

THE CLOVEN SHOOF

Volume XI, #4 July/August XIV A.S. 80th Issue

Copyright © 1979 C.E. by the Church of Satan; P.O. Box 896; Daly City, CA 94017; U.S.A.

LIBRARY

SEP 25 1979

STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF WISCONSIN

From Anton Szandor La Vey:

I don't hate TV. Actually, I despise it. Various historians have been cited as to why others hate TV, like encouraging mental laziness, unhealthy radiation, low intelligence-level programming, bad influence, etc. My reason is not without respect to those I have just cited, but rather different from them.

Being contemptuous of most people whom I am forced to encounter in everyday life, I do not wish to have them as guests in my home. Especially with me as a captive audience. I would feel hypocritical griping about the lack of visual, mental and emotional stimulation I receive from contemporary society, and then sit in front of a TV screen and watch that very reason unfold before me. That would also display a greater degree of masochism than I entertain. TV programming is, of necessity, trendy, popular, contemporary. I find contemporary human interaction akin to eating and sleeping, i.e. things one must do in order to survive. To me, however, survival is not necessarily entertainment. Perhaps for others it is. For me it is work. It is work, not fun, dealing with a society and institutions run for others' profit at my expense, by depressingly boorish and stupid louts. That is not fun. It is definitely work. But I don't have to bring it home with me. The vivid visual reminders of an unthinking society which I must entertain in order to survive on a daily basis are not my idea of either stimulation nor relaxation.

They say that time heals all wounds. Given that I am a perennial misanthrope, I can evaluate, appreciate and even revel in the trends of the masses, once they have become history--or if it can be speculation towards the future. The shuffling hordes that once many have been so repugnant to me have donned new devices and ideals, thereby elevating their old ones to quaintness. That's why I watch old movies.

Never has there been so much of so little. An overkill of sameness and mediocrity in the guise of enlightenment and prosperity prevails. It overlaps into every facet of life. It forces itself like a cancer upon everyone who exposes himself to it. It is so omnipresent that it is welcomed into what should be the most sacred confines of personal freedom.

That is why an illuminated TV screen is my enemy, unless it is showing an old movie without interruption. The TV screen, like fire, nuclear energy, and the sun, has the potential for great blessings. I am pleased that it has finally emerged into a personalized role, with the increased development of videotape and disks. It can be a personal tool as well as a weapon of war. Thus far its place as the latter is unrivalled in man's history. No single weapon ever devised can reach as many people at once over as sustained a period of time, while remaining undetected. Its gradual omnipresence has created the ultimate invader--one whose presence is so strongly accepted that it is not noticed until it is gone. That is why its slaves awaken only after the screen is blank, and anger most when service is interrupted. Like a successful conquerer, it is depended upon to provide constant surveillance over children and adults who are not being monitored by other authority figures at work or play, in the outside world or at home. Escape from TV means only one thing to me: a step closer to personal freedom.

The past two issues of The Cloven Hoof have dealt with the positive aspects of humanoids. Before I discuss methods of construction, however, I feel certain arguments which will be levelled against them should be presented.

There will be objections that ready accessibility of humanoids dulls the gratification which comes with pursuing, capturing, and pleasing the desired object. This is a drawback not to be dismissed lightly. Just as it is sometimes better to give than to receive, it is only so because of the ego gratification obtained from appreciation and recognition received in return. Unfortunately, many humans' sole contribution to the world--if it can indeed be considered such--is the ability to produce another human being. If this is all one has to offer, if one cannot attain recognition, acceptance, accomplishment, and justification for living through any means other than sexual conquest, then sexual conquest is a must.

Discouraging to the concept of artificial human companions as this might sound, adequately wrought humanoids' very existence creates an invariable impasse for those who would protest the loudest. If some human beings have no attributes other than their sexual desires and physical beauty, they might be categorized as "beautiful people." Mingling among the populace, they serve as a rather limited sort of stud service. There will always be those who can obtain all the sex they crave on nothing more than their looks, and more power to them if they can.

What about the horny, but not so pretty, though? What about those who have the consuming lusts but not a single attractive quality with which to entice a partner? The chase is all-important to them--conquest is tantamount to "success," yet there is no one to conquer. For these an ersatz person may *not* appeal, as their sexual drives and powers of procreation are all they have to bestow upon a world unneeding of their gifts.

Given an android to play with, such a person might find it disappointing at first, but once he discovers it is infinitely superior to the slick pages of the magazines he has been purchasing at exorbitant prices, or the results of the drinks he has been buying for dispassionate cocktail waitresses, he might learn to like the humanoid. Here enters a rather bizarre form of achievement therapy. Once excess drives have been channeled off via the android, any latent talents or abilities will have an opportunity to surface, thereby turning a nonentity into a halfway productive, achievement-oriented individual.

Complete and readily-available sexual release with the ultimate object of one's wildest fantasies cannot help but foster deeper appreciation for the sort of sacred and profound love that often comes off second best to needs for physical gratification. The proper selection of a mate would be accomplished without physical attributes blinding one to another's undesirable qualities. Discretion and care in mate-matching could not help but produce more compatible and lasting unions--marriages that would be far more than a moral, religious, legal excuse for sex.

"Who needs marriage in our present scene? People simply live together if they feel like it now. What's the big deal?" The big deal is that whether marriage per se is in or out, the "any old port in a storm until the real thing comes along" syndrome unconsciously still governs the majority of "living together" relationships. The same trauma and heartache is felt by one of the parties, upon dissolving the relationship, as would be felt had an elaborately framed marriage certificate been hanging on the living room wall. Just as stone walls and iron bars make not a prison, freedom from marriage is no assurance of a frustration free shack-up!

I have already approached the next argument that might be voiced against the use of artificial human beings: that it would remove the *meaning* from "meaningful relationship." An android can only destroy a meaningful relationship if it is based solely on sex. In this respect, the partner lacking in non-sexual attributes will soon be reduced to another dummy, probably inferior in quality and workmanship, and had better shape up or ship out. Whichever happens, of course, is dependent upon the resourcefulness and potential of the individual found lacking. More often than not, unreasonable sexual demands of a partner with stronger drives makes life miserable for the lesser, and dilutes the real potential and compatibility of both partners. Consequently, relaxation of anxieties provided by humanoids serves to restore or increase the substance of a basically sound relationship.

Generally speaking, humans choose their respective mates with the primary motivating factor being sexual attraction, with idealistic and compassionate qualities running in second place. It will be said that if the demon of lust will be gratified through the use of such infernal devices, all unions initiated by sexual attraction which lead to idyllic and meaningful relationships will be discouraged, if not eliminated altogether. Sexual attraction, it will be argued, is but a preliminary process towards any viable relationship. True, countless couples who have started out as red-hot sex partners have mellowed into dear old devoted mates. We can only evaluate the present argument on the basis of marriages which have appeared to succeed, as opposed to the number that have failed, under existing conditions.

Judging by the present success/failure ratio, the potential risk imposed by androids cannot

but be negligible. Such an argument (abolition) is like telling a teetotaler it is fortunate for him that orange juice is not intoxicating, for if it were he might have become a drunk.

It has long been the argument of abolitionists of all varieties that by eliminating the vehicle in question, human behavior will be bettered. This applies to liquor, drugs, pornography, guns, and all manner of things. *People* make crime, and vices thrive on human inadequacies. Control should be imposed on those who are incapable of controlling themselves, rather than abolishing devices which might be harmlessly or positively employed by those who have a modicum of capability and sense of responsibility. Besides, if the limited person can play God with an artificial human being his otherwise potentially aggressive and possibly dangerous ploys for recognition and assertion will be dissolved. Since almost all creative and/or destructive acts result from sublimation of sexual drives, the humanoid would preclude sublimation leading to non-sexual but harmful actions.

If, therefore, the use of an artificial human companion would reduce the likelihood of dangerous and antisocial acts caused by sexual repression, would it not also eliminate or reduce creative activities in a law-abiding, creative person? Would not a non-productive sort of indolence sweep the world, while all creative energy was being shot to hell by sex-sated beings humping away with their plastic partners? Could this not invoke the beginning of the end of all human endeavor and achievement? Would children, knowing their sexual needs would be accommodated as soon as puberty and the price of an android presented themselves, lie abed each day instead of going to school?

The answer to all of these questions is based upon the premise that humans will compete for recognition in one way or another. If everyone is sexually satisfied, obtaining his partner in the image most pleasing to his taste, his only means of recognition *must* come from his non-sexual accomplishments. Thus status through achievement in non-sexual pursuits can only occur in a society where sexual conquest has become as obsolete as warfare, both having been discarded as wastes of time and human energy, relative to the dubious bounties gained by each.

I find little valid argument against the concept of artificial human companions. Even those persons whose grandparents viewed early aircraft with such sentiments as, "If God had intended man to fly He would have given him wings," will find it difficult to employ their ancestors' logic. "God" did not give man wings, nor did he create the airplane, either, so man must be held responsible for that particular blasphemy. "God" *did*, it is assumed, create man, however; and we find ourselves treading on theologically thin ice when we advocate humanoids.

If man creates graven images in wholesale lots which will produce ecstasies unrivalled by all the religions of the past--and those graven images are in the form of the most perfect physical specimen each human could pray up--and "God" is supposed to carry the contract on the creation of such images--but *man* threatens to give "Him" competition--doesn't this bring *man* a large step closer to being God?

"--And God created man in His own image."

* * *

As summer nears its end, many people who haven't already done so are eagerly anticipating an opportunity to obtain their yearly sun-roasting, that they might yet receive the approval of friends and co-workers who proudly display bronzed and leathery bodies. A few maniacal and terrifying words are in order concerning the effects of sunlight on the human organism.

"Mad dogs and Englishmen go out in the noonday sun." Only where it has become fashionable to enhance physical appearance by becoming dark from the sun's rays, do people purposely expose themselves to the sun. Those who *must* exist in the sun a good part of their lives take every precaution to avoid the sun's rays by covering themselves with whatever materials are available. The degree of longevity attained by perennial sun dwellers is measurable by their protective pigmentation and natural immunity.

The sun's radiation warms the earth, incubates life, and promotes growth. But its liabilities outweigh its benefits, when directed towards a mature human body. Nature has shaded vegetables and fruit with leaves, that the might be protected. The clothes we wear are our leaves and without them the pulp of our bodies would wither before its time.

The legend of the vampire should be re-examined. The "undead" sleep through the sunlight hours, only to come forth by night, remaining active until the rays of the morning sun appear. Most people would live longer if they would absorb no more direct sunlight than is needed. Properties conferred by sunshine (vitamins, antibodies) are more safely obtained by artificial means, as detrimental effects can be more readily monitored. The average person needs but a few hours a year in the sun to sustain himself, once he has reached physical maturity.

The single element in man's history that has universally been equated with God and survival

is the sun. Yet the all pervasive deathray--that which atrophies and kills--is one and the same. The Lord giveth, and the Lord taketh away. What can possibly be more obvious than the sun? The life giver, and the death provoker.

We know that the undersea kingdom flourishes without the need for sunlight, and the longest lived of all known creatures--the Galapagos tortoise--is but one of the denizens of this realm, which includes the carp. Aldous Huxley advanced a literary hypothesis in *After Many a Summer Dies the Swan*. As his Dr. Obispo presumed, we die before we really have a chance to grow up, partly because of mental conditioning and self-fulfilling prophesy, and largely because of the sun. The sun gives light by which man can see where he is going, and man, being substantially visual in orientation, equates his light provider with his life provider.

A high mortality rate exists among people whose skin is unsuited to solar radiation, yet who deliberately expose themselves to it. Just as misapplied curative measures can be deadly, and overdoses of medicine toxic, the sun too has been partially recognized for its detrimental potential. Skin cancer has been isolated to solar exposure, but beyond that affliction little else has been "proven."

Alcoholics' systems have a thirst for liquor, but the inability to cope with it. The sun-worshipper who craves his sun bath will persist, driven by his compulsion, never realizing that he is what might be termed a "solarholic." His body, like the alcoholic's, cannot, nor was it ever meant to, cope with the massive doses of radiation to which he exposes it. Unlike the alcoholic, however, *he thinks his habit is healthful, while it is destroying him.*

Huxley's 201-year-old Fifth Earl of Gonister was last seen in a dark cell. The vampire also provides a clue. Myths are the carryovers of shamans and often links from which revelation may be extracted. The sun's rays on the undead are considered anathema. The Chinese absorb radioactive properties in ginseng, long ingested for its supposed power of rejuvenation. The structure of ginseng has been established as $C_{32}H_{36}O_{49}H_{48}O_3$, proving its radioactive propensities. In addition, Gurwitch proved that the mitogenetic radiations emitted by onions and garlic are able to exert a marked change in the organism. These substances--onions, garlic, and in the Orient, ginseng, are traditionally employed as protection against vampires, who supposedly shun such substances as they do sunlight. Coincidence?

Man's first mirror was a reflection in a pool of water. The illumination that would allow one's reflection to be seen was undoubtedly provided by the sun, which reflected its rays without any protective filtration. Did an alleged vampire shun reflective surfaces for reasons other than consternation over his or her lack of reflection, or lack of a "soul"? Might we assume that the vampire would, if its legend had developed later in man's existence shun X-ray and ultra-violet exposure of all types (TV?) in order to sustain or prolong corporeal life?

As previously stated, the sun has been synonymous with the godhead of innumerable cultures, including the myth of Christ. All birthdates of the gods were that of the sun. As a result of the god-association, the sun became sacred *in all respects* and infallible in its "goodness."

The lemming has been contemplated for its seemingly mysterious act of swimming compulsively to its death, yet we participate in an equally senseless exercise in our over-exposure to the sun. The lemming kills itself prematurely by swimming to its death. Man kills himself prematurely by sunning himself to death. Perhaps the lemming perceives his sunless sea-depth (the thing that kills him) as every bit as essential as man so regards his sun.

Many have recognized the relative interchange between God and the Devil, good and evil, as two sides of the same coin. How shortsighted is man, that he cannot more readily perceive the destructive aspects of the sun. Only when he is blistered with sunburn or disintegrating with skin cancer (a rather belated finding) will he concede any harmful qualities of solar exposure.

As everything moves in cycles and sooner or later completes a full circle, the very life giving property of any living creature is the ingredient that gradually deals him death, unless recognized and avoided. The older one gets, the less sun he should absorb, yet see the old folks basking after their retirement, on verandas and beaches, lawns and benches of a million retreats, killing themselves, committing suicide in a manner that must be every bit as inexplicable to a higher intelligence, if one exists, as the pointlessness of the lemmings' behavior is to man.

* * *

If your address label reads 7/XIV or 8/XIV, send \$10 renewal (\$15 couples) and address label. This is your only renewal notice; you will receive no second notice! 2NOV-SHMOZ KAPOF?