m sure it would fit under Crowley’s definition of “magic.” But as far as I’m concerned, there is absolutely nothing useful about using such mystical language to describe such a mundane thing.

And of course LaVey tries to cover his tracks by saying that magic is not scientifically explainable, but science has always been, at one time or another, considered magic. Well, if you go in a time machine and show Genghis Kahn how a microwave oven works, he’ll sure as Hell call it magic. But we know it’s not magic. If what is called “magic” will only someday become recognized as science, what’s the purpose of using such mystical otherworldly jargon as “magic” to describe it in the first place? As Satanists, shouldn’t we know better?

If there is no claim being made of supernatural, occult, or “non-natural” significance to the intentional change that is created (as in blowing your nose), then it’s just creating intentional change, pure

and simple. Blowing your nose is blowing your nose. If there IS a claim of supernatural, occult or “non-natural” significance being made, how can it be substantiated? It can’t be. I have never met a self-proclaimed magician who can prove that their spells actually work, and part of being a “magician” is claiming that your spells actually work.

Now if my pro-magic readers are really clever, they will be thinking to themselves, “But the existence of deity cannot be substantiated any more than the supernatural/occult/’non-natural’ claims of magic can.” And this is absolutely true. However, the difference here is one of **self-descriptors**; a person calling themselves the *worshiper of a deity* may not be able to prove that the deity they worship exists, but they can certainly show you the religious rituals they practice and thereby prove that they *worship* it.

On the other hand, a person calling themselves a “magician” cannot prove that the supernatural/occult/’non-natural” changes they supposedly effect are really happening. They might really be having spiritual experiences of some sort, but they cannot prove the part about having *human control* over the spirit world. And those like Crowley and LaVey, who conveniently snip out the supernatural/occult/’non-natural” part, are shooting themselves in the foot by dismantling the very necessity for a term like “magic” in the first place.

MYSTICISM

In the dictionary, the term “mysticism” is defined as “a belief in the existence of realities beyond perceptual or intellectual apprehension that are central to being and directly accessible by subjective experience.” The term is often used interchangeably with magic by some occultists, but there is a very important difference between the two of them. While magic makes the claim of *human control* being exerted over the spirit world, mysticism is merely a belief in *experiencing* the spirit world. Mysticism makes no claims about exerting influence or control over the occult forces that are subjectively experienced.

I am inclined to believe that most (if not all) “magicians” are really just mystics who erroneously identify themselves as magicians. I feel the very same way about people who call themselves witches, warlocks, sorcerers, wizards, magi, magistri templi, ipsissimi, and all these other various synonyms for people who can exert control over the spirit world by some prescribed method. As far as I am concerned, the practices of magic, witchcraft,

and sorcery are subjects that exist entirely within the realm of fiction, and I will not revise my opinion until I meet somebody who can actually prove to me that they wield such power.

Even Anton LaVey has admitted that his idea of “magic” is really nothing more than ritualized psychodrama. In his *Satanic Bible*, he wrote the following (pp. 52 - 53):

Modern man has come a long way; he has become disenchanted with the nonsensical dogmas of past religions. We are living in an enlightened age. Psychiatry has made great strides in enlightening man about his true personality. We are living in an era of intellectual awareness unlike any the world has ever seen.

This is all very well and good, BUT - there is one flaw in this new state of awareness. It is one thing to accept something intellectually, but to accept the same thing emotionally is an entirely different matter. The one need that psychiatry cannot fill is man's inherent need for emotionalizing through dogma. Man needs ceremony and ritual, fantasy and enchantment. Psychiatry, despite all the good it has done, has robbed man of wonder and fantasy which religion, in the past, has provided.

Satanism, realizing the current needs of man, fills the large grey void between religion and psychiatry. The Satanic philosophy *combines* the fundamentals of psychology *and* good, honest emotionalizing, or dogma. It provides man with his much needed fantasy. There is nothing wrong with dogma, providing it is not based on ideas and actions which go completely against human nature.

If “magic” is really only a form of ritualized psychodrama which utilizes fantasy and dogma for the purpose of helping people to emotionally accept their true personalities, then why not just be **honest** and call it **psychodrama**? Why is there an apparent need among LaVeyan Satanists to refer to this practice as “magic”? In other areas of the SB, LaVey rather harshly criticizes the idea of theism by postulating that “All religions of a spiritual nature are inventions of man.” But did he not realize that he is in fact contradicting himself? If we are to insist that our gods and goddesses are only inventions of our own carnal brains, then why can we not *also* insist that “magic” is only an invention of our own carnal brains?

Like Crowley, LaVey is an example of a man who insisted on grafting a mystical language onto something that is not really “magical,” but rather just self-therapeutic. In my opinion, people who are theists have more reason to want to use the word “magic” than LaVeyans, even though these theistic “magicians” cannot prove that what they do is really “magic” either.

Now there are many people in the world who practice what they believe to be “magical” rituals, and who practice such things as Qabalah, Tarot reading, rune divination, the Enochian Keys, etc. And many of these people claim that they have meaningful spiritual experiences from practicing these things. As I am a person who believes very strongly in the existence of a spirit world, I am not inclined to doubt their claims that they are indeed experiencing *something* of a mystical nature in their rituals. Otherwise, I would be a hypocrite.

But to this very day, I still have not met a single person who has been able to prove that their practice of Qabalah, Tarot reading, the Enochian keys, etc. has really given them a “special power” or powers which enables them to exert control over the spirit world. These practices may help them to understand themselves on a deep, spiritual level. But this is *mysticism*, not *magic*.

So when I say that I do not believe in magic, I am not saying that I think such things as the Qabalah, the Enochian keys, Tarot reading, crystal gazing, or whatever else are completely meaningless or useless. I believe that they have meaning and that they can be useful to people; I just disagree with the *terminology* that is popularly used.

I do not claim to wield any sort of control over the spirit world. I am a person who practices **worship** and **prayer**. Whenever I want to invoke a change in reality by supernatural means, I make a **reverent petition** to the Prince of Darkness. If Apep should choose to ignore my petition, then I take this to mean that either (1) I am not supposed to get the change that I want, or (2) There is a way to get the change that I want by myself, and Apep is trying to show me that I have not tried hard enough.

Members or sympathizers of the Church of Satan will most likely be thinking to themselves at this point, “You’re no Satanist! You believe in more of a deity-based Neopaganism. You deny the ego by worshiping an external deity that you believe to be higher than yourself. All deity-based religions are just crutches for people who can’t face up to the hard facts of life. And prayer makes you lazy. You can sit and pray to a god for what you want all day, and when you don’t get it, you excuse your laziness by saying, ‘Oh, well I didn’t get what I wanted. I guess it’s just [my] God’s will.’ Satanism is supposed to be about worshiping ourselves and our own power, and not bowing before any ‘god.’ The Satanist is a magician, not a worshiper who grovels and prays.”

My response to this is: I don’t consider worship of the ego to be Satanism. I consider worship of the Prince of Darkness to be

Satanism. I don't care what LaVey might have said on the subject. And if you think that deity-based religions are all just crutches and cop-outs, what about those times when you don't get what you want from the "magical working" you performed? One can just as easily say, "Oh well, I didn't get what I wanted, I guess I just didn't do that magic spell right." Magic can be - and IS - used as an excuse for laziness just as much as prayer. You can't tell me that there aren't people out there who cast "spells" for great wealth, and then who just sit at home, waiting for a check to show up in the mail. You can't tell me that there aren't people who cast "spells" to make someone fall in love with them, and then who just sit at home, waiting for the doorbell to ring. You can't tell me that there aren't people who cast "curses" to destroy their enemies, and then who just sit at home and wait for their neighbors to croak.

On the other hand, there are plenty of people in the world who are theistic and who pray, but who understand the cold hard fact that if you really want something done, you best do it yourself. There are many Christians, for instance, who teach that "God helps those who help themselves!" If it's a case of you just being too lazy to take care of it yourself, and you pray to Apep to do it for you, and Apep chooses *not* to do it for you, then it's *your own fault* that you're not getting what you want, not Apep's. I never said that Apep is a genie.

I do *not* believe that (1) I can "command the Powers of Darkness to bestow their infernal power upon me!" or (2) I can "tap into" some cosmic force and use it for my own ends, or (3) I have the power to supernaturally make all my own prayers come true. #1 strikes me not only as a rather silly idea, but as a rather insulting postulation as well. I am a **Devil worshiper**, meaning that I revere the Powers of Darkness and seek to serve them in whatever ways that I am able. I am not here to "command" the Powers of Darkness like some wannabe-Faust. Therefore, although I do consider myself to be a **mystic**, I reject all such terminology as "magic" or "witchcraft" or "sorcery" *within the confines of my own beliefs and practices*.

However, I respect the fact that there are many people out there who will disagree with my views on this subject, and who may even feel that I am trying to "take away their right to call themselves 'magicians.'" Such is not the case. If any of my readers *honestly* believe that they qualify for the definition of the terms "magician" or "witch" or "sorcerer," then so be it. You don't need my approval; call yourself whatever seems best for you to call yourself. All the more power to you. But the point of this article, above anything else,

is to illustrate why the idea of “magic” is not a part of *my* belief system, and why I object to the claim that “Magic is an important cornerstone to Satanist belief and practice.”

“SET” AND THE PRINCE OF DARKNESS

IN 1975 a major disagreement occurred within the Church of Satan, the very first well-known public organization dedicated to representing Satanism as an alternative religion in its own right. According to some, Anton LaVey had made a decision to start selling positions in the Church priesthood to anyone who was willing to pay the right price. In other words, you could become a Priest of the Church of Satan simply by contributing to LaVey's personal bank account. Others say that the problem was primarily between LaVey and Michael Aquino's disagreement over the existence of a literal Prince of Darkness. Still others say that Aquino was not happy being subordinate to LaVey in the Church, and that the break occurred due to a desire in Aquino to be the “head-honcho” of his own Satanic organization. Everyone seems to have a different version of what happened. Personally, I do not consider it to be any of my business what might have went on between LaVey and Aquino in their personal lives, and I am more than happy to remain unenlightened on the subject. But one thing is certain: Aquino and many other CoS priests decided to abandon LaVey's Church, and for a while they didn't know what to do. That is, until Michael Aquino invoked the Prince of Darkness on the North Solstice of 1975.

Supposedly, Aquino invoked the Prince of Darkness as Satan, but the Prince answered Aquino by the name of Set. From this invocation, Aquino transcribed *The Book of Coming Forth by Night*, a document that is said to have been inspired by the Prince Himself in His form as Set. It is from this document that the Temple of Set was founded. Essentially, the new Satanic church would be based upon the belief -- as outlined in the BoCfbN -- that “Satan,” the Christian Devil, is not a mere symbol as in LaVeyan doctrine, but an actual being. What's more, Satan is not just a “fallen angel” that rebelled against Yahweh; rather, He was originally the ancient Egyptian god Set, whom Aquino and his associates define as “the Principle of Isolate Intelligence” (i.e., the idea that the mind or psyche exists apart from the rest of the universe on a fundamental level). Aquino's new Satanic paradigm also involved a neo-Egyptian mystical concept, *Xeper* (pronounced “Kheffer”), a formula which reads “I have come into being” in English and which outlines the process of expanding and refining one's independence from the rest of the universe.

Now the reason I am going into this little history lesson is not to

lecture on Setian philosophy, or to argue whether LaVey was better than Aquino or vice versa, but rather to focus on this association between Satan and Set. To be fair, Michael Aquino was not the first occultist to make this connection; his predecessor in this matter was Aleister Crowley, the “Great Beast” himself, who considered the Christian devil concept to be identical to the Egyptian Set and to the astrological properties of Saturn. But I believe that Aquino’s part in this story bears much more significance, because he was a *Satanist* who began to associate Satan with Set, while Crowley was not a Satanist but a ceremonial magician (or “magickian,” as he would have spelled it).

When I first declared myself a Satanist in August of 1997, my definition of Satanism was largely similar to the Church of Satan’s paradigm. That is, I perceived Satanism as being essentially secular humanism with “diabolical window-dressings.” I did not believe in a literal Satan; rather, I perceived Satan as simply being a symbolic icon, rather like Uncle Sam or Santa Claus, and my idea of “Satanism” was more keyed to the concept of just “being my own god.” This phase in my life as a Satanist was rather short-lived, however, for it was only one month later, in September of 1997, that I first discovered the Temple of Set. As I began to read some of their literature (beginning with their General Information Letter, then gravitating to articles by Don Webb and by Michael Aquino himself), I became fascinated with their metaphysical worldview. And it was at this time that I first began to feel that the Prince of Darkness is *not* simply a symbol or an “impersonal force in nature,” but an actual living, thinking entity.

After reading literature by the likes of Michael Aquino, Don Webb, Michael Kelly, James Lewis and Balanone, I began to experiment with contacting the Prince of Darkness in rituals (previously, in my quasi-LaVeyan days, I had never seen any point in practicing rituals, or in attempting to contact any supernatural beings). My efforts were successful, to say the least, and before I knew it I was developing my own personal relationship with this God. Taking inspiration from the Setian model, I took to calling Him Set and used ancient Egyptian imagery and symbolism to represent His spirit and my worldview.

The identification of the Prince of Darkness with Set made sense to me on the grounds that Set was the *neter* (i.e., god) who opposed peace, harmony and order in Egyptian theology. That is to say, Set was the Rebel who initiated change and evolution by sparking conflict, disorder and strife. In like manner, the Prince of Darkness is an entity who “stirs up chaos” in order to cause growth to occur. Set

was associated by the Egyptians with the color red (which is also traditionally associated with the Devil), and He was associated with the infertile desert regions surrounding the fertile land of the Nile (and the Devil is also traditionally associated with the desert, as in the New Testament story of Jesus' temptation in the desert).

Set was also the God of the Nighttime Sky, and I have always felt that there is a special connection between the nighttime sky and the Prince of Darkness. Set was perceived as being a very carnal and indulgent force (even though He was seen as infertile, He nonetheless had quite a reputation for chasing after members of both sexes), which of course lends itself easily to the idea of the Devil as the God of this World. Set was also God of foreigners, foreign lands and foreign influences, as was particularly believed by the Egyptians when their country was invaded by the Hyskos (who recognized Set, by the name of Sutekh, as their supreme god). This is similar to how I perceive the Prince of Darkness as being the "patron saint" of all that is strange, unknown and outside or against the norm. And just as the Devil has traditionally been associated with goats and other horned animals, so too was Set associated with horned animals and animals with pricked or pointy ears.

Set was originally perceived by the Egyptians as the one deity who was powerful enough to defend the Sun God Ra from the dragon of darkness, Apep, during the sun's nocturnal journey through the underworld. It was believed that Set would battle Apep every morning just before dawn, and that the rising of the sun was symbolic of Set's victory over the beast. In this context, Set can be seen as a Dark God who defends the light of civilization (i.e., Ra) from ignorance (i.e., Apep), and this is certainly consistent with my own idea of the Dark Prince as a Dark and Wild Horned God who is paradoxically a bringer of enlightenment.

However, as Set came to be feared more and more as the God of foreign and alien influences, Egyptian xenophobia caused Him to become *identified* with the serpent Apep. In some cases Set was considered to be in control of Apep, while in others He and Apep were considered to be one and the same creature. Since Set was often called "The Red Lord," I believe that His later identification with Apep may very well be the mythological origin of what St. John would later describe as the "Great Red Dragon" in his Apocalypse (and whom John specifically identified as Satan). The apocalyptic image of the maiden who gives birth to a holy child and who is chased by the Great Red Dragon bears some resemblance to the Egyptian story of Isis, who gives birth to Horus and who is chased by Set.

Yet another similarity I find between Set and the Prince of Darkness is that both seem to have an intimate connection with storms, particularly thunderstorms. Whenever a thunderstorm occurs around me, I cannot help but feel my connection to the Prince grow more intense as the storm endures. Even in the Bible, Satan is associated with storms when He is described as having fallen “like lightning from heaven.”

So for a long time, I considered Satan and Set to be identical with one another. Much later it would occur to me that although some Setians postulate that the word “Satan” originally came from “Set-hen” (an alternate name for Set), this theory has not been validated in any credible archaeological resource of which I am currently aware. The claim does not seem very likely, due to the fact that the word “Satan” was originally not even a name, but simply a common noun, like “dog” or “cat.” It was not applied to a specific individual entity, but used in association with any number of adversarial beings, including the Abrahamic god himself in some cases (as when he causes the Flood in the Old Testament). After doing some more extensive research, I could find no credible scholars or archaeologists who supported the theory that the Devil was originally Set in any of their works. However, I should point out that I have not completely exhausted all of the resources that are out there. But it would seem that the postulation by Setians that “Satan came from Set-hen” has no verification outside of the Temple of Set, at least to my knowledge. It would seem that it was merely an attempt to escape the limitations of Judeo-Christian symbolism by associating Satan with an earlier pagan deity, so that the Prince would not have to look like an “evil” deity (although the Devil is given a less “evil” image in the Book of Enoch, a Judeo-Christian scripture which paints a pretty positive image of Him for all its Abrahamic propaganda).

I also began to disagree with the Setian metaphysical model. For instance, I no longer believe that all the religions of the world are dualistically divided between the Right Hand Path (RHP) and the Left Hand Path (LHP), or that the RHP is the path of “nature worship” and the LHP is the path of “consciousness worship.” I no longer accept the idea that the basic principle of Satanism is to *Xeper* so that one can remain conscious and therefore alive after the death of one’s physical body. In fact, my idea of Satanism became more and more devotional through the years; I became continually less interested in occultism and more interested in simply worshipping the Prince of Darkness as my God. And since I could find no hard evidence that Satan and Set are identical, I also began to question

my use for calling my God Set. Therefore, I abandoned my Setian phase and began to try separating the Prince of Darkness from Set in my mind. Later on, when I discovered Diane Vera's [Church of Azazel](#) website and the Book of Enoch, I took to calling Him Azazel.

However, my attraction to the name "Set" as an alternate name for the Master did not completely leave me. In the summer of 2004 I cracked out the Egypt books again in an attempt to find some possible historical link between Set and Satan that I might have overlooked. I became absolutely *obsessed* with proving that Satan and Set are the same entity. I believe the reason why this became so important to me is because of the fact that when I first came to believe in and experience the Prince of Darkness as a literal being, I knew Him as Set, not as Satan or Azazel. Therefore, despite my being dubious of Setian historical theories and metaphysics, I cannot help but feel that there IS some significance to the name Set in its modern-day association with Satan. Needless to say, I still have not yet discovered anything that would prove to a hard polytheist that these two gods are identical. Despite this, however, I believe that I have now reached a more honest and accurate understanding of the "Satan is Set" theory.

I believe it is best to assume that the Prince of Darkness is indeed a distinct entity from the ancient Egyptian *neter* Set, or at least that there is no way of proving otherwise. As a matter of fact, I think there is far more reason to equate the New Testament Satan with [Apep](#) than there is to identify Him with Set. However, thanks to people like Michael Aquino and the Temple of Set, "Set" does seem to have become an adopted name for the Prince of Darkness in the twenty-first century. Seeing how He first revealed Himself to me by this name, then I believe it is reasonable to say that it is valid to call Him such, provided that it be understood that by calling the Devil "Set," one is not necessarily worshiping the same "Set" that was worshiped in ancient Egypt.

As a way of illustrating my point, I will refer to the name "Lucifer," its original distinction from Satan and its later association with Him as an example. Originally, Lucifer was a completely different concept from Satan. Lucifer was a Latin name, used by the Romans for the Morning Star, which is really the planet Venus. Due to a misinterpretation of the biblical Book of Isaiah, however, "Lucifer" has now become a traditional name for the Devil in Western culture. I believe that this is also the case with the name "Set." Set may have originally been a completely separate divinity, but as with the name "Lucifer" in the Middle Ages, "Set" has been

adopted in the twentieth century as an alternate name for Satan.

What's more, the name "Set" has been given to Satan by *Satanists*, the people who actually follow *Satan*; the name "Lucifer" -- and indeed all of His other names, such as Satan, Azazel, Belial, and Samael -- were all given to Him by the Jews, the Christians and the Muslims, the people who hate and fear Him. And even though Setians attempt to distance themselves from Satanism, they nonetheless continue to refer to Set as "the Prince of Darkness," and they also use the Satanic pentagram (i.e., with two points up) as the symbol of their religion. I feel it is pretty safe to assume that Set was not called "Prince of Darkness" or associated with the pentagram in ancient Egypt. For these reasons, I believe that the deity the Setians follow is not really the ancient Egyptian Set but the Devil under a newly adopted name. Whereas the Setians believe that "Set" is the oldest name for the Prince of Darkness, I would argue that it is actually one of His *newest* names.

Another good reason for accepting the name Set as an alternate name for the Prince of Darkness is this: although it makes more sense to identify Satan with the Egyptian [Apep](#), Set was indeed identified with Apep when he went through periods of demonization in ancient Egypt. Therefore, Set as an aspect of (or replacement for) Apep in Egyptian religion may be regarded as an aspect of Satan as well.

I am not suggesting that we as theistic Satanists should discard all of the traditional names for the Prince of Darkness. I am not suggesting that we refrain from calling Him Satan, Lucifer, Azazel and other Hebrew names. I am merely suggesting that the name "Set" be added to our growing collection of "infernal names" for our God. I am not demanding that all theistic Satanists start calling Him Set, but I do feel that for some Satanists, it is somehow necessary to know Him (at least partially) as Set. I like to think that I have finally found a reasonable justification for calling Him Set that does not necessarily violate a hard polytheistic worldview.

RECOMMENDED RITUAL PRACTICES

A STANDARD PRAYER TO THE PRINCE OF DARKNESS

I give praise unto Thee, Lord Azazel,
Prince of Darkness, God of this World;
Great Horned Spirit of the Wilderness
Who is Ruler of the Earth.

I present and surrender my soul unto Thee,
Who departeth from the purity of paradise
For the pleasures of the flesh!

I present and surrender my soul unto Thee,
Who descendeth unto the earth
Like lightning from heaven!

I present and surrender my soul unto Thee,
Whose temptation is the seed
Of the fruit of all wisdom!

All hail unto Thee, Great Iblis,
Supreme Adversary of Tyranny and Ignorance,
Most holy Messenger who beareth forth the Black Flame.

I hereby proclaim that Shaitan is
God of this World, God of the flesh,
God of my body and God of my soul;
And I proclaim that Shaitan is my one and only Master,
And that I shall neither serve nor bow to any other as such,
Whether mortal or divine.

Flesh without sin, world without end;

In the Name of the Dragon, the Beast and the Holy Goat,
Amen.

Now and forevermore,

Hail IBLIS!
Hail SHAITAN!
Hail AZAZEL!

So mote it be!

A STANDARD RITE TO THE PRINCE OF DARKNESS

Things You Will Need For the Ceremony:

- 1) Altar/table/some kind of raised platform (facing North)
- 2) Athame/sword/pointer of some kind
- 3) Black clothes (or, if you prefer, you can do the ritual naked)
- 4) At least one black candle (to be placed on the altar/table)
- 5) Some kind of image that represents the Prince of Darkness to you, to be placed on the altar/table. (It can be a picture that you hang on the wall above your altar, or a statue, or something that you have made yourself.)

Stages of the Ceremony:

- 1) Banishing
- 2) Invocation (General and Aspectual)
- 3) Act of Worship
- 4) Sacrificial Offering
- 5) Recital of Prayers and Requests
- 6) Giving of Thanks
- 7) Closing Hymn

TIMING

This ceremony is best conducted during the night, particularly right at midnight, the Witching Hour. I personally feel that my rituals are somewhat unsuccessful if the sun is still up.

PREPARATION

Dress (or undress) for the ritual. It may be helpful if you bathe yourself just before commencing. Make sure everything is in place, then light the black candle and turn off all the lights (the only light in the entire room should be coming from the black candle). You can use more than one black candle if you like.

STAGE ONE - BANISHING

Eyes closed, facing North:

I focus my mind and my Will upon the Prince of Darkness.
I focus my mind and my Will upon the Prince of Darkness.
I focus my mind and my Will upon the Prince of Darkness.
I focus my mind and my Will upon the Prince of Darkness.
I focus my mind and my Will upon the Prince of Darkness.
I focus my mind and my Will upon the Prince of Darkness.
I focus my mind and my Will upon the Prince of Darkness.
I focus my mind and my Will upon the Prince of Darkness.
I focus my mind and my Will upon the Prince of Darkness.

Another suitable banishing to use for the purposes of this ritual would be my [Exorcism of Jehovah](#). However, I highly suggest that only experienced Satanists use this banishing technique and that novices use the above listed technique instead.

STAGE TWO - INVOCATION

Recite the General Invocation:

“Hail unto my Master, the Devil, the Lord of this World and Prince of Darkness! The Red One of darkest brilliance, whose eternal Shadow is the light of my life. Surely I belong to Thee in both body and spirit; I have taken Thy name as a part of myself, and I rejoice in Thy spirit. For in the Shadow of Lucifer there is love and warmth, and in the midst of His darkness there is undying light. O mighty Black Goat of the Wilderness! O mighty Serpent of Eden’s Demise! To Thee I give praise forever and ever, Amen.”

“Master, I call Thee forth from the bottomless abyss. Master, I call Thee forth from the ends of the earth. Master, I call Thee forth from the nighttime sky. Come forth from within my flesh and my spirit, and greet me as Thy humble servant and friend. I wish to worship and honor Thee, to commune with Thee and to be still and know that Thou art my God.”

Take your athame and point it in the air, toward North:

“Oh hear the names of the mighty Prince of Darkness!”

Trace a point-down pentagram in the air as you recite the Aspectual Invocations:

“Hail to Thee, Belial, God of This World! Lord of the Earth and Spirit of the Flesh. He whose strength is in the mountain. Help me to be strong and to embrace the pleasures and pains of earthly existence. All praise unto Thee, Lord Belial! Hail Belial!”

Turn northwest, and trace another point-down pentagram in the air:

“Hail to Thee, Behemoth, Beast of the Earth! Lord of the Waters and the Earth, Great Beast of Revelation! He whose voice is the Call of the Wild. Help me to be the best and most successful animal that I can be. All praise unto Thee, Lord Behemoth! Hail Behemoth!”

Turn west, and trace another point-down pentagram in the air:

“Hail to Thee, Typhon, Beast of the Sea! Lord of the Waters and Creature of the Depths. He who is the heart of the thunderous Hurricane. Help me to understand the deepest regions of my Self, and to be a raging storm against all that would oppress me. All praise unto Thee, Lord Typhon! Hail Typhon!”

Turn southwest, and trace another point-down pentagram in the air:

“Hail to Thee, Set, Great Red Dragon! Lord of the Flame and the Waters, Outsider-God. He who roams the lonely Wilderness. Help me to stay true to my Self, and to overcome all that would infringe upon my Selfhood. All praise unto Thee, Lord Set! Hail Set!”

Turn south, and trace another point-down pentagram in the air:

“Hail to Thee, Shaitan, Adversary! Lord of the Flame and Supreme Enemy of the God of Abraham. He who left the Kingdom of Heaven in flames. Help me to always remain strong in the face of the Tyrant God, and to prevail over my enemies! All praise unto Thee, Lord Shaitan. Hail Shaitan!”

Turn southeast, and trace another point-down pentagram in the air:

“Hail to Thee, Samael, Serpent of Eden! Lord of the Air and the Flame, Venomous One. He who tempted Adam and Eve with the Fruit of Knowledge. Help me to find and maintain the strength to think

for myself, and to do what I know in my heart is right. All praise unto Thee, Lord Samael! Hail Samael!”

Turn east, and trace another point-down pentagram in the air:

“Hail to Thee, Lucifer, Bringer of Light! Lord of the Air and Morning Star. He who destroys ignorance with the calling of Dawn. Help me to pierce through my own blindness and to find the light of understanding. All praise unto Thee, Lord Lucifer! Hail Lucifer!”

Turn northeast, and trace another point-down pentagram in the air:

“Hail to Thee, Azazel, Scapegoat! Lord of the Earth and the Air, Dark Horned God. He whose celestial knowledge is drawn to the earth by worldly lust. Help me to achieve knowledge and happiness here on earth and in the flesh. All praise unto Thee, Lord Azazel! Hail Azazel!”

Turn north; put down your athame and raise both your hands into the air in the Sign of the Horns:

“Hail to Thee, Prince of Darkness! Lord of the Elements, beloved Master! He who is of the Darkness, but who brings the Light. Help me to serve You in as many ways that I can. All praise unto Thee, my Prince of Darkness! Hail Satan! Hail Set!”

STAGE THREE - ACT OF WORSHIP

This stage is perhaps the most personal, next to the Sacrificial Offering. When it comes to the Act of Worship, I usually get down on my knees and bow my head to the North, remaining silent while I do so. However, other Satanists may not be comfortable with bowing on their knees; to these persons, I would suggest trying another technique. Since this is the only one that really seems to work for me, I’m afraid I can’t seem to think of any other good suggestions.

After bowing on my knees, I will usually recite a Declaration of Faith like the one below:

“Master, I believe in Thee. Master, I pass near to Thee! Thou art in my flesh, Thou art in my blood, and Thou art in my very soul. Thy spirit giveth refreshment to me when I am thirsty; Thy spirit healeth me when I am sick. Thou makest me to search for the hidden answers, Thou makest me to be wise. Forever am I indebted to Thee,

my Lord and Muse. I live for Thee and I breathe for Thee; I pass into being for Thee. Hail Lucifer, the Lord and Prince of this World!"

STAGE FOUR - SACRIFICIAL OFFERING

Blood sacrifice, whether it be from an animal or human, is in my (and most Satanists') opinion un-Satanic. It is far better and far more Satanic to sacrifice energy from your own body -- by means of a simple orgasm, rather than by bloodletting -- than to sacrifice the life of any innocent creature. Animal sacrifice may be appropriate in Voudon or some form of reconstructionist paganism (or hell, even reconstructionist Judaism if there is such a thing), but it is not appropriate in Satanism as far as I am concerned.

Another method of sacrifice is to choose an enemy of yours, like someone who has gone out of their way to hurt you or someone you love, and to **symbolically** sacrifice them by means of sticking a pin into a doll or lighting a photograph of the person on fire. **Symbolically** killing a **deserving** victim is fine and dandy, but actually spilling blood in a Satanic ritual is pointless. The Prince wants us to indulge in life and to worship the forces within ourselves that **give** and **create** life, not to torture innocent and defenseless little animals. And if you **do** torture little animals in your rituals, I hope that Lucifer gives you exactly what you deserve -- a slow and painful death!

Some Devil Worshipers like to cut themselves and write prayers to Lucifer in their own blood. Although I personally dislike this method, I don't have any real qualms against it as long as the Satanists in question are knowledgeable enough to do this without accidentally slashing an artery or giving themselves some kind of infection. Be careful, boys and girls!

That said, an acceptable sacrifice is to be made directly after the Act of Worship.

STAGE FIVE - RECITAL OF PRAYERS AND REQUESTS

If you have any particular prayers or requests that you would like to make to the Dark Prince, this is the part of the ritual in which you make them. Unless there is something specific that I want to pray to him about, I usually just say a generic prayer for myself and for all of my loved ones, asking that we all be able to find peace and happiness. I find that this part of the ritual is best improvised, at least for me; but if you like, you may certainly write your prayers down on paper. Some Satanists then like to burn their prayers in the flame of the black candle(s). Whatever works for you is best, but just make sure that you do NOT attempt to "boss" the

Master around. Always make sure to word your requests as politely and respectfully as possible.

STAGE SIX - GIVING OF THANKS

At this point in the ritual, it is time to give thanks to the Prince of Darkness for all that He has done for you. You may write your own thank-you prayer if you like, and sometimes it is best to improvise; but below is an example of a short and to-the-point thank-you prayer:

“I give thanks unto Thee, Prince Lucifer my Master, for all that Thou hath done for me. I give thanks unto Thee for guiding me, for giving me strength in my hour of darkness, and for never leaving my side. Thou art truly a most noble and loving God, and to Thee I am forever devoted in both spirit and flesh.”

STAGE SEVEN - CLOSING HYMN

After giving thanks to the Prince, it is important to close the ritual with a hymn or hymns. I would suggest reading one of the [Hymns to the Prince of Darkness](#) that I provide here on my website, though if you would rather recite one of your own writing, that is even better.

HYMNS TO THE PRINCE OF DARKNESS

HYMN I

Poor, downtrodden goat of sin

Sent out into the wilderness
To drive away the strange within
And overcome their godlessness.

All alone in desert sands,
Spirit of profanity.
Foreigner in foreign lands,
Who overcame insanity.

Uplifted by the light of pride,
Strengthened by Desire's flame.
Immortal of the Dark outside,
Whom no god nor gods can tame.

Azazel of enlightened view,

Beloved Prince of Darkness, true
How can you stand the loneliness?
Grant me, Thy son, Thy consciousness.

"The quest for sight is wrought with pain,

*And heaven's light is not to gain;
But like a Demon god earth-born,
I embrace both rose and thorn."*

And so the wisdom of the Goat

Is made for us to see, so mote!
Thus spake the Nightspirit to me,
The words of immortality.

HYMN II

Red One of the wilderness and nighttime sky,

Heart of the storm and the wind's war-cry;
Angel at midnight with the twilight eyes,
Muse of unconvention who shall never die!

I feel the void of the yet-to-be

Gaping wide, ever wide for me.
I feel the pull of my destiny,
I fear the future and the future is me.

A mere nothing am I,

Yet still You bid me try;
Ever do I fail and fall,
Yet still I hear Your Call.

For in the Shadow of Apep there is love and might,

In the midst of His Darkness, there is dawning Light.
The stars are His eyes in the veil of night,
And, somehow, I know that all will be right.

HYMN III

Black Goat dressed in Eternal Night,

I hear You calling from inside my soul.
My mind is opened to Occluded Sight,
Like Black Lightning, without control.

In my heart Your thunder dwells,

Pushing and pulling me to the Dark.
With You in me, my humanity swells
An animal with my Master's mark.

Guide me, oh Nightspirit of the Wild

Who leads me and loves me as His child.
Teach me, oh Wise One of the Tower,
Who nurtures Thought, the sacred Power.

Lead me to the Sacred Tree!

Light the Spark that is dark as night!
Open the gates to the Left Hand Path!
O beloved Azazel, my bringer of Light!

A HYMN TO LILITH

I call unto the Lady of the Night
The Succubus, the Queen of Hell's Delight
Night-Mare of Eden, Lamia, First Eve
Lilith, in whom I trust and believe.

Oh, Wise Woman of the Wilderness

Oh, Maiden who disobeys to redress,
Witch-Queen of Midnight in sensual dress,
Who rules over man and his carnal flesh.

She who deserted the Garden of Light,

Who ran into Darkness and found her own Sight
Her power to become more than she was made,
To become a Nightspirited Nymph of the Shade.

Great Lover of men in the full moon light,

Who conceals herself gently within the night
Who inspires the daughters of Eve to rebel
To overcome obstacles, and to excel.

She who found love in the Fallen Angel,

Azazel the Prince, the Commander of Hell
She who revolts against all convention
And whose wisdom is beyond mortal mention.

Oh Lilith, to Thee I give solemn praise

Great Goddess who kills and destroys my malaise
My life and my blood for the Demoness
Whose soul is a night-cloaked, loving caress!

A RITE TO ASTAROTH

If you are interested in attempting to invoke Astaroth for yourself, the following is a method that I have used before in the past:

(1) Turn out the lights and light a candle. (It doesn't have to be black, in fact it should preferably be white in my opinion. If you don't want to use a candle, something like a child's night-light, but without any cartoon pictures or writing on it, will suffice. Just plug that sucker in and turn it on.)

(2) Stare into the flame of the candle (or the bulb of the night-light) for as long as you feel necessary. When you feel ready to do so, recite the following invocation, or one of your own liking:

"Hail, Astaroth! Great Goddess of Love and War! Lady Lucifer of the Twilight; O mighty Lioness of love's burning desire. I humbly invoke You, O Queen of Heaven and Earth; I invite You to come forth from the sky, to come forth from the ends of the earth and to come forth from the depths of the underworld. Hear my prayer oh blessed Whore of Babylon, and greet me as Your servant and friend! I wish only to get to know You, and to rejoice in the fiery light of Your majestic spirit. Hail, Astaroth! Hail, Astaroth! Hail, Astaroth!"

(Repeat this invocation as many times as you feel is necessary.)

(3) Now continue staring into the light. Begin to visualize a current of bright yet invisible energy emanating the light, and imagine that this bright, invisible energy is beginning to pour itself into you. When I did this for the first time, I soon began to get images in my head of Astaroth as a very attractive dark-haired woman with feathery wings dressed entirely in white, and riding upon a Lion. This visualization may be helpful for you, but if it isn't then I would encourage you to just let whatever pops into your head suffice for the purposes of the ritual.

(4) Once you feel like you've got the Goddess's attention, talk to Her and explain to Her all the things you feel. Unload all of your problems on to Her, and I think you might be surprised at what happens.

(5) When you feel ready to close the ritual, say something like the following:

“Thank you, Astaroth, for answering my call and for blessing me with Your presence. I must end this ritual now, but I invite You to stay near to me, as You see fit, even after I have said goodbye. That said, thank you once again for listening to me. Hail, Astaroth!”

(6) Blow out the candle or turn off your night-light and go into another room. You’ll want to sit down and think about what you went through in the ritual; I’m sure you’ll have plenty to think about.

SUGGESTED PRACTICES FOR HALLOWEEN

FOR any theistic Satanists who are wondering what special things they can do to celebrate Halloween as a Satanic holiday, I would suggest the following:

I believe it is always good to spend at least a hour of meditation right at the Witching Hour of October 31st, in the early morning. Then go to sleep. When you awake in the morning and get ready to do all the various things you have to do throughout the day, say something like the following:

Halloween, so dear, is here;

The Season of the Witch brings cheer.

Today the Devil will bring light

To those who celebrate this night.

I pledge this day to Satan's power,

And look forward to Witching Hour;

For at the stroke of midnight's bell,

I will praise the King of Hell.

I would suggest that you recite this little rhyme, or something similar to it, at least three times during the day: (1) once in the morning when you get up, (2) once in the afternoon when you eat lunch, and (3) once in the evening, when the sun is setting. But if you wish to recite it more times than that, then don't let me stop you!

It is preferable that you say the prayer the final time during a big dinner, which you should eat right before it gets dark. Dedicate the meal to Satan and drink a toast to Him. Say a prayer of thanks for all the good things that have happened over the course of the past year, and then chow down! You should have this feast before it gets dark, because the trick-or-treaters usually come out right at sundown. Of course, if the trick-or-treating starts at a different time in your respective area, then schedule your Halloween dinner accordingly.

I feel that it is important that Satanists encourage and participate in the practice of trick-or-treating. For me, this is one of the many Halloween traditions that gives glory to the Prince of Darkness. This is because trick-or-treating encourages both children and adults to let their imaginations fly and to dress up as whatever

their hearts desire. Plus, it has the added incentive of getting CANDY, and I believe that Satan loves it when we indulge in eating massive quantities of chocolate! So take this opportunity to unleash your imagination by wearing a costume and hand out candy to trick-or-treaters. Or, if you are a Satanist parent, take your children out trick-or-treating. If you allow your children to trick-or-treat, be extremely careful that you STAY WITH YOUR CHILD AT ALL TIMES. Also, you will want to make DOUBLE SURE that you check the candy your children get before you let them eat it. Take an example from the Old Goat and take DAMN good care of your kids! And make sure to sacrifice a chocolate bar or two to Satan when you get home.

If you don't have children, and if trick-or-treating is not practiced in your neighborhood, then buy yourself some candy anyway and give yourself a treat at home. Or, if you are really daring, you can dress up as a kid with some kind of accelerated growth syndrome, and go trick-or-treating in a neighborhood where it is practiced. Come on, this is Halloween! Be creative!

When you get home from trick-or-treating, treat yourself to some good ol' fashioned Halloween movies. If you are staying at home, you can start the movies while you are handing out candy. If you don't have a VCR or DVD player, you can at least play some good ol' fashioned Halloween-oriented music. If you have children, I would suggest not playing anything that is rated R or that contains too much gore, unless you as the parent trust your child to be able to differentiate between reality and fantasy. If you need some good ideas for child-appropriate Halloween films to view, I would suggest either *E.T.: The Extra-Terrestrial* (which takes place during Halloween), or *The Halloween Tree*, an animated film that is narrated by Ray Bradbury.

But be sure to get the kids to bed before midnight (especially if it's a school night), because by the time Witching Hour (midnight) comes round, it is time to do a ritual. This is because it is traditionally during the Witching Hour that the veil between the real and the unreal is at its thinnest.

The ritual can be as simple or complex as you prefer, and you can either do it alone or with a group. You can also do it outdoors or indoors, whichever you prefer (I prefer outdoors, but this is not always feasible). Here are the things that you will need for your ritual:

- (1) An altar or raised platform of some variety. It doesn't need to be anything fancy, just a table will do.

(2) At least one black candle (more is good, if you have more).

(3) As many Jack-O'Lanterns as you can muster. Plug-in Jack-O'Lanterns are the greatest because they don't smell bad, they can be re-used the next year, and you don't have to worry about them rotting. However, Jack-O'Lanterns that are actually carved from real pumpkins adds an air of real authenticity, so if possible, try to have at least one organic Jack-O'Lantern. If you can get one, this one should go on your altar. If not, then any plug-in Jack-O'Lantern will do.

(4) You will need a pentagram somewhere. It can either hang above your altar, or be placed upon it. Or you can wear it if you like. The more pentagrams the better, but just one will do. Even if it is scrawled on a piece of notebook paper.

(5) An offering of some sort. Contrary to fundamentalist Christian propaganda, the ideal Satanic sacrifice should not be a blood sacrifice, but an offering of some kind of food or special beverage. Some kind of expensive wine would be appropriate, or perhaps a pumpkin pie. Whatever sort of sustenance the offering will be, it will have to be placed upon the ground outdoors, after presentation to the altar. If you are doing your ritual indoors, this will mean that you will have to temporarily leave the altar. This is okay.

(6) Have ready some literature to read during the ceremony. I would suggest something from the works of Edgar Allen Poe or H. P. Lovecraft, but virtually any author or poet who has written a work of a gothic nature should do.

(7) It is good to have a chalice or cup of some sort, filled with some kind of drink that you prefer.

(8) Finally, you need yourself (obviously)!

Now, in my view it really does not matter which direction the altar is facing, but some folks like to have it facing a particular direction. I say do whatever is most convenient. You should be dressed in black. When the clock strikes twelve midnight, raise your hands in the sign of the horns and say something like the following:

IT IS DONE!

The Hour of Darkness has come;

The Door to Hell is open unto all the mortal world,

And the Prince of Darkness and His Demons do ride

Upon the winds of the night!

*The souls of the dead whisper in the wind,
And all the Children of Darkness do cackle with glee;
For now is the Hour of the Unreal;
Now is the Season of the Witch!
Now is the Circle of the Year renewed.*

Let down your hands and put them together in the semblance of prayer. Or, if you have somebody conducting the ritual with you, join hands with them and then recite the following:

*Our most holy Lord Satan,
Azazel-Lucifer!
O mighty Lord of this World,
Who art at once the Prince of Darkness
And the Angel of Light!
Hear now, oh Lord, our prayer unto Thee;
Come forth from the midnight darkness
And answer our call.
For this night is the festival of Samhain
The Eve of All Hallows
And the Devil's Night.
Come forth from the ends of the earth, O Master!
And give us Thy blessing.
Attend and witness this ritual, oh Satan,
And greet us as Thy servants and friends!
Hail Satan! Hail Satan! Hail Satan!*

Keep your hands in the semblance of prayer (or continue holding hands with your partner), close your eyes and remain silent and still for anywhere from ten to twenty minutes. Meditate upon the thought of Satan, and let His essence flow through you from within. Focus your mind upon the brilliant blackness of His light. When you feel that you are ready, the next thing you will need to do is to present your offering to Satan. Recite something akin to the following:

*O mighty Red One of Darkest Brilliance,
Who departeth from the purity of paradise
For the pleasures of the unexplored;
Thou who descendeth unto the earth
Like lightning from heaven;
Thou whose temptation beareth
The seed of the fruit of all knowledge!*

*Unto Thee we render this sacrifice,
In representation of our love and devotion
To Thee and Thy works.*

If you are outdoors, present the offering to the altar, preferably while on one knee, and then place the offering on the ground, in such a way that it may be consumed by the ants in the ground. If you are indoors, first present the offering to the altar, then temporarily go outside and place the offering on the ground. When you have returned to the altar, say:

Hail Satan! Hail Satan! Hail Satan!

Now is the time to read whatever piece or pieces of literature you have selected to present during the ritual. Ideally, this part of the ritual should be done slowly and comfortably. Do not worry about taking up a great deal of time; if it lasts a long time, then it should last a long time. Pick up your selected work or works to be read, and then recite something like the following:

*Now, I would like to read words
Which beareth great power to me.
By all the blessed Powers of Darkness,
I invite o mighty Lucifer to hear
This work that I so love and cherish.*

Then recite whatever poem or piece of literature that you have prepared for the ritual. As indicated above, it should preferably be something of a gothic nature, such as Poe or Lovecraft. However, if you have something that you would consider a bit more intimate for your purposes, then feel free to read from that instead. Whatever the case may be, read aloud to your heart's content until whenever you feel you are done. When you are, recite something like the following:

*And now, in this rite to Summer's End,
I drink from this chalice,
To the honor of my Master,
Lord Satan o mighty.*

Lift the chalice and drink from it. Once done, join hands again (or form them in the semblance of prayer), close your eyes and be silent once more. This time, meditate upon all the good things that

have happened to you over the course of the past year, and meditate upon the things that you hope to accomplish during the next. Do this for ten to twenty minutes, and when you feel you are ready, feel free to voice any requests or concerns that you might have to the Prince of Darkness, with your eyes closed. When you have done this, open your eyes, raise your arms in the sign of the horns, and recite something like the following:

*I give thanks unto Thee, oh Lord Satan!
Great God of the Earth who art my Master.
Thanks unto Thee for attending my ritual
And for answering the call of Thy servant.
Oh Lord and Master, to Thee I give solemn praise,
For tonight is Thy night, and I bask in the Light
Of Thy infernal wisdom supreme.
Thank you Satan!
May the Prince of Darkness forever be strong and valiant!
All praise unto the Old Goat
Who loveth and protecteth His servants and friends.
Happy Samhain! Happy Halloween!
Hail Satan! Hail Satan! Hail Satan!
Amen.*

Take a bow. When you have risen, extinguish the black candle(s), but leave the Jack-O'Lanterns lit. Whatever you do, do not turn on any overhead lights. Feel free to turn on your television and watch some more Halloween films or listen to music. If you should get sleepy, close your eyes and rest. If you feel wired, then stay up until the dawn rises upon the morning of November 1st, and know in your heart that you are a beloved child of Satan.

TO CONTACT A DEAD LOVED ONE

Ideally, Halloween is the best time of year to attempt at conversing with the spirits of dead loved ones. However, I would venture to state that perhaps the best time to make such an attempt is right after sundown on the evening of November 1st. This is because I believe it would be somewhat disrespectful to the spirits of my dead loved ones if I were to invoke them after just having invoked Satan on Halloween night. Therefore, since Samhain is actually the day of November 1st, and the magic of Samhain really continues until the Witching Hour of November 2nd, then one should be able to successfully contact a dead loved one at anytime between

sundown and midnight of November 1st. Here is a suggested ritual outline for contacting a dead loved one:

First, you will need to set up some kind of altar, but one without any pentagrams or icons of any particular religious persuasion. It is best to go spiritually neutral in this sort of thing, I feel. You will need to decorate the altar with various things that remind you of the particular person you are trying to summon, such as photographs, personal possessions, articles of clothing, etc. You may also wish to prepare a selected piece or pieces of literature to be read in honor of the loved one. You may wish to light some candles for the duration of the ceremony, though I do not believe that it makes much difference what particular color of candle is implemented. You will also need a chalice filled with some kind of elixir, with which you will make a toast to your loved one.

When you are prepared, begin by standing before the altar with your eyes closed and be silent and still for as long a period as you feel necessary. Try to let your conscious mind become hypnotized by lack of activity.

Then, when you feel ready, recite something similar to this:

I invoke the name of (insert name here).

I invoke the memory of (name).

I invoke the spirit of (name).

*(Name), I call you forth from the furthest regions of the
otherworld,*

And I invite you to attend and witness this ritual.

The spirit of my ancestry is an instrument of power,

And by the blood of my ancestors,

I invite (name) to come forth from the night

And to join me and greet me as kith and kin!

You will now need to recite a continuation of this invocation, and it will need to have been written by yourself. It must be appropriate to the person that you wish to invoke. You don't have to be a Professor of Literature to do it, but it does need to be heart-felt, and you have to recite the invocation with the full expectation that whoever you are calling out to will hear you. I would like to warn *against* deciding to be experimental and summoning somebody that you've never summoned before, or somebody you don't know. Unless it is someone you know you can trust, don't summon them; you never know who (or what) might decide to answer. Also, it's important to stare into at a picture or symbol of the one you wish to invoke while you recite the invocation. If you have somebody

participating with you, join hands with them and have them recite the invocation with you simultaneously, as many times as you feel is necessary.

After this, you must remain silent for a good ten to twenty minutes or so, preferably with your eyes closed. If you have someone participating with you, continue to hold their hand. As you are silent, focus your mind on the person that you summoned during the second relevant invocation. Think about the good times you have had with them, your love for them and their love for you.

Then, when you feel ready, say whatever it is that you feel you want to say to your dead loved one. Tell them about the things that have happened to you since they left this world (or, if you invoked them last year, tell them about the things that have happened since you last talked to them). Feel free to shoot the breeze with them. Express your love to them. Or, if you would prefer just to be silent, then perhaps that is just as well.

Then recite whatever literary work or works that you have prepared for the ritual. When you have done, lift your chalice and recite something like the following:

*And now, at Summer's End,
I drink from this chalice,
To the honor of (name),
Who is my kith and kin!*

Drink from the chalice fully, replace it, and observe a moment of silence. Then say something like:

*And now it is time to close this ritual,
And for me to say goodbye.
Thank you (name), for attending and witnessing this ritual;
Thank you for joining me and showing your love for me.
I render my love unto you, and my good wishes;
And I hope to hear from you next Halloween.
Happy Samhain! Happy Halloween!*

Blow out the candles, and you are done.