

The CLOVEN hoof

September/October XIX A.S.

Copyright © 1984 C.F. Church of Satan, PO Box 220082, San Francisco, CA 94121, U.S.A.

Entire contents by Anton Szandor La Vey

I have been accused of advocating Christian thought when I write of dynamic submissiveness. It should be clear that when people believed that "the meek shall inherit the earth", the ruling class was far from meek. Victory has, and always will belong to the strong, but what constitutes strength? Is it bombast? Empty assertiveness? Desperate bravado? Hollow independence? I think not.

It was once considered a sign of weakness if a man cried. Now it's a sign of weakness if a woman cries. It's still OK if a baby cries, because it's his only means of verbal expression. And besides, he is a dependent creature. It seems unless one is a child, one should be self-sufficient and independent and if not, had better learn how. The fact that humans (and other animals) are NOT wholly independent poses a problem, and that is: Everybody goes around acting independent, while obviously interacting with others. So, you have a society full of "whole" people, which means absolutely nothing. Once there was a world of insignificant people who knew the boundaries of their own insignificance. Then, people were told to "find" themselves. They never considered themselves "lost" until then. After a couple of decades of "finding" themselves, they were told to "develop" themselves. After developing their "potential", they all happily wound up -- presumably -- POTENT.

Now, my question is: With all the "potent" people in our midst -- the big shots, the free, the independent, the emancipated -- why is there more frustration, anxiety, despondency, etc., around than ever?

Can it be that this new "independence" has resulted in a depersonalization -- a cloning -- unlike anything previously encountered? What a truly diabolical conspiracy it would be, if, by encouraging personal autonomy in naturally dependent individuals (the vast majority), they would be rendered unsure, then desperate, then helpless, and finally malleable to the impersonal dictates of the system. If one is a personal slave, one will never be an unwitting slave to an impersonal set of principles. Of the two, who is the freer? The more individualistic? The more discriminating? The stronger?

Exercises anyone? How to be powerful in the land of Frustration? Ask for help from those who would feel needed by your request. Say "I'm sorry" once in a while -- it requires an astounding ego. Compliment someone -- even if you know you can do it much better. When everyone else is talking, dummy up. When everyone else is sitting around in unnerving silence, talk your head off. If you love someone, let them know it -- the words are so outré now, that they have tremendous impact -- remember; this isn't 1968.

Exclusivity is always strong, because it depends upon sameness for its contrast. When self-styled masters become the real slaves, then who are the real masters? ***

Just as the word, "ego", was a negative term in the sixties (thereby enhancing the need for a Satanic Bible), so the buzzword, "control", has become a fearsome oath in the Orwellian clime. The supreme irony is that whenever a word or term becomes anathema, it's used for purposes of misdirection. When the ego was being trampled as an unsavory ingredient of human behavior, billions were being made catering to substitutes for it, not to mention preparing for the "me" decade of the seventies. Huey Long stated that if Fascism was to come to America, it would be in the form of "Americanism". Aptly, the highest form of control exists where it is in the guise of "independence".

And so we come to control by the State, effected by the *stigmatization* and subsequent *elimination* of control by the individual. WHEN IT IS NO LONGER FASHIONABLE FOR THE INDIVIDUAL TO CONTROL, ONLY THE IMPERSONAL DICTATES OF THE STATE WILL.

With more people around, there is a greater need for control, but a greater danger to the system if people think they're being controlled. Hence, tangible examples of control must be presented, in forms easily recognized and calculated to appeal to personal emotions. These, clearly, are the forms of control to be guarded against and fought; i.e., an unruly child who creates impossible demands, a domineering spouse who curtails personal expression, an unappreciative boss who has too long taken one for granted, -- fortunately for the system, the list is short, yet covers gut wrenching situations universal enough to be effective as a smokescreen for the Big Control.

RENEWALS If address label reads 9/XIX or 10/XIX, send \$10.00 (\$15 couples) renewal and label.

4NOV SHMOZ KAPOF