



Copyright © 1980 C. E. by the Church of Satan, P.O. Box 896; Daly City, CA 94017; U.S.A.

\*\*\*\*\*

*Entire contents by Anton Szandor La Vey*

The response to my article, "How to Make a Bundle as a Reformed Satanist," is gratifying. There has never been greater affirmation directed towards traitors, double-crossers, quitters, sneaks and snitches in the history of the world. Even during the witch hunts of antiquity, informers received little adulation. Reformed wretches were simply tolerated. One of the most obscene displays I can imagine is to encounter a once-famous personality describing his or her new-found Christian fervor, especially when fame was attained as a result of glamor in one form or another. Anyone who must make a big deal out of their piety, advertising their religious beliefs, has been mortified at having been thought wicked and probably still is. Anyone publicly proclaiming a strong Christian image has at some time been accused of being sinful and is running scared. In short, all religious evangelism is terrified overcompensation for a guilty conscience. The more evangelical, the guiltier the conscience. The more sanctimonious, the more to hide.

The substance of my aforementioned essay was that one can handsomely profit by becoming a sounding board for the thinly disguised maliciousness and treachery of those who have been selling out to themselves all their lives without even knowing it. Quite obviously, that's how most preachers make money; they strip a person bare of any identity he may have had, then sell it back to him at a neat profit, but of course, in a nicey-nicey package.

I can't observe a TV evangelist without recalling my own experience as a young man, playing the organ for their meetings. It was a racket, plain and simple. The devout members of the audience or congregation were openly referred to as "suckers" or "marks" after the tent or auditorium was cleared. And the revivalists were big names in their day--the equivalents of today's TV messiahs.

It helps if any salesperson truly believes in the product being sold, but it has been my personal observation that deep down inside, the most successful don't. In any religious scam it's easy enough to recruit "true believers" to manage the show, while the big shots laugh up their sleeves. But let's not be too quick to absolve the true believers on the grounds that they are "sincere." They are sincere only insofar as their sincerity confers social acceptability upon them. History has proven that when the going gets rough enough or when standards of thought change, they become just as fervently sincere in whatever new beliefs prevail. No one ever lost money exploiting the wishy-washy fickleness of the public.

#### *Megarhythm*

If opposites attract on a personal level, so do they affect mass-thinking cycles. Anything popular today is certain to be rejected at some time in the future. With all of the research done on circadian rhythms (biorhythm), I have found nothing on what might be termed "megarhythm," or the charting of collective human likes and dislikes and easily predictable attitudinal changes. The techniques of opinion-molding have been available to advertisers and politicians, but the secrets of prediction based on timing have been neglected because, "as everyone knows, there's no predicting what the public will go for." I maintain that there is most certainly opportunity for accurate prediction of what the public will accept or reject, based on one simple rule: the attraction of opposites. As you should know, most people don't

deal in shades of gray, but only in black and white. A megarhythm shade of gray is only a transitional division of opinions before the resolution of one or the other. In short, fickleness is a certainty.

This is not to imply that there are no perennially appealing sensations, regardless of trends. Basic needs like food, sex, sleep, etc., remain fairly consistent. That's why most products advertised are related to them. The most basic human emotion is fear, however, and therefore the supreme prime mover. We are attracted to opposites because sameness to most represents boredom and stagnation, decay and death.

Left to their *own* resources, most people would never change. Thus, change must be effected by opinion makers. Under such an arrangement, change is expected, if not demanded. If someone advocating change for the better comes along, fine. If not, change for the worse will do--just so long as it's change. That's really the reason people elect "Hobson's choice" presidential candidates. They rationalize to themselves that if they don't vote, they will lose an "inalienable right," when in reality, they are playing musical chairs. Their fears of losing a voice are only present because they believe they have one to start with. It never occurs to them that the most effective statements are often made not by what one says, but by what one *doesn't* say. Without realizing it, they persist in behaving in a totally predictable manner. When, for example, Hobson's choice becomes so unbearable that no one votes--that, in itself, should have been predictable. And that, in itself, will be another manifestation of the law of the attraction of opposites.

In countries where so-called democracy did not exist, leaders were not elected into nor voted out of office. Under monarchical rule or despotism change usually came about with death or revolution, the latter invariably violent in nature. Perhaps the most unrecognized revolution of all has come about with the overall ineffectiveness of revolution as traditionally assumed. To say that all contemporary revolution is calculated and planned as to its outcome may appear an oversimplification. It is quite easy to predict, using the sort of megarhythm principle I've advanced, just whom and what will win out in any conflict. The rules of the game only apply when one is knowingly playing the game.

A pack of bomb-throwing dissidents nowadays is only the stuff of which the circus is made. Each act is still part of a show which is essentially a planned performance. Sporadic outbursts in America, for example (riots, etc.), are indications that a public still cares one way or the other and will keep its outrage on a highly visible level. It also insures that there will be enough votes in an election to keep the game players on the same board. Satanically speaking, the guy who really wins is not the one who plays the game, but the one who manufactures and sells the boards.

#### *Power Through Alienation*

A Satanist is not a revolutionary, but an alien, who, by his very alienation, is performing the ultimate revolt against the mindless drones who fear the very rejection on which a Satanist thrives. The importance of acceptance from others has been so firmly engrained in most of us, that we have blindly *accepted the importance of acceptance*. We have forgotten how to entertain the notion that *our judgement matters*. We have invalidated our right to personal judgement, because of the fear of rejection by a society of befuddled dolts. There is no great accomplishment in being accepted, if those who accept you are your intellectual and emotional inferiors.

Because a Satanist has pride in alienation, he has not only the closest thing to a real voice, but the nearest thing to freedom as well. The further removed one can get from popular standards and opinions, the less contaminated with the contagion of crowds one becomes. This is not to imply that physical isolation is a prerequisite. A move to the woods and the life of an anchorite is not required and, for most temperaments, actually stifling.

Just as charity begins in the home, emancipation through alienation begins in the mind. The first step is to see how far you can think for yourself--an impossible task for most. How does one know when that is happening? The most accurate test is to locate the origin of your "original thought." Where did you read it? Who did you see or hear discussing it? Inasmuch as there are no "original thoughts," there must be an inspirational source. Is that source consciously recognizable as such, or is it a composite of several? Or is it a source unknown to the conscious mind, an influence which insidiously infiltrated the brain? Even though it has been established that our actions and opinions are as a result of the sum total of accumulated experience and learning, most trendiness can be easily reduced to the most obvious forms of contagious communication. If you bear this in mind, it will make it easier to isolate the blind obedience which you take for granted as freedom.

Having decided or discovered that your thoughts are excessively pedestrian, the first exer-



cise towards change (deprogramming) is the old debating team technique of playing Devil's Advocate. It is now reasonably safe to state that NO ONE is more entitled to act in that capacity than a self-professed Satanist! In fact, anyone who yearns to be "just like anybody else" seems most un-Satanic, until one considers the paradoxical fact that the norm is a miserable quest for "individuality," "self-expression," "personal development," etc., blah, blah, blah. In our present social state everybody is one of a kind, and half-heartedly believes it. Their nagging inner fears tell them otherwise.

So, you don't want to be "like everybody else" and want to think for yourself? I have constantly said that non-conformity takes both guts and imagination. If you have the guts but are wanting in the imagination department, don't go to some phony counsellor and have a nice neat neo-conformist non-conformist package made up for you. Again, play Devil's Advocate and just reverse your current standards of thought. If what evolves is harmless to your physical freedom and won't land you in jail or debt, you have made some progress. Remember, you have nothing to fear but freedom.

\* \* \*

Speaking of fear, the color black has so many fearsome connotations that it is synonymous with evil in the western world. Several books have appeared in recent years, advising on the proper colors in clothing oneself for success. Each of these books advises that certain colors are to be avoided so not to alienate others (translate: frighten them). Therefore, only "safe" colors and patterns are recommended to ensure approval, while gaining a teeny-weeny bit of respect--not too much--just enough to move up a rung on the ladder of mediocrity (ten rungs, each one inch apart).

As I have said before, it takes guts to be a non-conformist--plus imagination. What is magically lacking in recent self-help books is an opening statement which might read like this: "The rules contained herein are expressly intended for those who wish to gain or maintain acceptance from the kind of people they see on TV shows. If you are a creep, this will make other creeps who have read this book and heeded its advice think you are quite with it. If, however, you are some kind of weirdo fag pervert or one of those "artistic" types, you'd better just forget about reading this. Likewise, if you are a gangster, secret service man or Russian spy. Or, if you look odd but have been very successful. If you are the last category, do yourself a favor and keep your personal appearance secrets to yourself--or, better yet, write the author and let him in on them."

All self-help manuals are effective if they give the reader self-confidence, which in turn, projects itself to others. Perhaps that's why I hear complaints from Satanists concerning the seemingly innocuous stuff contained in most books of sure-fire formulas. There is a Satanic personality that automatically refutes those prescribed exercises and devices. Rather than build self-confidence in a Satanic personality, such books serve to stifle it. It has long been established that the combination of black and red is the most awesome and intimidating of all colors. Yet despite empirical evidence of the psychological impact of that combination, nowhere is there mention of it in articles or books dealing with dressing for "power." Such is the Law of Invisibility.

\* \* \*

A sort while ago, the Santa Clara (CA) County Jail painted a holding cell pink. Almost miraculously, prisoners who would ordinarily act in a violent manner were calm. The resultant painting of other cells cut violent behavior down accordingly. News items stating the phenomenon attempted no explanations. The great mystery should be easily explained. Until recently, pale green was considered the most relaxing color for institutional use. Its overuse, though, became so synonymous with emergency rooms, prison cells, mental wards, and flophouses, that what started as a positive and therapeutic color descended into a negative connotation, carrying the message of fear loud and clear. Pink, in the collective consciousness, presents no threat. It conveys infantile images, powder puffs, sissified weakness and dependency. Tests conducted in pink rooms have shown otherwise capable weight lifters unable to function beyond a fraction of their ability.

Here's an idea: If you want to negotiate effectively with an otherwise dynamic or bombastic individual, do it in an all pink room, dressed all in pink, while wearing green-tinted (neutralizing) sunglasses.

\* \* \*

Speaking of pink, Miss Piggy has become the prototype for the forthcoming glamor image. What is merrily accepted as a joke and fondly entertained as a ludicrous parody is a Machiavellian conditioning process. Pigs are in and the popular expression to "pig out," has acquired a positive connotation in an economic climate which has made copious eating a luxury. Again, pre-

dictability rears its predictable head.

In a hungry society there is neither market nor magnificence for diet pills or thinness. Synonymous with chubbiness is opulence and excess. Thus, the desirability of a lean, well-scrubbed, sleek, athletic--in other words: austere, astringent, unadorned, strictly functional--person is on the wane. Soon the little short fat girls will be all the rage, with big sweaty thighs and flashy trappings. Crazy? Just wait and see. Bet nobody saw a similarity between Clark Gable and Mickey Mouse, either. Ah, the power of subliminal conditioning.

If you think I'm full of shit, just study the standards of beauty for the past couple of decades and consider what the diametric opposite might be. Miss Piggy has softened up the public for an easy acceptance of an economically predictable change in aesthetic values.

There's good news for fat men, too, as the same influences for change are involved. Only this time it's a female who's leading the way. Any student of popular culture knows that before the "think thin" era, a man's substance was judged by his bulk and skinny lads did all they could to beef themselves up. During another "fat" period (1890-1920) group photos depict even the thinnest men pushing their bellies out against their elk's tooth gold watch chains in order to appear more prosperous and important. Then came the twenties, with a free-flowing economy and sleek looks, followed by the depression of the thirties and renewed efforts to look prosperous. The residue of the depression hung over through the forties, and somewhere in the fifties consumerism and the good life (with new video counselling) started everyone on the road to weight-watching for health and sexual desirability.

Of course, what is really appealing doesn't matter, though; because most persons, having no free will, not only accept prevailing standards, but "learn" to like them. For this reason, the same men who went ape over a Farrah Fawcett will be just as enthused over a Miss Piggy type. I believe were discussing fickleness earlier.

Natural processes of selection, as amplified in *The Compleat Witch*, will, fortunately for sorcery, prevail. That is precisely why certain men (and women) have had "show" lovers which the public sees, while their objects of genuine passion languish in relative seclusion and anonymity. True to the adage about appearances being deceptive, attention is often squandered on the showpieces, but not without the liability of speedy expendability.

The formulae in *The Compleat Witch* concerning the attraction of opposites should reinforce an awareness that even though each person responds to certain stimuli, he doesn't really know what he wants. Someone else must tell him. It is this constant war between real needs and conditioned desires which has weakened the human mind rather than strengthen it. It has also served a diabolical purpose in an overpopulated world, by providing a wondrous process of selection for the future.

\* \* \*

The other evening, a man paid me a meaningful compliment. During dinner he open-mindedly listened to my unorthodox ramblings with startled agreement and accepted what I said with equal amounts of elation and profundity. The man was no foolish oaf, but an affluent and successful businessman. At the close of the evening, he said, "It's been great fun meeting you."

Now, I know that the word "fun," used by certain people, is meta-talk for fear--sort of like whistling in the graveyard. When "high society" types encounter a potentially unnerving person, situation, or stylistic approach, they insulate themselves by the mantra, "such fun!" There is a term for the seeking out of such things. It is called *eustress*. More about it forthcoming.

\* \* \*

In conclusion, a few words from an old anti-hero:

"We are so unused to living that we often feel something like loathing for 'real life' and so cannot bear to be reminded of it. We have really gone so far as to think of 'real life' as toil, almost as servitude, and that it is better in books. What do we cry for, what do we beg for? We don't know ourselves. And it would be worse for us if our stupid whims were indulged. Just try giving us, for example, as much independence as possible, and we... I assure you we should all immediately go back under discipline. As for what concerns me personally, I have only carried to a logical conclusion in my life what you yourselves didn't dare to take more than half way; and you supposed your cowardice was common sense, and comforted yourselves with the self-deception. Where did all the sages get the idea that a man's desires must be normal and virtuous? What a man needs is simply and solely *independent* volition, whatever that independence may cost and wherever it may lead. Well, but the Devil only knows what volition..."

- Fyodor Dostoyevsky  
"Notes from Underground" 1864

\* \* \*

If your label reads 7/XV or 8/XV, send \$10/\$15 couples and address label. 2NOV SHMOZ KAPOP?