

The "CLOVEN" HOOF

Third Quarter, XXII Anno Satanas Copyright © 1987 C.E. by the
Church of Satan, P.O. Box 210082 San Francisco, Ca 94121 U.S.A.

Vol. XX, #3
121st Issue



BINARIC, or, Don't Try to Teach a Pig to Sing--It Wastes Your Time and Annoys the Pig Anton Szandor LaVey

High on our agenda of "things to do" should be to develop a new, essential language for the living. Perhaps "Binaric" would be an appropriate name. The purpose is to convey certain things to those who *cannot* understand (and probably *would not* understand) what you're trying to tell them, because of their *inability* to respond to your communication. This inability can arise from vocabulary impoverishment, divergent backgrounds, cultural barriers, or psychological block.

Binaric is based on the premise that only *one* of two choices can be readily processed by most (*including* human) computers. There are no shades of grey, so to speak. Either *on* or *off*, *understood* or *not understood*. The purpose in successful articulate speech, in practical usage, is to be as readily understood as possible.

The higher man cannot, for example, say to a lower man, "I have many encumbrances at this time, so it is inopportune for me to meet with you." He cannot expect the other to know, much less care what an "encumbrance" is, or what constitutes "inopportune." In short, the other cannot relate, much less positively respond, to a proffered situation he cannot solipsistically relate to.

Polemic is essential to translation, but grossly unsuccessful. You could say, "I can't meet with you because my sleep pattern is such that 10 in the morning for *me* is like 3 in the morning to you--we are on different circadian rhythms--and I need strict timing to apply and cure the latex for my new humanoid." Do you think a lecture on circadian rhythms and the construction of androids will help? It will make things *worse*. Your friend will think you are crazy or selfish or both for such a lame excuse. Of course, it's lame to *him*, because he cannot relate to it. So speak in a language he *can*.

"I can't meet you because my car is in the shop and the only guy who can fix it is in Borneo" or "My Aunt Fanny is coming to visit for the first time in 28 years" or "I have 1200 pages of data to process in the next week." Far fetched? Not really. Not *nearly* as much as the *truth*. But is it really Lie vs. Truth? Binaric is not lying, any more than a parent lies by not revealing a child's adoption until the proper time in that child's development.

Unfortunately, we aren't dealing with children who can *develop* or evolve to a greater level of understanding and/or sophistication. Largely, we face an arrested or atrophied thinking process, extremely limited in its choices. Hence *Binaric* communication, based on another's solipsistic, or identifiable range of understanding.

Binaric is a difficult language for a higher man to learn, because it requires *reduction* rather than *elaboration*. In the reduction process, entire concepts must be discarded for others--not an easy task for one who *thinks*. Premises which are often painful must be utilized if a message is to be transmitted. It's as important for a person speaking Binaric to be on his toes--to watch his "grammar"--as it is for a foreigner or semi-literate to convey the proper words to his more articulate listener. Try it. It's difficult, but necessary.

"What Manner of Man is This?"--Blanche Barton*

Recently, I've had an opportunity to do quite a bit of writing about Anton LaVey and, as a consequence, have been in a prime position to reflect on the evolution of reactions to this mystifying, eclectic man. Even after more than twenty years in the public eye, publishers are still resistant to the idea of doing a book showing Anton LaVey in a positive, or even fairly objective, light. Given the present state of hysteria, perhaps I shouldn't be surprised, but I am. And it seems that other people of the new generation, who have grown up in the post-1966 world, are surprised too.

Over the past few years, I've seen first-hand the phenomenon that Arthur Lyons calls "selective inattention" concerning Anton LaVey. The man himself is a phenomenon--an imposing blend of music, mystery, and genius. Never before in the history of mankind had there been a public Satanist. Never had there been an international organization dedicated to Satan, advocating a philosophy which, for the first time, integrates rationality and magic. And, finally, this is the first time one man has had such an overwhelming influence on our society yet has been so resoundingly ignored. If you doubt, visit the "New Age" section of your nearest bookstore. On one hand there are the entrepreneurs who have taken up LaVeyan ideas, slapped a more palatable name on them than "Satanism" and made lots of money "discovering" and presenting these methods or topics to the public, prior publication be damned. On the other hand, there are the Satanic "experts" who adroitly spin their heads around avoiding confrontations with what real Satanism is, so they can still spread the same swill and get asked to lots of guest spots on talk shows, completely ignoring the one man who brought Satanism to the world and who has written the only authoritative book advocating the subject.

I've almost gotten tired of asking "Why?" Why is it so painful for these people to give Anton LaVey so much as a notation in their bibliography? It can't still be theological, can it? God is long dead--they're not still so afraid of "Satan", are they? From the transparently "coincidental" scabbings of Robert Anton Wilson to the Johnny-come-lately "evolutionary" ramblings of parasitic pseudo-Satanic rip-off artists--some pathetically claiming to have "taken over where the Church of Satan left off"--it seems mandatory to ignore, minimize, or attempt to discredit Anton Szandor LaVey. I get the idea Anton LaVey must be the most dangerous man in the world.

*Miss Barton is under contract to write a new biography of Anton LaVey.

It doesn't really matter. The new con swiftly approaches. I've heard many stories lately of long-time associates of Anton LaVey's producing for their kids a signed picture from a long-neglected photo album, or a framed certificate from the old Witches' Workshop dug out from a box in the back of the closet, or an inscribed copy of The Satanic Bible, probably kept in the bottom of a bureau drawer so as not to upset a worrisome spouse, which is immediately grabbed up by their teenage son or daughter. As they hold it with awe, they ask, "Do you know him? I mean, actually know Anton LaVey?" The parent's status has obviously just skyrocketed in the younger person's eyes--that their *own parent* would be so cool is unimaginable to most kids.

The parent is usually rather nonplussed as well at their child's obvious knowledge and respect for the High Priest of the Church of Satan. During *their* time, Anton LaVey was a rather menacing curiosity, attracting an odd and impressive group of people from around the world to his rituals and soirees but still an oddity, an eccentric. The "Black House" was an avant-garde place to bring friends from out of town if you wanted to scare the hell out of them.

Now there is an emerging willingness of a newer generation to give due credit and homage to Anton LaVey, indignant at the squeamish evaluation he has been given over the years and holding him as their secret idol. A certain proprietary defensiveness is exhibited in many young rock-and-rollers since LaVey is their discovery. Now heavy metal bands who, a year ago, worked overtime to explain that they do not worship the Devil no matter what their lyrics and costumes seem to convey, are doing a brisk 180° about-face. Led by musicians like King Diamond, who proudly flouts his affiliation with Anton LaVey, all the bands have had to address the subject of Satanism. Most find they have to at least leave the question open or their fans might lose respect for them.

The hysteria concerning Satanic murders, child sacrifices, animal sacrifices, child molestations, ad infinitum seems to be gathering speed at such a pace it's bound to get worse before it gets better. Yet lines are being drawn. It's gotten to the point where too many Satanic Bibles have been sold. Out of every one hundred people watching hysterical talk shows, possibly twenty have either read the book themselves or know someone close to them who has told them enough about real Satanism to dispel the myths. The Bible is in its 24th printing and is selling better everyday. Those who have read it aren't buying the bullshit anymore. Of course, we know that it's still necessary for Satanism to be misunderstood. Billions of tax-free dollars are at stake. Anton LaVey is too much of a threat--not a criminal threat but an economic one. All we stand for goes against the grain of established economic complacency which feeds the consumer war. As the foremost advocate of therapeutic alienation and true individualism, he has been assailed on personal as well as economic fronts.

We must be aware of our position as Satanists. We are the new "spook" organization. We're the CIA, the Mafia, the M.I.B. (Men In Black), all rolled into one. Dr. LaVey is even more of a threat because his organization is not making tons of money. It's safer to think that "he's just in it for the dough." If he's not making money hand over fist, then the organization must be based on true idealism--a revolution rather than (nudge, nudge) just another evangelical, money-making enterprise. That's one reason why we don't disclose membership figures. No matter what the figure is, it would be all too easy to quantify and dismiss us. That's the name of the game--expendability.

The more appropriate question would be, "Who in the newer generation is not a Satanist?"--the influence is so widespread. The whole idea of starting the Church of Satan was not to have lots of members who needed activities and organized weekly meetings to keep them "involved", but to have an overwhelming and irreversible effect on man's history. These goals have been accomplished on a majestic scale. Anton LaVey has made Christianity obsolete and opened men's minds to be able to catch up with and utilize the vast opportunities our technology is opening to us, without being intellectually and socially cramped by Christianity.

So much of Satanism was (and is) in direct opposition to the major foci of the '60's--no drugs, no feminist "liberation", no universal love and acceptance, a formality in dress rather than the uniform of the tattered jeans and t-shirts. As we move away from the Sixties mind-set into our territory of rational self-interest, anti-androgeny, etc., renewed attention will come to Anton LaVey. But a new kind of attention from that of the 60's. Over the last twenty years public interest, once quite fashionable, has become restricted to the sub-underground of society. But Satanism and Anton LaVey have again found their way into the pop underground culture. On Orrin Klapp's scale, he will have migrated from Fool, through Villain, to Hero. It's like the "man bites dog" rule of thumb in journalism--a "good guy" who really turns out to be a bad guy isn't news; a "bad guy" who turns out to be stimulating, innovative, all right--now that's news. As more responsible reporting is done on LaVey, it will be harder for people to look in the other direction because, whichever direction they look, there he will be. Because of the media's concerted efforts to suppress information about him, it only creates more intense interest. *Or is that part of a diabolical plan--to create a backlash?* That's how true revolutions are brought about. There has to be something set up to revolt against.

I don't expect miracles. The Outsider, the Alien will always be given a meager amount of credit, I suppose. That's an inevitable consequence of being the Accuser--people don't like to hear what you have to say. But then again--perhaps we're due for a renaissance of the shadow romantic--the *film noir* anti-hero. Anton LaVey has been setting trends and breaking precedents all his life. In this new Satanic world he's created--why not expect that the Devil might finally get his due?

Good Company--As a final note, our hysterical quote of the month, from the November 1st *Record*.

NATION BRIEFS

THE RECORD

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1987

NAZI SAYS HE HAS NO REGRETS

CHICAGO — The most notorious Nazi war criminal still at large, Alois Brunner, said in an interview from his home in Syria that he regrets nothing he did in World War II and would do it all over, a newspaper reported. "All of them [Jews] deserved to die because they were the Devil's agents and human garbage," Brunner said in an interview with the Chicago Sun-Times.

¿NOV SHMOZ KAPOP?