CHAPTER XXVII

37

STRUCTURE OF MIND BASED ON THAT OF BODY (HAECKEL AND BERTRAND

RUSSELL)

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

Was the sudden cloudburst at the end of my last letter somewhat of a surprise, and more that somewhat of a shock? Cheer up! The worst is yet to come.

This is where clean thinking --- a subject whose fringes I seem to remember

having touched --- wins the Gold Medal of the Royal Humane Society.

It is surely the wise course to accept the plain facts; to try to

explain them away, or to excuse them, is certain to involve one in a

maelstrom of sophistry; and when, despite these laudable efforts, the  $\$ 

facts jump up and land a short jab to the point, one is even worse off than before.

This has to be said, because Sammasati is assuredly one of the most

useful, as well as one of the most trustworthy and most manageable,

weapons in the armoury of the Aspirant.

You stop me, obviously with a demand for a personal explanation. "How

very foundation-stones of  ${\tt Buddhism}\,,$  and yet refer disciples enthusiasti-

cally to the technique of some of its subtlest superstructures?"

I laff.

It is the old, old story. When the Buddha was making experiments and recording the results, he was on safe ground: when he started to theorize, committing (incidentally) innumerable logical crimes in the process, he is no better a guesser than the Arahat next door, or for the matter of that, the Arahat's Lady Char. So, if you don't mind, we will look a little into this matter of Sammasati: what is it when it's at home? It may be no more than a personal fancy, but I think Allan Bennett's translation of the term, "Recollection," is as near as one can get in English. One can strain the meaning slightly to include Recollection, to imply the ranging of one's facts, and the fitting of them into an organized structure. The term "sati" suggests an identification of Being with Knowledge --- see The Soldier and the Hunchback! --! and? (Equinox I, 1). So far as it applies to the Magical Memory, it lays stress on some such expedient, very much as is explained in Liber Thisarb (Magick, pp. 415 - 422). But is it not a little strange that "The Abomination of Desolation should be set up in the Holy Place," as it were? Why should the wholebearted search for Truth and Beauty disclose such hateful hideous elements as necessary components of the Absolute Perfection?

Never mind the why, for a moment; first let us be sure that it is so.

38

Have we any grounds for expecting this to be the case? We certainly have.

This is a case where "clean thinking" is most absolutely helpful. The  $\,$ 

truth is of exquisite texture; it blazons the escutcheon of the Unity

of Nature in such delicate yet forceful colours that the Postulant may

well come thereby to the Opening of the Trance of Wonder; yet religious

theories and personal pernicketiness have erected against its impact the

very stoutest of their hedgehogs of prejudice.

Who shall help us here? Not the sonorous Vedas, not the Upanishads,

Not Apollonius, Plotinus, Ruysbroeck, Molinos; not any gleaner in the

field of  $\dots$  priori; no, a mere devotee of natural history and biology:

Ernst Haeckel.

Enormous, elephantine, his work's bulk is almost incredible; for us

his one revolutionary discovery is pertinent to this matter of Samma-

sati and the revelations of one's inmost subtle structure.

He discovered, and he demonstrated, that the history of any animal

throughout the course of its evolution is repeated in the stages of

the individual. To put it crudely, the growth of a child from the

fertilized ovum to the adult repeats the adventures of its species.

This doctrine is tremendously important, and I feel that I do not know

how to emphasize it as it deserves. I want to be exceptionally accurate;

yet the use of his meticulous scientific terms, with an armoury of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

quotations, would almost certainly result in your missing the point,

"unable to see the wood for the trees."

Let me put it that the body is formed by the super-position of layers,

each representing a stage in the history of the evolution of the species.

The foetus displays essential characteristics of insect, reptile, mammal

(or whatever they are) in the order in which these classes of  ${\tt animal}$ 

appeared in the world's history.

Now I want to put forward a thesis --- and as far as I know it is personal

to myself, based on my work at Cefal- --- to the effect that the mind is  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

constructed on precisely the same lines.

You will remember from my note on "Breaks" in meditation how one's

gradual improvement in the practice results in the barring-out of

certain classes of idea, by classes. The ready-to-hand, recent fugi-

tive thoughts come first and first they go. Then the events of the

previous day or so, and the preoccupations of the mind for that period.

Next, one comes to the layer of reveries and other forms of wish-phanstasm;

then cryptomnesia gets busy with incidents of childhood and the like;

finally, there intrudes the class of "atmospherics," where one cannot

trace the source of the interruption.

All these are matters of the conscious rational mind; and when I explored

and classified these facts, in the very first months of my serious prac-

tice of Yoga, I had no suspicion that they were no more than the foam on

a glass of champagne: nay, rather of

"black wine in jars of jade

39

Cooled all these months in hoarded snow, Black wine with purple starlight in its bosom, Oily and sweet as the soul of a brown maid Brought from the forenoon's archipelago, Her brows bound bright with many a scarlet

blossom

Like the blood of the slain that flowered free When we met the black men knee to knee."

How apt the verses are! How close are wine and snow to lust and slaughter!

I have been digressing, for all that; let us return to our goats!

The structure of the mind reveals its history as does the structure of the body.

(Capitals, please, or bang on something; that has got to sink in.)

Just as your body was at one stage the body of an ape, a fish, a froq

(and all the rest of it) so did that animal at that stage possess a mind correlative.

Now then! In the course of that kind of initiation conferred by Samma-

sati, the layers are stripped off very much as happens in elementary

meditation (Dharana) to the conscious mind.

(There is a way of acquiring a great deal of strange and unsuspected

knowledge of these matters by the use of Sulphuric Ether, [C2H5]2O,

according to a special technique. I wrote a paper on it once,  $16\ \mathrm{pp}$ .  $4\mathrm{to}$ , and fearing that it might be lost had many copies made

and distributed. Where is it? I must write you a letter one day.)

Accordingly, one finds oneself experiencing the thoughts, the feelings,

the desires of a gorilla, a crocodile, a rat, a devil-fish, or what have

you! One is no longer capable of human thoughts in the ordinary sense

of the word; such would be wholly unintelligible.

I leave the rest to your imagination; doesn't it sound to you a little

like some of the accounts of "The Dweller on the Threshold?"

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

CHAPTER XXVIII

NEED TO DEFINE "GOD", "SELF", ETC.

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

Artless remark!8 Oh you!

Well, I suppose it's a gift --- to stir Hell to its most abysmal horror with one small remark slipped in at the end. Scorpion!

192

8\* Refers to a pious phrase at the end of her letter.

40

"Higher self" --- "God within us."

Dear Lady, you could never have picked five words from Iroquois, or Banti, or Basuto or the Jargon of Master Frantois Villon, or Pictish, which severally and together convey less to my mind.

No, no, not Less: I mean More, so much more that it amounts to nothing

at all. Spencer Montmorency Bourbon Hohenstaufen sounds very exclusive

and aristocratic, and even posh or Ritzy; but if you bestow these names

Gentleman" Lee Davis9

recently hanged for rape and murder, was not a near relation either of the General or the President: he was a Nigger.

Gimme the old spade, I've got to go digging again.

1. Higher. Here we fall straight into the arms of Freud. Why "higher?"

Because in a scrap it is easier to strangle him if you are on top. When

very young children watch their parents in actu coitus, a circumstance

exceedingly usual almost anywhere outside England, and even here where

houseroom is restricted, the infant supposes that his mother, upon whom  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

he depends entirely for nourishment, is being attacked by the intrusive

stranger whom they want him to address as "Dad." From this seed springs

an "over-under complex," giving rise later on, in certain cases to whole  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,n\right\}$ 

legions of neuroses.

Now then make it a little clearer, please, just what you mean by "higher."

Skeat seems to connect it with hills, swellings, boils, the maternal breast; is that reason enough for us to connect it with the advantage, or --- "superiority" merely translates it into Latin! --- worth, or --- no, it's really too difficult. Of course, sometimes it has a "bad" meaning, as of temperature in fever; but nearly always it implies a condition preferable to "low." Applied to the "self," it becomes a sort of trade name; nobody tells me if he means Khu, or Ba, or Khabs, or Ut of the Upanishads or Augoeides of the Neo-Platonists, or Adonai of the Bulwer-Lytton, or --- --- here we are with all those thrice-accurs't alternatives. There is not, cannot be, any specific meaning unless we start with a sound skeleton of ontogenic theory, a well-mapped hierarchy of the Cosmos, and define the term anew. Then why use it? To do so can only cause confusion, unless the context helps us to clarify the image. And that is surely rather a defeatist attitude, isn't it? When I first set myself to put a name to my "mission" --the contempla-9^ WEH NOTE: Crowley sometimes carries his despite for euphemism to a point that obscures his purpose. The use of the term "nigger" here gives such offense to the modern reader that the point can be missed! This was not so in Crowley's youth, when this term was used without regard for its effect. For the record, "nigger" does not derive from "negro" = "black" but from "niggard" = "lazy". Crowley uses it here for the stereotype; but he also uses it deliberately to shock, as a lazy way to make such an effect. That makes Crowley a "nigger" at this point, as the word is properly defined! {Research Lee Davis --- }

41

tion carried me half-way across South-West China --- I considered these alternatives. I thought to cut the Gordian Knot, and call it by Abramelin's title the "Holy Guardian Angel" because (I mused) that will be as intelligible to the villagers of Pu Peng as to the most learned Pundits; moreover, the implied theory was so crude that no one need be bound by it. All this is rubbish, as you will see when we reach the discussion on "self:" To explain now would lead to too unwieldy a digression. 2. "Within." If you don't mind, we'll tackle this now, while "higher" is fresh in our minds; for it is also a preposition. First you want to go up; then you want to go in. Why? As "higher" gave the idea of aggression, of conquest, "within" usually implies safety. Always we get back to that stage of history when the social unit, based on the family, was little less than condition No. 1 of survival. The house, the castle, the fortified camp, the city wall; the "gens," the clan, the tribe, the "patrie," to be outside means danger from cold, hunger and thirst, raiding parties, highway robbers, bears, wolves, and tigers. To go out was to take a risk; and, your labour and courage being assets to your kinsmen, you were also a bad man; in fact, a "bounder" or "outsider." "Debauch" is simply "to go out of doors!" St. John says: "without are dogs and sorcerers and whoremongers and adulterers and idolaters and. . " --- so on. We of Thelema challenge all this briskly. "The word of Sin is Restriction." (AL I, 41). Our formula, roughly speaking, is to go out and grab what we want. We do this so thoroughly that we grow extending our conception of "I" by including each new accretion instead

of remaining a closely delineated self, proud of possessing other things,

as do the Black Brothers.

We are whole-hearted extroverts; the penalty of restricting oneself is

anything from neurosis to down right lunacy; in particular, melancholia.

You ask whether these remarks do not conflict with  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  repeated definition

of Initiation as the Way In. Not at all; the Inmost is identical with

the All. As you travel inward, you become able to perceive all the

layers which surround the "Self" from within, thus enlarging the scope

of your vision of the Universe. It is like moving from a skirmishing

patrol to G.H.Q.; and the object of so doing is obviously to exercise

constantly increasing control over the whole  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Army}}$  . Every step in rank

enables you both to see more and to do more; but one's attention is

inevitably directed outward.

When the entire system of the Universe is conterminous with your compre-

hension, "inward" and "outward" become identical.

But it won't do at all to seek anything within but a point of view, for

the simple reason that there is nothing else there!

It is just like all those symbols in The Book of Thoth; as soon as you

get to the "end" of anything, you suddenly find it is the "beginning."

To formulate the idea of "self" at all, you must posit limitations; any-

thing that is distinguishable is a mere temporary (and arbitrary)

selection of the finite from the infinite; whatever you chose to think

42

of, it changes, it grows, it disappears.

You have got to train your mind to canter through those leafy avenues of

thought upon the good green turf of Indifference; when you can do it

without conscious effort, so that up-down, in-out, far-near, black-white

(and so on for everything) appears quite automatically, you are already

as near an Initiate as makes no matter.

- 3. "Self." For a full discussion of this see Letter XLII.
- 4. "God." This is really to bad of you!

Of all the hopelessly mangled words in the language, you settle with  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

unerring Sadism on the most brutally butchered.

Crippen10 was an amateur.

Skeat hardly helps us at all, except by warning us that "good" has nothing

whatever to do with it.11 Dieu comes from Deus, with all its Sol-Jupiter

references, and Deos, which Plato thought meant a runner; hence,  $\operatorname{Sun}$ ,

Moon, Planets.

The best I can do for you, honest Injun! is the Russian word for god

Bog; connected probably, though the Lithuanian, with the Welsh  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Bwq}}$ 

a spectre or hobgoblin. Bugge, too. Not very inspiring, is it, to

replace the Old Hundredth by "Hush! Hush! Hush! here come the Bogey  $\,$ 

Man." Or is it.

Enough of this fooling! Out, trusty rapier, and home to the stone heart

of the audacious woman that wrote "God within us."

I know you thought you knew more or less what you meant when you wrote  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{N}}$ 

it; but surely that was a mere slip. An instant's thought would have

warned you that the word wouldn't stand even the most superficial analysis

You meant "Something which seems to me the most perfect symbol of all

that I love, worship, admire" --- all that class of verb.

But nobody else will have the same set of qualities in his private museum;

you have, as every one has always done, made another God in your own image.

197

Then the Vedantists define God as "having neither quality nor quantity;"

and some Yogis have a practice of setting up images to knock them  $\operatorname{down}$ 

at once with "Not that! Not that!"

And the Buddhists won't admit any God at all in anything at all like the sense in which you use the word12.

What's worse, whatever you may mean by "God" conveys no idea to me:  $\ensuremath{\mathrm{I}}$ 

10\* Crippen was a famous English poisoner who was caught and hung.

11^ WEH NOTE: Shipley's Dictionary of Word Origins sneaks the following in

under the word "goodbye": "God, Goth. guth, may be traced to Aryan ghut,

god, from ghuto, to implore: God is the one to whom we pray." "God" might

also be a contraction of "Odin", as "'Od" --- have the English speaking

Christians been praying to the Aesir all this time? 12\* One of the most amusing passages of irony is to be found in The

Questions of King Milinda where the Arhat Nagasena demolishes Maha  $\mbox{\it Brahma}$ .

43

can only guess by the light of  $my\ exceedingly\ small$  knowledge of you and

your general habits of thought and action. Then what sense was there in

chucking it at my head? Half a brick would have served you better.

You think you can explain to me viva voce, perhaps? Don't you dare try!

Whatever you said, I should prove to be nonsense, philosophically and in

a dozen other ways. And the County Council Ambulance would bundle you

off in your battered and bewildered d,bris to the Bug-house, as is so  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,2,\ldots \right\}$ 

etymologically indicated.

Do see it simply; the word must in any event connote ideas of Neschamah,

not of Ruach.

"But you use the word all the time." Yes, I do, and rely on the context to crystallize this most fluid --- or gaseous --- of expressions.

5. "Us". Why "Us"?

Is this a reference to the Old School Tie, or that Finishing School in

Brussels, and the ticket to the Royal enclosure at Ascot? I do not

suppose for a moment that you meant it that way: but it's
there. And
so ---

Anecdote of Lao-Tze.

The Old One was surrounded as usual by a galaxy of adoring disciples,

and they were trying to get him to show them where the Tao was to be found.

It was in the Sun and Moon, he admitted; it was in the Son of Heaven

and in the Superior Man. (Not George Nathaniel Curzon, however). It

was in the Blossoms of Springtide, and in the chilling winds that swept  $\ \ \,$ 

over from Siberia, and in the Wild Geese that it bore Southward when  $\,$ 

their instinct bade them. In short, the catalogue began to look is if

it were going to extend indefinitely; and an impatient disciple, pointing

to certain traces left by a mule in its recent passage, asked: "And is

the Tao also in that?" The Master nodded, and echoed: "Also in that."

. . . .

Then what becomes of this privileged "us"? We are obliged to extend it

to include everything. Then, as we have just seen, "God" also is un-  $\ensuremath{\text{\footnote{Mathematics}}}$ 

fettered by definitions.

Net result: "God within us" means precisely nothing at all.

And so it does, By Bradman!

"Bind nothing! Let there be no difference made among you between any

one thing & any other thing; for thereby there cometh hurt. But whoso availeth in this, let him be the chief of all!" (AL I, 22 - 23)I implore you not to point out that, this being the case, words like "hurt" and "chief" cannot possibly mean anything. The fact is that if we are to get on peaceably in the Club, we have to know when to take any given expression in a Pickwickian sense. In the Ruach all the laws of logic apply: they don't in Neschamah. 44 The real meaning of the passage is simple enough, if you that it refers to a specific result of Initiation. You have to be able to reckon up the Universe, as a whole and in every part; and to get rid of all its false or partial realities by discarding everything but the One Reality which is the sole truth in, and of Illusion. There is one set of equations which express the relation of the Perceiver and the Perceived, adjusted in accordance with the particular limitations on both sides; another cancels out all the finite terms, and leaves us with an ultimate  $x = 0 = 0\emptyset$ . See? I know I'm a disheartening kind of bloke, and it does seem so unfriendly to jump down a fellow's throat every minute or so when she tries to put it ever so nicely, and it is so easy --- isn't it? --- to play the game of Sanctimonious Grandiloquence, and surely what was said was perfectly harmless, and . . . .

No, N.O., no: not harmless at all. My whole object is it

Get any book for free on: www.Abika.com

train you to

silence every kind of hypothetical speculation, and formulae both  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{reso}}\xspace-$ 

nant and satisfying. I want you to ---

abhor them
abominate them
despise them
detest them
escew them
hate them
loathe them
and da capo.

and to get on with your practice. Then when you get the results, you can try, albeit uselessly, to fit your own words to the facts, if you should wish to communicate, for any good reason, your experiences to

Then, despairing of your impotence, how glad you will be that you have

been trained not to let anyone fob you of with phrases.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally yours,

666

CHAPTER XXIX

other people.

WHAT IS CERTAINTY

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

Well, I suppose I ought to have expected you to cock that wise left  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

eyebrow at me! Right you are to wonder precisely what I  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{mean}}$  by

"certainty", in the light of:

45

"On Soul's curtain

Is written this one certainty, that naught is certain."

Then there is that chapter in The Book of Lies (again!) "The Chinese cannot help thinking that the Octave has five notes." "The more necessary anything appears to my mind, the more certain it is that I only assert a limitation." "I slept with Faith, and found a corpse in my arms on awaking." "I drank and danced all night with Doubt, and found her a virgin in the morning." I wouldn't start to argue with the Chinese, if I were you; they might remind you that you exude the stench peculiar to corpses. Again, that other "Hymn to St. Thomas", as I ought perhaps to have called it: "Doubt. Doubt Thyself Doubt even if thou doubtest thyself. Doubt all Doubt even if thou doubtest all." "It seems sometimes as if beneath all conscious doubt there lay some deepest certainty. O kill it! slay the snake!" "The horn of the Doubt-Goat be exalted!" "Dive deeper, ever deeper, into the Abyss of Mind, until thou unearth that fox THAT. On, hounds! Yoicks! Tally-ho! Bring THAT to bay!" "Then, wind the Mort!" Once more --- what a book that is: I never realized it until now! it says --- see that double page at the onset, one with "?" and the other with "!" alone upon the blank. Moreover you should read the long essay "The Soldier and the Hunchback: ! and?" in the first volume and number of The Equinox.

But every one of those --- rather significant, nich wahr? -- -- slides into

a rhapsody of exaltation, a dithyramb, a Paeanl3. No good here. For

13\* It seems natural to me --- apodeictic after a fashion --- to treat Doubt

as positive, even aggressive. There is none of the wavering, wobbling,

woebegone wail of the weary and bewildered wage-slave; it is a trium-

phant challenge, disagreement for its own sake. Irish!

Browing painted a quite perfect picture of my Doubt.

"Up jumped Tokay on our table, Like a pigmy castle-warder, Dwarfish to see but stout and able, Arms and accoutrement all in order;

46

what you want is a penny plain pedestrian prose Probability-Percentage.

You want to know what the Odds are when I say "certain".

A case for casuistry? At least, for classification. It depends rather

on one's tone of voice? Yes, of course, and as to the classification,

off we jog to the Divine Pymander, who saw, and stated, the  $\operatorname{quiddity}$  of

our query with his accustomed lucidity. He discerns three degrees of

Truth; and he distinguishes accordingly: ---

- 1. True
- 2. Certain without error
- 3. Of all truth.

Clear enough, the difference between 1 and 2: ask me the time, I say  $\,$ 

half-past two; and that's true enough. But the Astronomer Royal is by

no manner of means satisfied with any approximation of that  ${\tt kind.}\ {\tt He}$ 

wants it accurate. He must know the longitude to a second; he must  $% \left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left$ 

have decided what method of measuring time is to be used; he must make

corrections for this and for that; and he must have attached an (arbitrary)

interpretation to the system; the whole question of Relativity pops up.

And, even so, he will enter a caveat about every single ganglion in the gossamer of his calculations.

cation and Lord knows what leads at last to a statement which may be

called "Certain without Error".

Excuse me just a moment! When I was staying at the Consulate of Tengyueh,

just inside the S.W. frontier of China, our one link with England, Home,

and Beauty was the Telegraph Service from Pekin. One week it was silent,

and we were anxious for news, our last bit of information having been

that there was rioting in Shanghai, seventeen Sikh policemen killed.

For all we  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$  knew the whole country might rise en masse at any moment to

expel the "Foreign Devils". At last the welcome messenger trotted across  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

from the city in the twilight with a whole sheaf of telegrams. Alas,

save for the date of dispatch, the wording in each one was identical:

each told us that it was noon in Pekin!

They had to be relayed at Yung Chang, and both the operators had taken  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{L}}$ 

ten days off to smoke opium, sensible fellows!

And fierce he looked North, then wheeling South Blew with his bugle a challenge to Drouth, Cocked his flap-hat with the tosspot feather, Twisted his thumb in his red moustache, Jingled his huge brass spurs together, Tightened his waist with its Buda Sash, And then, with an impudence nought could abash Shrugged his hump-shoulder, to tell the beholder, For twenty such knaves he should laugh but the bolder; And so, with his sword-hilt gallantly jutting, And dexter hand on his haunch abutting, Went the little man, Sir Ausbruch, strutting!"

It's not the least bit like Tokay; rather the Bull's Blood its neighbor,

or any rough strong red wine like Rioja. Curious, though, his making him

a hunchbacked dwarf; there must be something in this deep down. I wonder  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

what! (Ask Jung!)

47

But Hermes Trismegistus is not content with any such fugues as the Astronomer, however cunning and colossal his Organ; his Third Degree demands much more than this. The Astronomer's estimate has puttied every tiniest crack, he concedes it, but then waves it brusquely away: all the time the door is standing wide open! The Astronomer's exquisitely tailored figure stands in abashed isolation, like a gawky young man at his first Ball; he feels that he doesn't belong, For this D.S.T., or Greenwich, or what not, however exact in itself, is so only in reference to some other set of measurements which themselves turn out to be arbitrary; it is not of any ultimate import; nobody can dispute it, but it simply doesn't matter to anybody, apart from the particular case. It is not "Of all Truth." What Hermes means by this it will be well to enquire. May we call it "a truth of Religion?" (Don't be shocked! The original word implies a binding-together-again, as in a "Body of Doctrine: compare the word "Ligature". It was only later by corruption, that the word came to imply "piety;" re-ligens, attentive (to the gods) as opposed to neg-ligens, neglectful.) I think that Hermes was contemplating a Ruach closely knitted together and anchored by incessant Aspiration to the Supernal Triad; just such an one, in short, as appears in those remarks on the Magical Memory, a God-man ready to discard his well-worn Instrument for a new one, bought up to date with all the latest improvements (the movement of geist during his past incarnation, in particular) well wrought and ready for his use.

This being so, a truth which is "of all Truth" should mean any proposition which forms an essential part of this Khu --- this "Magical Identity" of a man. How how curious it must appear at the first glance to note that the truths of this order should prove to be what we call Axioms --- or even Platitudes ---. . . . . What's that noise? . . . . . I think I hear Sir Ausbruch! And in full eruption too! And hasn't he the right? For all this time we've bluffed our way breezily ahead over the sparkling seas, oblivious of that very Chinese Chinese-puzzle that we started with, the paradox (is it?) of the Chinese Gamut. (We shan't get into doldrums; there's always the way out from "?" to "!" as with any and every intellectual problem whatsoever: it's the only way. Otherwise, of course, we get to A is A, A is not-A, not-A is not-A, not-A is A, as is inevitable). "The more certain I am of anything, the more certain it is that I am only asserting a limitation of my own mind." Very good, but what am I to do about it? Some at least of such certainties must surely be "of all Truth". The test of admission to this class ought to be that, of one were to accept the contradictory of the proposition, the entire structure of the Mind would be knocked to pieces, as is 48 not at all the case with the Astronomer's determination, which may turn out to be wrong for a dozen different reasons without

anybody getting

seriously wounded in his tenderest feelings.

The Statesman knows instinctively, or at worst, by his training and

experience, what sort of assertion, harmless enough on the surface,

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{may}}$  be "dangerous thinking", a death-blow to his own idea of what is

"of all Truth", and strikes out wildly in a panic entirely
justifiable

from his own point of view. Exhibit No. 1: Galileo and that lot. What

could it possibly matter to the Gospel story that people should think

that the Earth moves round the Sun? (Riemann, and oh! such a lot of

things, have shewn that it didn't and doesn't! This sort of "Truth"

is only a set of conventions.)

"Oh, don't gas away like this! I want to know what to do about it. Am

I to accept this cauerwauling  ${\tt Gamut},$  and enlarge  ${\tt my}$   ${\tt Mind},$  and call it

an Initiation? Or am I to nail my own of-all-Truth Tonic Solfa to the  $\,$ 

Mast, and go down into the Maelstrom of Insanity with colours flying?

Do you really need Massed Bands to lull Baby to sleep?

The Master of the Temple deals very simply and efficiently with problems  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

of this kind. "The Mind" (says he) of this Party of the First Part,

hereinafter referred to as Frater N (or whatever his  $8\emptyset = 3\ddot{U}$  motto may

be) is so constructed that the interval from  ${\tt C}$  to  ${\tt C}$  is most harmoniously

divided into n notes; that of the Party of the Second Part hereinafter

referred to as --- not a Heretic, an Atheist, a Bolshie, ad Die-hard, a

Schismatic, and Anarchist, a Black Magician, a Friend of Aleister Crowley,

or whatever may be the current term of abuse --- Mr. A, Lord B, the Duke

of C, Mrs. X, or whatever he or she may chance to be called --- into five.

The Structure called of-all-Truth in neither of us is affected in the

least, any more than in the reading of a Thermometer with Fahrenheit on  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{$ 

one side and Centigrade on the other.

You naturally object that this answer is little better than an evasion,

No, it doesn't really; for if you were able to put up a Projection of those two minds, there would be, firstly, some sort of compensation

elsewhere than in the musical section; and secondly, some  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Truth}}$  of a

yet higher order which is common to both.

Not unaware am I that these conceptions are at first exceedingly diffi-

cult to formulate clearly. I wouldn't go so far as to say that one would

have to be a Master of the Temple to understand them; but it is really

very necessary to have grasped firmly the doctrine that "a thing is only

true insofar as it contains its contradiction in itself." (A good way to

realize this is by keeping up a merry dance of paradoxes, such as infest

Logic and Mathematics. The repeated butting of the head against a brick

wall is bound in the long run to shake up the little grey cells  $\lceil as \rceil$ 

Poirot might say], teach you to distrust any train of argument, however

apparently impeccable the syllogisms, and to seek ever more eagerly the  $\,$ 

dawn of that Neschamic consciousness where all these things are clearly

understood, although impossible to express in rational language.)

The prime function of intellect is differentiation; it deals with marks,

with limits, with the relations of what is not identical; in Neschamah

49

all this work has been carried out so perfectly that the "rough working"

has passed clean out of mind; just so, you say "I" as if it were an

indivisible Unity, unconscious of the inconceivably intricate machinery

of anatomical, physiological, psychological construction which issues in this idea of "I".

We may then with some confidence reaffirm that our certainties do assert

our limitations; but this kind of limitation is not necessarily harmful,

provided that we view the situation in its proper perspective, that we

understand that membership of the of-all-Truth class does not (as one is

apt to think at first sight) deepen the gulfs which separate  $\min d$  from

mind, but on the contrary put us in a position to ignore them. Our acts  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

of "love under will," which express our devotion to Nuit, which multiply  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{N}}$ 

the fulfillments of our possibilities, become continually more efficacious,

and more closely bound up with our Formula of Initiation; and we progres-

sively become aware of deeper and vaster Images of the of-all-Truth class,

which reconcile, by including within themselves, all apparent antinomies.

It is certain without error that I ought to go to bed.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

CHAPTER XXX

DO YOU BELIEVE IN GOD?

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

You are quite right, as usual. True, we have gone over a great deal of

the ground in various learned disquisitions of  $\operatorname{\mathsf{Gods}}\nolimits$  ,  $\operatorname{\mathsf{Angels}}\nolimits$  ,  $\operatorname{\mathsf{Elves}}\nolimits$  , et

hoc genus omne.

But God with a capital "G" in the singular is a totally different pair of Bl•chers --- nicht wahr?

Let me go back just for a moment to the meaning of "belief". We agreed

that the word was senseless except as it implies an opinion, instinct,

conviction --- what you please! --- so firmly entrenched in our natures that we act automatically as if it were "true" and "certain without error, "perhaps even "of the essence of truth." (Browning discusses this in Mr. Sludge the Medium.) Good: the field is clear for an enquiry into this word "God". We find ourselves in trouble from the start. We must define; and to define is to limit; and to limit is "God" to "a God" or at best "the God". He must be omniscient ({symbol of alchemical mercury}) omnipotent, ({Al. Sulfur }) and omnipresent ({Al. Salt}); yet to such a Being no purpose would be possible; so that all the apologies for the existence of "evil" crash. If there be opposites of any kind, there can be no consistency. He cannot be Two; He must be One; 50 yet, as is obvious, he isn't. How do the Hindu philosophers try to get out of this guag? "Evil" is "illusion;" has no "real" existence. Then what is the point of it? They say "Not that, not that!" denying to him all attributes; He is "that which is without quantity or quality." They contradict themselves at every turn; seeking to remove limit, they remove definition. Their only refuge is in "superconsciousness." Splendid! but now "belief" has disappeared altogether; for the word has no sense unless it is subject to the laws of normal thought...Tut! you must be feeling it yourself; the further one goes, the darker the path. All I have written is somehow muddled and obscure, maugre my frenzied struggle for lucidity, simplicity . . . .

Is this the fault of my own sophistication? I asked myself. Tell you what! I'll trot round to my masseuse, and put it up to her. She is a simple country soul, by no means over-educated, but intelligent; capable of a firm grasp of the principles of her job; a steady church-goer on what she considers worthwhile occasions; dislikes the rector, but praises his policy of keeping his discourse within bounds. done quite a lot of thinking for herself; distrusts and despises the Press and the Radio, has no use for ready-made opinions. She shares with the flock their normal prejudices and phobias, but is not bigoted about them, and follows readily enough a line of simplyexpressed destructive criticism when it is put to her. This is, however, only a temporary reaction; a day later she would repeat the previous inanities as if they had never been demolished. In the late fifties, at a quess. I sprang your question on her out of the blue, ... la "doodlebuq;" premising merely that I had been asked the question, and was puzzled as to how to answer it. Her reply was curious and surprising: without a moment's hesitation and with great enthusiasm, "Quickly, yes!" The spontaneous reservation struck me as extremely interesting. I said: of course, but suppose you think it over --- and out --- a bit, what am I to understand? She began glibly "He's a great big --- " and broke off, looking foolish. Then, although omnipotent, He needed our help --- we were all just as powerful as He, for we were little bits of each other --- but exactly how, or to what end, she did not make clear. An exclamation: "Then there is the Devil!" She went on without a word from me for a long while, tying herself up into fresh knots with every phase. She became irreverent, then downright blasphemous; stopped short and began to laugh at herself. And so forth --- but, what struck me as curious and significant, in the

main her argument followed quite closely the lines which came naturally  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

to me, at the beginning of this letter!

In the end, "curiouser and curiouser," she arrived at a practically

identical conclusion: she believed, but what she believed in  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{was}}$ 

As to our old criterion of what we imply in practice when we say that

we believe, she began by saying that If we "helped" God in His mysterious

plan, He would in some fashion or other look after us. But about this

she was even more vague than in the matter of intellectual conviction;

"helping God" meant behaving decently according to one's own instinctive

ideas of what "decently" means.

It is very encouraging that she should have seen, without any prompting

51

Nothing!

on my part, to what a muddle the question necessarily led; and very  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

nice for me, because it lets me out, cara soror!

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours fraternally,

666

P.S. I thought it a good plan to put my fundamental position all by

itself in a postscript; to frame it. My observation of the Universe

convinces me that there are beings of intelligence and power of a far  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

higher quality than anything we can conceive of as human; that they are

not necessarily based on the cerebral and nervous structures that we

know; and that the one and only chance for mankind to advance as a  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\}$ 

whole is for individuals to make contact with such Beings.

## CHAPTER XXXI

RELIGION --- IS THELEMA A "NEW RELIGION?"

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

"Would you describe your system as a new religion?" A pertinent question,

you doubtless suppose; whether it may happen to mean anything is --- is ---

is --- well, is what we must try to make clear.

True, it's a slogan of A.'. A.'. "The method of science --- the aim of

religion." Here the word "aim" and the context help the
definition;

it must mean the attainment of Knowledge and Power in spiritual matters

--- or words to that effect: as soon as one selects a phrase, one starts

to kick holes in it! Yet we both know perfectly well all the time what we do mean.

But this is certainly not the sense of the word in your question. It

may clear our minds, as has so often happened, if we examine it through  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

the lens of dear old Skeat.

Religion, he says, Latin: religio, piety. Collection or paying atten-

tion to: religens as opposed to negligens, neglecting; the attitude

of Gallio. But it also implies a binding together i.e. of ideas; in

fact, a "body of doctrine." Not a bad expression. A religion then, is

a more or less coherent and consistent set of beliefs, with precepts and

prohibitions therefrom deducible. But then there is the sense in which

"Magic". Here the point is that religious people attribute phenomena

to the will of some postulated Being or Beings, placable and moveable  $\,$ 

by virtue of sacrifice, devotion, or appeal. Against such, the scienti-

fic or magical mind believes in the Laws of Nature, asserts "If A, then

 $\mbox{\ensuremath{\mathtt{B}}"}$  --- if you do so-and-so, the result will be so-and-so, aloof from

arbitrary interference. Joshua, it is alleged, made the sun stand still by supplication, and Hezekiah in the same way cause it to "go back upon the dial of Ahaz;" Willett did it by putting the clock back, and getting an Act of Parliament to confirm his lunacy. Petruchio, too "It shall be what o'clock I say it is!" The two last came close to the magical

213

 ${\tt method};$  at least, to that branch of it which consists of "fooling all

52

the people all the time." But such an operation, if true Magick were

employed, would be beyond the power of any magician of my acquaintance;

for it would mess up the solar system completely. (You remember how

this happened, and what came of it, in a rather clever short story by

 ${
m H.G.\ Wells.14})$  For true Magick means "to employ one set of natural forces

at a mechanical advantage as against another set" --- I quote, as closely

as memory serves, Thomas Henry Huxley, when he explains that when he

lifts his water-jug --- or his elbow --- he does not "defy the Law of

Gravitation." On the contrary, he uses that Law; its equations form

part of the system by which he lifts the jug without spilling the water.

To sum up, our system is a religion just so far as a religion means an

enthusiastic putting-together of a series of doctrines, no one of which

must in any way clash with Science or Magick.

Call it a new religion, then, if it so please your Gracious Majesty;

but I confess that I fail to see what you will have gained by so doing,

and I feel bound to add that you might easily cause a great  $\mbox{\tt deal}$  of

misunderstanding, and work a rather stupid kind of mischief.

The word does not occur in The Book of the Law.

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours fraternally,

666

CHAPTER XXXII

HOW CAN A YOGI EVER BE WORRIED?

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

That question I have been expecting for a very long time! And what you

expect is to see my middle stump break the wicket-keeper's nose, with

the balls smartly fielded by Third Man and Short Leg!

I admit that it looks like a strong case. Here (you put it in your more

elegant prose) we have a Yogi, nay more, a Paramahamsa, a  $\operatorname{Bodhisattva}$  of

the best: yea, further, we have a Master of the Temple --- and is not his

Motto "Vi veri vniversom vivus vici?" and yet we find him fussing like

an old hen over the most trivial of troubles; we find him wrapped in the

lacustrine vapours of Avernus, fretting himself into a fever about imagi-

nary misfortunes at which no normal person would do more than cast  ${\tt a}$ 

contemptuous glance, and get on with the job.

Yes, although you can scarcely evade indictment for unnecessarily employ-

ing the language of hyperbole, I see what you mean. Yet the answer is  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

adequate; the very terms of his Bargain with Destiny not only allow for,

but imply, some such reaction on the part of the Master to the  $\operatorname{Bludgeon}$ -

ings of Fate. (W. E. Henley15)

There are two ways of looking at the problem. One is what I  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{may}}$  call

the mathematical. If I have ten and sixpence in the world and but a  $\,$ 

14^ WEH NOTE: {Research it --- may be "The Man Who Could Work Miracles" --

also the British film made of the story about the time  $\mbox{\sc Crowley}$  was writing.}

15\* An English poet.

53

half-guinea cigar, I have no money left to buy a box of matches. To "snap out of it" and recover my normal serenity requires only a minute effort, and the whole of my magical energy is earmarked for the Great Work. I have none left to make that effort. Of course, if the worry is enough to interfere with that Work, I must detail a corporal's file to abate the nuisance. The other way may be called the Taoist aspect. First, however, let me explain the point of view of the Master of the Temple, as it is so similar. You should remember from your reading what happens in this Grade. The new Master is "cast out" into the sphere appropriate to the nature of his own particular Great Work. And it is proper for him to act in true accordance with the nature of the man as he was when he passed through that Sphere (or Grade) on his upward journey. Thus, if he be cast out into  $3\emptyset = 8p$ , it is no part of his work to aim at the virtues of a  $4\emptyset = 7b$ ; all that has been done long before. It is no business of his to be bothering his head about anything at all but his Work; so he must react to events as they occur in the way natural to him without trying to "improve himself." (This, of course, applies not only to worry, but to all his funny little ways.) The Taoist position differs little, but it is independent of all considerations of the man's attainment; it is an universal rule based on a particular theory of things in general. Thus, "benevolence and righteousness" are not "virtues;" they are only symptoms of the world-disease, in that they should be needed. The same applies to all conditions, and

to all modes of seeking to modify them. There is only one

proper reaction

to event; that is, to adjust oneself with perfect elasticity to whatever happens.

216

That tiger across the paddy-field looks hungry. There are several ways

of dealing with the situation. One can run away, or climb a tree, or

shoot him, or (in your case) cow him by the Power of the Human Eye; but

the way of the Tao is to take no particular notice. (This, incidentally,

is not such bad Magick; the diversion of your attention might very well

result in your becoming invisible, as I have explained in a previous

letter.) The theory appears to be that, although your effort to save

yourself is successful, it is bound to create a disturbance of equili-

brium elsewhere, with results equally disastrous. Even more so; it

might be that to be eaten by a tiger is just what you needed in your  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

career through the incarnations; at that moment there might well be a

vacancy somewhere exactly where it will do most good to your Great

Work. When you press on one spot, you make a corresponding bulge in  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

another, as we often see a beautiful lady, unhappy about her waist-line,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

adopt drastic measures, and transform herself into the semblance of  $\boldsymbol{a}$ 

Pouter Puffin!

In theory, I am particularly pleased about this Method, because it goes

for everybody, requires no knowledge, no technical training,
"no nuffin."

All the same, it won't do for me, except in a much modified form, and

in very special cases; because no course of action (or inaction) is

conceivable that would do great violence to my nature.

So let me worry along, please, with the accent on the "along;" I will

grin and bear it, or, if it gets so bad that I can't do my Work, I will

make the necessary effort to abate the nuisance, always most careful to

do as little damage as possible to the main current of my total Energy.

54

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours fraternally,

217

666

CHAPTER XXXIII

THE GOLDEN MEAN

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

You would think that one who like myself has the Sun, the Lord of  $\operatorname{His}$ 

Horoscope, in Libra, with Venus who rules that sign in close conjunction  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

with him, with Saturn trine, Uranus sextile, Mars square and Luna quincunx

to him, would wear the Golden Mean as a breastplate, flaunt it on my

banneret, quarter it on  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  escutcheon, and grave it on the two-edged blade

of my thrice trusty falchion!

Just so, objects that instinct itself! "Had you been born a few hours

earlier, with Aries rising, its lord Mars aggravated by the square of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

Sol and Venus, you would indeed have bee a Wild Man of the Woods, arro-  $\,$ 

gant, bigoted, domineering, incapable of seeing a second side to any

question, headstrong, haughty, a seething hell-broth of hate; and this  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

fact disables your judgment."

All perfectly true. My equable nature is congenitally hostile to extreme  $% \left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =0$ 

measures, except in imagination. I cannot bear sudden violent movements.

Climbing rocks, people used to say that I didn't climb them, that I oozed over them!

This explains, I think, my deep-seated dislike of many passages in The

Boot of the Law. "O prophet! thou hast ill will to learn this writing.

I see thee hate the hand & the pen; but I am stronger." (AL II, 10-11)

Well, what is the upshot of all this? It answers your question about the

value to be attached to this Golden Mean. There is no rule about it;

your own attitude is proper for yourself, and has no value for anybody

else. But you must make sure exactly what that attitude actually is, deep down.

Let us go back for a moment to the passage above quoted. The text goes

on to give the reason for the facts.  $\mbox{"Because of me}$  in Thee which thou

knewest not. for why? Because thou wast the knower, and me." (AL II,  $12\,$ 

-13) The unexpected use or disuse of capitals, the queer syntax, the

unintelligibility of the whole passage: these certainly indicate some  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

profound Qabalistic import in these texts.

So we had better mark that Strictly Private, and forget it.

One point, however, we have forgotten: although  ${\tt my}$  Libra inclinations

do bias me personally, they also make me fair-minded, "a judge, and a good

judge too" in the memorable phrase of the late William Schwenk Gilbert.

So I will sum up what is to be said for and against this Golden Mean.

As usual, nobody has taken the trouble to define the term. We know that  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

it was extolled by both the Greek and the Chinese philosophers; but  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{I}}$ 

55

cannot see that they meant much more than to counsel the avoidance of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

extremes, whether of measures or of opinions; and to advocate moderation in all things.

James Hilton has a most amusing Chinese in his Lost Horizon. When the  $\,$ 

American 100% he-man, mixer, joiner, and go-getter, agrees with him about broadmindedness in religious beliefs, and ends "and I'm dead sure you're right!" his host mildly rebukes him, saying: "But we are only moderately sure." S

CHAPTER XVI.

"SERIOUS" STYLE OF A.C., OR THE APPARENT FRIVOLITY OF SOME OF MY REMARKS.

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

Alas! It is unlikely that either you or I should come upon a copy of

Max Beerbohm's portrait of Mathew Arnold; but Raven Hill's famous car-

toon is history, and can be told as such without the illustration.

We shall have to go into the matter, because of your very just  $\operatorname{criticism}$ 

of my magical writings in general --- and these letters, being colloquial,

are naturally an extreme case.

Far-off indeed those sunny days when life in England was worth living;

when one could travel anywhere in Europe --- except Russia and Turkey,

which spiritually, at least, are in Asia --- or America, without a pass-

port; when we complained that closing time was twelve-thirty a.m.;

when there was little or no class bitterness, the future seemed secure,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

and only Nonconformists failed to enjoy the fun that bubbled up on every side.

Well, in those days there were Music-halls; I can't hope to explain to

you what they were like, but they were jolly. (I'm afraid that there's  $\,$ 

another word beyond the scope of your universe!) At the Empire, Leicester

Square, which at that time actually looked as if it had been lifted  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

bodily from the "Continong" (a very wicked place) there was a promenade,

with bars complete (drinking bars, my dear child, I blush to say) where

one might hope to find "strength and beauty met together, Kindle their image like a star in a sea of glassy weather." There one might always find London's "soiled doves" (ass they revoltingly called them in the papers) of every type: Theodora (celebrated "Christian" Empress) and Phryne, Messalina and Thais, Baudelaire's swarthy mistress, and Nana, Moll Flanders and Fanny hill. But the enemies of life were on guard. They saw people enjoying themselves, (shame!) and they raked through the mildewed parchments of obsolete laws until they found some long-forgotten piece of mischief that might stop it. The withered husks of womanhood, idle, frustrated, spiteful and malignant, called up their forces, blackmailed the Church into supporting them, and began a senseless string of prosecutions. Notable in infamy stands out he name of Mrs. Ormiston Chant. So here we had the trial of some harmless girl for "accosting;" it was a scene from this that inspired Raven Hill's admirable cartoon. A "pale young curate" is in the witness box. "The prisoner, " he drawled "made improper proposals to me. The actual words used were: "why do you look so sad, Bertie?'" The magistrate: "A very natural question!" Now, fifty years later, here am I in the dock. 1 ("How can you expect people to take your Magick seriously!" I hear from every quarter, "when you write so gleefully about it, with your tongue always in your cheek?") My dear good sister, do be logical!

Here am I who set out nigh half a century ago to seek "The Stone of the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

Wise, the Summum Bonum, True Wisdom and Perfect Happiness:" I get it,

and you expect me to look down a forty-inch nose and lament!

I have plenty of trouble in life, and often enough I am in low enough  $\ensuremath{\text{I}}$ 

spirits to please anybody; but turn my thoughts to Magick -- the years

fall off. I am again the gay, quick, careless boy to whom the world was gracious.

Let this serve for an epitaph: Gray took eleven years; I, less.

Elegy Written in a Country Farmyard

By

Cock-a-doodle-doo

Here lies upon this hospitable spot
A youth to flats and flatties unknown;
The Plymouth Brethren gave it to him hot;
Trinity, Cambridge, claimed him for her own.

He climbed a lot of mountains in his time
 He stalked the tiger, bear and elephant.
He wrote a stack of poems, some sublime,
 Some not. Tales, essays, pictures, plays my

aunt!

At chess a minor master, Hoylake set

His handicap at two. Love drove him crazy.

Three thousand women used to call him pet;

In other matters --- shall we call him "lazy"?

He had the gift of laughing at himself;
Most affably he walked and talked with God;
And now the silly bastard's on the shelf,
We'll bury him beneath another sod.

- - - - -

In all the active moods of Nature --- her activity is Worship! there is

an element of rejoicing; even when she is at her wildest and most

destructive. (You know Gilbert's song "When the tiger is alashing of

his tail"?) Her sadness always goes with the implied threat of cessa-

tion --- and that we know to be illusion.

There is nothing worse in religion, especially in the  ${\tt Wisdom-Religion}$ ,

than the pedagogic-horatory accents of the owlish dogmatist, unless it be the pompous self-satisfaction of the prig. Eschew it, sister, eschew it! Even in giving orders there is a virile roar, and the commander who is best obeyed is he who rages cheerfully like an Eights Coach or a Rugger Captain. "Up Guards and at 'em!" may not be authentic; but that is the right spirit. 2 The curate's twang, the solemnity of self-importance, all manners that do not disclose the real man, are abominations, "Anathema Maranatha" --or any other day of the week. These painted masks are devised to conceal chicanery or emptiness. The easy-going humorous style of Vivekananda is intelligible and instructive; the platitudinous hot potatoes of Waite are neither. The dreadful thing is that this assumption of learning, of holiness, of mysterious avenging powers, somehow deceives the average student. He does not realise how well and wisely such have conned Wilde's maxim: "To be intelligible is to be found out." I know that I too am at times obscure; I lament the fact. The reason is twofold: (a) my ineradicable belief that my reader knows all about the subject better than I do myself, and (at best) may like to hear it tackled from a novel angle, (b) I am carried away by the exultant exaltation of my theme: I boil over with rapture --- not the crystalclear, the cool solution that I aimed at. On the Path of the Wise there is probably no danger more deadly, no poison more pernicious, no seduction more subtle than

Get any book for free on: www.Abika.com

Spiritual Pride;

it strikes, being solar, at the very heart of the Aspirant; more, it is

an inflation and exacerbation of the  ${\tt Ego}\,,$  so that its victim runs the

peril of straying into a Black Lodge, and finding himself at home there.

Against this risk we look to our insurance; there are two infallible:

Common Sense and the Sense of Humour. When you are lying exhausted and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

exenterate after the attainment of Vishvarupadarshana it is all wrong to

think: "Well, now I'm the holiest man in the world, of course with the

exception of John M. Watkins;" better recall the words of the weary

sceptical judge in A. P. Herbert's Holy Deadlock; he makes a Mantram of

it! "I put it to you --- I put it to you --- I put it to you
--- that you have

got a boil on your bottom."

To this rule there is, as usual with rules, an exception. Some states of

mind are of the same structure as poetry, where the "one step from the  $\,\,$ 

sublime to the ridiculous" is an easy and fatal step. But even so,

pedantry is as bad as ribaldry. Personally, I have tried to avoid the

dilemma by the use of poetic language and form; for instance, in AHA!

It is all difficult, dammed difficult; but if it must be that one's most

sacred shrine be profaned, let it be the clean assault of laughter rather  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

than the slimy smear of sactimoniousness!

There, or thereabouts, we must leave it. "Out of the fullness of the heart

the mouth speaketh;"  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right$ 

the music of a dirge.

Besides, what says the poet? "Love's at its height in pure love? Nay,

but after When the song's light dissolves gently in laughter."

Oh! "One word more" as Browning said, and poured forth the most puerile  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{T}}$ 

portentous piffle about that grim blue-stocking "interesting invalid,"

his spouting wife. Here it is, mercifully much shorter, and not in  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

```
tripping trochees!
```

"Actions speak louder than words." (I positively leak proverbs this afternoon --- country air, I suppose): and where actions are the issue, devil a joke from Aleister!

3

Do you see what is my mark? It is you that I am going to put in the dock about "being serious;" and that will take a separate letter --- part of the answer to yours received March 10th, 1944 and in general to your entire course of conduct since you came to me --- now over a year ago.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally yours,

666

CHAPTER XLV

"UNSERIOUS" CONDUCT OF A PUPIL

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

Here pops us Zola again --- this time he says J'Accuse! To day's Hexa

gram for me is No. X. LE, the Tiger: and the Duke of Chau comments on  $\,$ 

the last line as follows: "The sixth line, undivided, tells us to

look at the whole course that is trodden, and examine the presage which  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

that gives. If it be complete and without failure, there will be great

good fortune." O.K.; Let's!

It is now well over a year since you came to me howling like a damned

as my pupil. What have you done with that year?

. . . .

. . . .

First, suppose we put down what you agreed to do: The essential prelim-

inaries of the work of the A.'. A.'. --- you are to be heartily congratu-

lated upon your swift perception that the principles of that  $\operatorname{august}$ 

body were absolute.

1. Prepare and submit your Magical Record. (Without this you are

in the position of a navigator with neither chart nor  $\log$ .)

It would have been quite easy to get this ready in a week. Have

you done so in a year? No.

2. Learn to construct and perfect the Body of Light. This might

have required anything up to a dozen personal lessons. You were  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

urged to claim priority upon my time. What did you do?

You made one experiment with me fairly satisfactory, and got full

instructions for practice and experiment at home.

You made one experiment, ignoring every single one of the  $\operatorname{recom-}$ 

mendations made to you.

You kept on making further appointments for a second personal

lesson; and every one of them you broke.

3. Begin simple Yoga practices.

This, of course, cannot be checked at all in the absence of a

4

careful record and of instructed critical analysis. You do not

make the one, and are incapable of the other.

so I suppose you are very well satisfied with yourself!

4. Your O.T.O. work.

You were supplied with copies of those rituals to which you were

entitled.

You were to make copies of these.

Your were to go through them with me, so as to assimilate their  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

Symbolism and teaching.

Have you done any of this? No.

5. You were to write me a letter of questions once every fortnight.

Have you done so? No.

. . . .

. .

Have you in thirteen months done as much as honest work would have

accomplished in a week? No.

. . . .

. .

What excuses do you drag out, when taxed with these misdemeanors?

You are eager to make appointments to be received in audience; then you break them without warning, explanation, apology or regret.

You are always going to have ample time to devote to the Great Work;

but that time is always somewhere after the middle of next week.

If you put half as much enthusiasm into what you quite rightly claim to

be the most important factor in life as other old ladies do into  ${\tt Culbert-}$ 

son Contract, you might get somewhere.

What you need, in the way of a Guru, is some fat, greasy Swami, who

would not allow you to enter or leave his presence without permission,

or address him without being formally invited to do so. After seven  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

years at menial household drudgeries, you might with luck be allowed to

listen to some of his improving discourse.

Pretentious humbug is the only appeal to which you can be relied on to

respond. Praxiteles would repel you, unless you covered the  $\mbox{marble}$ 

completely with glittering gew-gaws, tinsel finery, sham jewels from

the tray of Autolycus! Yet it was precisely because you were sick of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

all this that you came to me at all.

How can one take you as a serious student? Only because you do have

moments when the scales fall from your eyes, and your deep need tears  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

down the tawdry counterfeits which hide the shrine where Isis stands

unveiled --- but ah! too far. You must advance.

To advance --- that means Work. Patient, exhausting, thankless, often

5

bewildering Work. Dear sister, if you would but Work! Work blindly,

foolishly, misguidedly, it doesn't matter in the end: Work in itself

has absolute virtue.

But for you, having got so far in this incarnation, there must be  $\boldsymbol{a}$ 

revolution. You must no longer hesitate, no longer plan; you must

leap into the dark, and leap at once.

"The Voice of my Higher Soul said unto me: Let me enter the Path of  $\,$ 

Darkness; peradventure thus I may attain the Light."

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally yours,

666

P.S. Let me adduce an example of the way in which the serious Aspirant

bends to the oar. This is not boasting as if the facts denoted super-

lative excellence; they speak. The only comment is that if such conduct

is not normal and universal, it ought to be. Yet no! I would add this:

that I have not yet heard of anyone who has attained to any results of

importance who does not attribute his success to devotion of quite similar quality.

Here they are:

-

1. The Cloud on the Sanctuary. On reading this book,  $\operatorname{Mr}$ .  $\operatorname{X.}$ , who was

desperate from the conviction that no success in life was worth a tinker's

dam, decided: "This is the answer to my problem; the members of the

Secret Fraternity which this book describes have solved the riddle of

2. X., hearing a conversation in a caf, which made him think that the

speaker might be such an one as he sought, hunted him down --- he had gone

on his travels --- caught him, and made him promise an interview at the earliest possible date.

3. This interview leading to an introduction to the  $\mbox{\it Fraternity}$ , he

joined it, pledging his fealty. But he was grievously shocked, and

nearly withdrew, when assured: "There is nothing in this Oath which

might conflict in any way with your civil, moral or religious obliga-

tions." If it was not worth while becoming a murderer, a traitor, and

an eternally damned soul, why bother about it? was his attitude.

The Head of the Fraternity being threatened with revolt,  $\mathbf{X}$ . when to  $\mathbf{him}$ ,

in circumstances which jeopardised his own progress, and offered his

Deciding to perform a critical Magical Operation, and being warned that  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

serious opposition might come from his own friends, family, etc., he

abandoned his career, changed his name, cut himself off completely from

the past, and allowed no alien interest of any sort to interfere with

his absorption in the Work. His journey to see the Head seemed at that time a fatal interruption; at the least, it involved the waste of one whole year. He was wrong; his gesture of setting the interests of the Order before his personal advancement was counted unto him

for right-

eousness.

6

There should be no need to extend this list; it could be continued

indefinitely. X. had one rule of life, and one only; to do whatever

came first on the list of agenda, and never to count the cost.

Because this course of conduct was so rigidly rational, it appeared to

others irrational and incalculable; because it was so serenely simple,

it appeared an insoluble mystery of a complexity utterly unfathomable!

But --- I fear that you are only too likely to ask --- is not this system

(a) absurd, (b) wrong, as certain in the long run to defeat its own object.

Well, as to (a), everything is absurd. The Universe is not constructed

to gratify the mania of "social planners" and their tedipus kind. As

to (b), there you said something; the refutation will lead us to open

a new chapter. Ought not X. to have laid down a comprehensive scheme,

and worked out the details, so that he would not break down half-way

through for lack of foresight and provision for emergencies?

An example. Suppose that the next step in his Work involved the sacri-

fice of a camel in a house in Tooting Bec, furnished in such

his Grimoire laid down, and that the purchase of the house left him without resources to but that furniture, to say nothing of the camel. What a fool!

No, that does not necessarily follow. If the  $\operatorname{Gods}$  will the  $\operatorname{End}$ , They

also will the means. I shall do all that is possible to me by buying

the house: I shall leave it to Them to do Their share when the time comes.

This "Act of Truth" is already a Magical Formula of infallible puissance;

the man who is capable of so thinking and acting is far more likely to

get what he wanted from the Sacrifice --- when at long last the  $\mathtt{Camel}$ 

appears on the premises --- then he who, having ample means to carry out

the whole Operation without risk of failure, goes through the ceremony

without ever having experienced a moment's anxiety about his ability to

bring it to a successful conclusion.

It think personally that the error lies in calculating. The injunction

is "to buy the egg of a perfectly black hen without haggling." You have

lie;...", ..." & all their words are skew-wise...." AL II, 32.

Let me add that it is a well-attested fact of magical experience ---

beginning with Tarquin and the Sibylline books! --- as well as a fact of

profane psychology, that if you funk a fence, it is harder next time.

If the boy falls off the pony, put him on again at once: if the young

airman crashes, send him up again without a minute's avoidable delay.

If you don't, their nerve is liable to break for good and all.

I am not saying that this policy is invariably successful; your judg-

ment may have misled you as to the necessity of the  $\ensuremath{\text{Operation}}$  which

loomed so large at the moment. And so on; plenty of room for blunders!

But it is a thousand times better to make every kind of  $mistake\ than$ 

to slide into the habit of hesitation, of uncertainty, of indecision.

7

For one thing, you acquire also the habit of dishonourable failure;

and you very soon convince yourself that "the whole thing is nonsense."

confidence comes from exercise, from taking risks, from picking your-

self up after a purler; finding that the maddest gambles keep oncoming

off, you begin to suspect that there is no more than Luck in it; you

observe this closely, and there forms, in the dusk dimly, a Shape; very

soon you see a  $\mbox{\sc Hand}\,,$  and from its movements you divine a  $\mbox{\sc Brain}$  behind

the whole contrivance.

"Good!" you say quietly, with a determined nod; "I'm watched, I'm  $\,$ 

helped: I'll do my bit; the rest will come about without my worrying  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right$ 

or meddling."

And so it is.

Good-night.

666.

CHAPTER XLVI

# SELFISHNESS

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

Selfishness? I am glad to find you worrying that bone, for it has

plenty of meat on it; fine juicy meat, none of your Chilled Argentine

or Canterbury lamb. It is a pelvis, what's more; for in a way the

whole structure of the ethics of Thelema is founded upon it. There is some danger here; for the question is a booby trap for the noble, the generous, the high-minded. "Selfishness," the great characteristic of the Master of the Temple, the very quintessence of his attainment, is not its contradictory, or even its contrary; it is perfectly compatible (nay, shall we friendly?) with it. The Book of the Law has plenty to say on this subject, and it does not mince its words. "First, text; sermon, next," as the poet says. AL II, 18, 19, 20, 21. "These are dead, these fellows; they feel not. We are not for the poor and sad: the lords of the earth are our kinsfolk. "Is a God to live in a dog? No! but the highest are of us. They shall rejoice, our chosen: who sorroweth is not of us. "Beauty and strength, leaping laughter and delicious languor, force and fire, are of us. "We have nothing with the outcast and the unfit: let them die in their misery. For they feel not. Compassion is the vice of kings: stamp 8 down the wretched & the weak: this is the law of the strong: this is our law and the joy of the world. ... " That sets up a standard, with a vengeance! (Note "they feel not," twice repeated. There should be something important to the thesis herein concealed.)

The passage becomes exalted, but a verse later resumes the theme, setting forth the philosophical basis of these apparently violent and arrogant remarks.

"...It is a lie, this folly against self...." (AL II, 22)

This is the central doctrine of Thelema in this matter. What are we to

understand by it? That this imbecile and nauseating cult of weakness  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{---}}$ 

democracy some call it --- is utterly false and vile.

Let us look into the matter. (First consult AL II, 24, 25, 48, 49, 58, 59.

and III, 18, 58, 59. It might be confusing to quote these texts in full;

but they throw much further light on the subject.) The word "compassion"

is its accepted sense --- which is bad ety

CHAPTER LXX

MORALITY (1)

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

"Tu l'as voulu, Georges Dandin!" I knew from the first that your sly,

insidious, poisoned poniard, slipped in between  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  ribs, would soon

or late involve a complete exposition of the whole subject of Morality.

Of we go! What really is it? The word comes from  ${\tt Mos}\,,$  Latin for

custom, manner. Similarly, ethics: from Greek ESOC custom.
"Tt

isn't done" may be modern slang, but it's correct.

Interesting to

study the usage of "moeurs" and "maniŠres" in French.

"Manner" from

"manus" --- hand: it is "the way to handle things."

But the theological conception has steered a very wrong course, even

for theology; brought in Divine Injunction, and Conscience, and a  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

whole host of bogeys. (Candles in hollow turnips deceive nobody out-  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

side a churchyard!)

So we find ourselves discussing a "palely wandering" phantom idea whose connotations or extensions depend on the time, the place, and the victim. We know "the crimes of Clapham chaste in Martaban, and the difference between Old and New Testament morality in such matters as polygamy and diet; while the fur flies when two learned professors go down with a smart attack of Odium Theologicum, and are ready to destroy a civilization on the question of whether it is right or wrong for a priest (or presbyter? or minister?) to wear a white nightie or a black in the pulpit. But what you want to know is the difference between (a) common or area morality, (b) Yoqin -- or "holy man's" morality, and (c) the Magical Morality of the New Aeon of Thelema. 1. Area Morality: This is the code of the "Slave-Gods," very thorougly analysed, pulverized, and de-loused by Nietzsche in Antichrist. It consists of all the meanest vices, especially envy, cowardice, cruelty and greed: all based on over-mastering Fear. Fear of the nightmare type. With this incubus, the rich and powerful have devised an engine to keep down the poor and the weak. They are lavish alike with threats and promises in Ogre Bogey's Castle and Cloud-Cuckoo-Land. "Religion is the opium of the people," when they flinch no longer from the phantom knout. 2. Eight Lectures on Yoga gives a reasonable account of the essence of this matter, especially in the talks on Yama and Niyama. (A book on this subject might well include a few quotations, notably paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 in the former). It might be summarized as "doing that, and only that, which facilitates the task in hand." line of conduct becomes a custom when experience has shown follow it makes for success. "Don't press!" "Play with a

straight

bat!" "Don't draw to five!" do not involve abstract
considerations

1

of right and wrong. Orthodox  $\operatorname{Hinduism}$  has raped this pure  $\operatorname{system}$ , and

begotten a bastard code which reeks of religion. A political manoeuvre  $\,$ 

of the Brahmin caste.

Suppose we relax a little, come down to earth, and look at what the  $\,$ 

far-famed morality of the Holy Man was, and is, in actual practice.

You will find this useful to crush Toshophist and  ${\tt Antroposophagist1}$ 

cockroaches as well as the ordinary Christian Scolex when they assail you.

In the lands of Hinduism and (to a less extent) of Islam, the Sultan,

the Dewan, the Maharajah, the Emir, or whatsoever they call "the  $\operatorname{Grand}$ 

Pandjandrum Himself, with the little round button on top," it is almost

a 100 per cent rule that the button works loose and is lost! Even in  $\ \ \,$ 

less exalted circles, any absolute ruler, on however petty a scale, is

liable to go the whole hog in an unexceptionably hoggish fashion. He  $\,$ 

has none to gainsay him, and he sees no reason for controlling himself.

This suits nearly everybody pretty well; the shrewd Wazir can govern

while his "master" fills up on "The King's Peg" (we must try one when  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

champagne is once again reasonably cheap) and all the other sensuous  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

and sensual delights unstinted. The result is that by the time he is  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

twenty --- he was probably married at 12 --- he is no longer fitted to

carry out his very first duty to the State, the production of an heir.

Quite contrary to this is the career of the "Holy Man." Accustomed to

the severest physical toil, inured to all the rigours of climate,

aloof from every noxious excess, he becomes a very champion of virility.

(Of course, there are exceptions, but the average "holy man" is a

fairly tall fellow of his hands). More, he has been particularly

trained for this form of asceticism by all sorts of secret methods and

practices; some of these, but the way, I was able to learn myself, and

found surprisingly efficacious.

So we have the law of supply and demand at work as uncomplainingly as

usual: the Holy Man prays for the threatened Dynasty, blesses the

Barren Queen; and they all live happy ever after. This is not an

Arabian Night's Tale of Antiquity; it is the same today: there are

very few Englishmen who have spent any time in India who have not been

approached with proposals of this character.

Similar conditions, curiously enough, existed in France; the "fils  $\dots$ 

papa" was usually a hopeless rotter, and his wife often resorted to a  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1$ 

famous monastery on the Riviera, where was an exceptionally holy  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Image}}$ 

of the Blessed Virgin Mary, prayers unto whom removed sterility. But

when M. Combes turned out the monks, the Image somehow lost it virtue.

Now get your Bible and turn up Luke VIII, 2! When the sal volatile has

worked, turn to John XIII 2,3 and ask a scholar what any Greek of the

period would have understood by the technical expressions there unambigu-  $\,$ 

ously employed.

 $1^{\circ}$  WEH NOTE: This is a reference to the school of thought of Rudolf Steiner.

By the time of this writing, Steiner's students were being taught that Crowley

was a "bad man". Tit for tat. Anthroposophy presents a merging of several

branches of mysticism with dance and movement. It rewards study, but one

shouldn't mention A.C. at the Steiner schools until one has acquired what  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

one wants!

2

Presently, I hope, you will begin to wonder whether, after all, the

"morality" of the middle classes of the nineteenth century, in Anglo-

Saxon countries, is quite as axiomatic as you were taught to suppose.

Please let me emphasize the fact that I have heard and seen these  $\operatorname{condi-}$ 

tions in Eastern countries with my own ears and eyes.

Vivekananda ---

certainly the best of the modern Indian writes on Yoga --- complained

bitterly that the old greymalkin witches of New York who called them-

selves his disciples had to be dodged with infinite precaution whenever

he wanted to spend an evening in the Tenderloin. On the other hand,

the Sheikh of Mish --- and a very holy Sheikh he was --- introduced his

"boy friend" as such to me when I visited him in the Sahara, without  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

the slightest shame or embarrassment.

Believe me, the humbug about "morality" in this country and the  ${\tt U.S.A.}$ ,

yes, even on the Continent in pious circles, is  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Hobgoblin}}$   $\ensuremath{\mathsf{No.}}$  1 on the

path of the Wise. If you are fooled by that, you will never get out

of the stinking bog of platitudinous mouthings of makebelieve "Masters."

Need I refer to the fact that most of the unco' guid are penny plain

hypocrites. A little less vile are those whose prejudices are Freudian

in character, who "compound for sins that they're inclined to, By damn-

ing those they have no mind to."

Even when, poor-spirited molluscs, they are honest, all that  $twaddle\ is$ 

Negation. "Hang your clothes on a hickory limb, and don't go near the

water!" does not produce a Gertrud Ederle. Thank  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{God}},$  the modern  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{girl}}$ 

has cast off at least one of her fetters --- the ceinture de  ${\tt chast}$ ,  ${\tt t}$ ,!

238

Perhaps we have now relaxed enough; we see that the "Holy man" is not

such a fool as he looks; and we may get on with our excursions into

the "Morality" of the Law of the New Aeon, which is the Aeon of Horus,

crowned and conquering child: and --- "The word of the Law
is Thelema{this
word in Greek caps}."

3. So much of The Book of the Law deals directly or indirectly with  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

morals that to quote relevant passages would be merely bewildering.

Not that this state of mind fails to result from the first, second,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

third and ninety-third perusals!

"When Duty bellows loud 'Thou must!'
The youth replies 'Pike's Peak or Bust!'"

is all very well, or might be if the bellow gave further particulars.

And one's general impression may very well be that Thelema not only

gives general licence to to any fool thing that comes into one's head,

but urges in the most emphatic terms, reinforced by the most eloquent  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

appeals in superb language, by glowing promises, and by categorical

assurance that no harm can possibly come thereby, the performance of  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right$ 

just that specific type of action, the maintenance of just that line

of conduct, which is most severely depreciated by the high priests and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

jurists of every religion, every system of ethics, that ever was under

the sun!

You may look sourly down a meanly-pointed nose, or yell "Whoop La!" and

make for Piccadilly Circus: in either case you will be wrong; you will

not have understood the Book.

Shameful confession, one of my own Chelas (or so it is rather incredibly

3

reported to me) said recently: "Self-discipline is a form of Restriction." (That, you remember, is "The word of Sin ...".) Of all the utter rubbish! (Anyhow, he was a "centre of pestilence" for discussing the Book at all.) About 90 % of Thelema, at a guess, is nothing but. self-discipline. One is only allowed to do anything and everything so as to have more scope for exercising that virtue. concentrate on "...thou hast no right but to do thy will." The point is that any possible act is to be performed if it is a necessary factor in that Equation of your Will. Any act that is not such a factor, however harmless, noble, virtuous or what not, is at the best a waste of energy. But there are no artificial barriers on any type of act in general. The standard of conduct has one single touchstone. There may be --- there will be --- every kind of difficulty in determining whether, by this standard, any given act is "right" or "wrong": but there should be no confusion. No act is righteous in itself, but only in to the True Will of the person who proposes to perform it. This is the Doctrine of Relativity applied to the moral sphere. I think that, if you have understood this, the whole theory within your grasp; hold it fast, and lay about you! Of course, there must be certain courses of action which, generally speaking, will be right for pretty well everybody. Some, per contra, will be generally barred, as interfering with another's equal right. Some cases will be so difficult that only a Magister Templi can judge them, and a Magus carry them wisely into effect. Fearsome responsibility,

I should say, that of the Masters who began the building-up

Aeon by bringing about these Wars!

of the New

(I do wish that we had the sense to take our ideas of Peace conditions  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

from the Bible, as our rulers so loudly profess that they do. The  $\,$ 

Enemy knows well enough that there is no other way to make a war pay.)

Now then, I hope that we have succeeded in clarifying this exceptionally

muddy marish water of morality from most of its alien and toxic dirt;

too often the Aspirant to the Sacred Wisdom finds no firm path under his

feet; the Bog of Respectability mires him who sought the  $\mbox{\sc Garden}$  of

Delights; soon the last bubbles burst from his choked lungs; he is

engulfed in the Slough of Despond.

In the passive elements of Earth and Water is no creative virtue to  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

cleanse themselves from such impurity as they chance to acquire; it is

therefore of cardinal importance to watch them, guard them, keep their

Purity untainted and unsoiled; shall the Holy Grail brim with poison

of Asps, and the golden Paten be defiled with the Bread of Iniquity?

Come Fire, come Air, cleanse ye and kindle the pure instruments, that  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{L}}$ 

Spirit may indwell, inform, inspire the whole, the One Continuous  $\,$ 

Sacrament of Life!

We have considered this Morality from quite a number of very different

points of view; wrought subtly and accurately into final shape, you

should find no further difficulty in understanding fully at least the  $\,$ 

theoretical and abstract aspects of the business.

But as to your own wit of judgment as to the general rules of your

own private Code of Morals, what is "right" and what is "wrong" for

you, that will emerge only from long self-analysis such as is the  $\,$ 

chief work of the Sword in the process of your Initiation.

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours fraternally.

666

P.S. Most of this is stated or implied in AHA!

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Be ever as you can MARSYAS A simple honest gentleman!

Body and manners be at ease, Not bloat with blazoned sanctities! Who fights as fights the soldier-saint? And see the artist-adept paint! Weak are the souls that fear the stress Of earth upon their holiness! They fast, they eat fantastic food, They prate of beans and brotherhood, Wear sandals, and long hair, and spats, And think that makes them Arahats! How shall man still his spirit-storm? Rational dress and Food Reform!

OLYMPAS I know such saints.

MARSYAS An easy vice:

> So wondrous well they advertise! O their mean souls are satisfied With wind of spiritual pride. They're all negation. "Do not eat; What poison to the soul is meat! Drink not; smoke not; deny the will! Wine and tobacco make us ill." Magic is life: the Will to Live Is one supreme Affirmative. These things that flinch from Life are worth No more to Heaven than to Earth. Affirm the everlasting Yes!

OLYMPAS Those saints at least score one success: Perfection of their priggishness!

MARSYAS Enough. The soul is subtlier fed With meditation's wine and bread. Forget their failings and our own;

Fix all our thoughts on love alone!

CHAPTER LXXI

MORALITY (2)

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

The contents of your letter appalled me. I had hoped that you had

5

left behind forever all that quality of thinking. It is unclean. It is stuffy and flabby. You write of a matter about which you cannot possibly have information, and what you say is not even a good guess; it is simply contrary to fact. It shows also that you have failed to grasp the nature of the O.T.O. Its main raison d'etre, apart from social and political plans, is the teaching and use of a secret method of achieving certain results. This secret is a scientific secret; it is guarded against betrayal or abuse by a very simple automatic arrange-

It is really difficult to answer your letters. You have got things so

higgledy-piggledy. You write of the constitutions of two orders, the

 $\mbox{A.'.}$   $\mbox{A.'.}$  and the  $\mbox{O.T.O.;}$  yet you ignore the printed information about

ment. Its guardians cannot be "dying" any more than

them which you are supposed to have read.

I have to answer each sentence of your letter separately, so incoherent

have you become!

electricians as a class can be.

You are a "student" of A.'. A.'., and become a Probationer as soon as  $\parbox{\footnotemath{\square}}$ 

you take and pass the examination. (This is intended mostly to make

sure that you have some general idea of the principal branches of the  $\,$ 

subject, and know the more important correspondences,) The rest: ---

please read One Star in Sight again, and do for God's sake try to

assimilate the information there very clearly and very fully given!  $\label{eq:clear_state}$ 

It is terrifyingly near the state of mind which we symbolize by Choronzon, this hurrying flustered dash of yours from one point of view to another: a set of statements all true after a fashion, but with such apprehensive agitation that a sensitive reader like myself comes near to being upset. You say that you must tread the Path alone: quite true, if only because anything that exists for you is necessarily part of yourself. Yet you have to "go to others", and you become a veritable busybody. You quote odd opinions at random without the means of estimating their value. Cannot I ever get you to understand the difference between an honest and dishonest teacher? I have always made it a rule never to put forward any statement of which I cannot produce proof; when I venture a personal opinion it is always Marked in Plain Figures to that effect. (I refer you to Magick p. 368: p. 375, paragraphs 1 and 2:. and p. 415, paragraphs 000 and 00. We insist from the beginning on the individual character of the work, and upon the necessity of maintaining the objective and sceptical standpoint. You are explicitly warned against reliance upon "authority," even that of the Order itself.) Consider my own assets, personal, social, educational, experiential and the rest: don't you see that all I had to do was to put out some brightlycoloured and mellifluous lie, and avoid treading on too many toes, to have had hundreds of thousands of idiots worshipping me? Please get a Konx om Pax somehow, and read p. XII: "It's only too easy to form a cult, "To cry a crusade with 'Deus Vult' . . . . "A pinch of Bible, a gallon of gas, "And I, or any otherguess ass, "Could bring to our mystical Moonlight Mass

6

"Those empty-headed Athenians."

and so on.

But I never forget that I am working on the 2,000 year basis; my work

will stand when all the pompous platitudes and pleasant pieties have

withered for the iridescent soft-soap bubbles that they are.

Soap! yes, indeed. I work on gold, and gold must be cleansed with acid.

I really cannot understand how you can be so inaccurate, with the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{very}}$ 

text before your eyes! You write --- "you write that in Jan. 1899 etc."

But I don't. Captain J. F. C. Fuller wrote it. A small point; but

you must learn to be careful about every tiniest detail.

Then you go on about "not only invisible chiefs2 of the A.'. A.'. . . . .

but also the Chiefs of the Golden Dawn . . .  $\mbox{\tt .}$  The Golden Dawn is merely

the name for the Outer Order: see Magick pp. 230-231. You have never  $\,$ 

been taught to read carefully. You write of Theoricus as the grade

following Neophyte: it isn't. Back to Magick pp. 230-231! You have

never taken the trouble to go with me through the Rituals of O.T.O.,

or you would not ask such questions. The O.T.O. is a training of

the Masonic type; there is no "astral" work in it at all, nor any Yoga.

There is a certain amount of Qabalah, and that of great doctrinal value.

But the really vital matter is the gradual progress towards disclosure  $% \left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right)$ 

of the Secret of the Ninth Degree. To use that secret to advantage

involves mastery both of Yoga and of Magick; but neither is taught in

the Order. Now it comes to be mentioned, this is really very strange.

However, I didn't invent the system; I must suppose that those who

did knew what they were about.

To me it is (a) convenient in various practical ways, (b) a machine for carrying out the orders of the Secret Chiefs of A.'. A.'. (c) by virtue of the Secret a magical weapon of incalculable power. You are not "stuck." You can use your Astral Body well enough: too well, in one way. But I think you need a few more journeys with me: you ought to get on to the stage where the vision results from a definite invocation. Do please forget all these vague statements about the "clarification of one's dream-life" (meaning what?) and "shadow-thinking" (meaning what?) These speculations are idle, and idleness is poison. very next paragraph you give the whole show away! "Artistically it appeals to me --- but not spiritually." You have been spiritually poisoned. What blasphemy more hideous could be penned? What lie so base, so false, so nasty, what so devilish and deadly a doctrine? I feel contaminated by the mere fact of being in a world where such filth is possible to conceive. I am all but in tears to think of my beloved sister tortured by so foul a denizen of the Abyss. Cannot you see in this the root of all your toadstool spawn of miseries, of doubts, of fears, of indecisions? 2\* How do you know They are "invisible?" I foresee that sooner or later you will be asking for more information about them, so I am

7

planning a

LXXVII)

As an Artist you are a consecrated Virgin Priestess, the Oracle of the

separate letter to supply this. (See Letters IX, L and

Most High. None has the right to approach you save with the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{most}}$ 

blessed awe, with arms outstretched as to invoke your benediction.

By "spiritually" you mean no more than "according to the lower and

middle-middle-class morality of the Anglo-Saxon of the period when

Longfellow and Tennyson were supposed to be poets, and Royal Academi-

cians painters."

There is a highly popular school of "occultists" which is 99 % an

escape-mechanism. The fear of death is one of the bogeys; but far

deeper is the root-fear  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  fear of being alone, of being oneself, of

life itself. With this there goes the sense of guilt.

The Book of the Law cuts directly at the root of all this calamitous,

this infamous tissue of falsehood.

What is the meaning of Initiation? It is the Path to the realisation

of your Self as the sole, the supreme, the absolute of all Truth,

Beauty, Purity, Perfection!

What is the artistic sense in you? What but the One Channel always

open to you through which this Light flows freely to enkindle you

(and the world through you) with flowers of inexhaustible fervour and flame?

And you set up against That this spectre of grim fear, of shame, of

 $\operatorname{qualms}$  and  $\operatorname{doubts},$  of inward  $\operatorname{quakings}$  lest --- you are too stricken

with panic to see clearly what the horror is. You say "the elemental

spirits and the Archangels are watching." (!) My dear, dear, sister,

did you invent these beings for no better purpose than to spy on you?

They are there to serve you; they are parts of your being whose func-

tion is to enable you to reach further in one particular direction or  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

another without interference from the other parts, so long as you

happen to need them for some service or other in the Great Work.

Please cleanse your mind once and for all of this delusion, disastrous  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

and most damnable, that there can be opposition between two essential

parts of your nature.

I think this idea is a monstrous growth upon the tetanus-soaked soil

of your fear of "the senses." Observe how all these mealy-mouthed

prigs develop their distrust of Life until hardly an action remains

that is not "dangerous" or in some way harmful. They dare not smoke,

drink, love --- do anything natural to them. They are right!! The Self

in them is Guilt, a marsh miasmal of foul pestilence. Last, since

"nature, though one expel it with a pitchfork, always returns," they

do their "sins" in secret, and pile hypocrisy upon the summit of all  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

their other vices.

I cannot write more; it makes me too sad. I hope there is no need.

Do be your Self, the radiant Daughter of the Muse!

With that command I turn to other tasks.

Love is the law, love under will.

8

Fraternally yours ever,

666

CHAPTER LXXII

EDUCATION

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

Education means "leading out"; this is not the same as "stuffing in".

I refuse to enlarge on this theme; it is all-important. To extract

something, you should first know what is there. Here astrology ought

to give useful hints; its indications give the mind something to work

on. Experience makes "confirmation strong as Holy Writ;" but beware

of ... priori. Do not be dogmatic; do not insist in the face of dis-

appointment. Astrology in education is useful as geology is to the  $% \left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =0$ 

prospector; it tells you the sort of thing to look for, and the

direction in which to explore.

There are, however, two main lines of teaching which are of universal

value to normal children; it is hardly possible to begin too early.

Firstly, accustom his ear from the start to noble sounds; the music

of nature and the rhythm of great poetry. Do not aim at his understand-

ing, but at his subconscious mind. Protect him from cacophonous noise;

avoid scoring any cheap success with him by inflicting jingles; do not

insult him by "baby-talk."

Secondly, let him understand, as soon as you start actual teaching, the

difference between the real and the conventional in what you make  $\mathop{\text{\rm him}}\nolimits$ 

memorize. Nothing irritates children more than the
arbitrary "because
I say so."

Nobody knows why the alphabet has the order which we know; it is quite

senseless. One could construct a much more rational order: e.g. the

Mother, the Single and the Double letters, all in the natural order of

the elements, planets and signs. Again, we have the "Missionary" Alpha-

bet, arranged "scientifically" as Gutturals, modified ditto, Dentals,

Labials, vowels and so on; a most repulsive concoction! But I would

not accept any emendation from the  $\operatorname{God}$  Thoth himself; it is infinitely

simpler to stick to the familiar order. But explain to the child that

this is only for convenience, like the rule of the road; indeed, like

almost any rules!

But when your teaching is of the disputable kind, explain that too;

encourage him to question, to demand a reason and to disagree. Get him

to fence with you; sharpen his wits by dialectic; lure him into think-

ing for himself. I want tricks which will show him the advantages of a

given subject of study; make him pester you to teach him. We did this

most successfully at the Abbey of Thelema in Cefalu; let me give you an

instance: reading. One of us would take the children shopping and bring

up the subject of ice-cream. Where, oh where could we get some?

Presently one would exclaim and point to a placard and say, "I really

do believe there'll be some there" --- and lo! it was so. Then they

9

would wonder how one knew, and one would say: Why, there's "Helados"

printed on that piece of card in the window. They would want to learn

to read at once. We would discourage them, saying what hard word it  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

was, and how much crying it cost, at the same time giving another  $\operatorname{demon-}$ 

stration of the advantages. They would insist, and we should yield  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$ 

to active, eager children, not to dullards that hated the idea of

"lessons." So with pretty well everything; we first excited the

child's will in the desired direction.

But (you ask) are there any special branches of learning which you  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,n\right\}$ 

regard as essential for all?

Yes.

Our old unvalued friend St. Paul, the cunning crook who turned the

Jewish communism of the Apostles into an international ramp, saw in a  $\,$ 

vision a man from Macedonia who said "Come over and help us!" This

time it has been a woman from California, but the purport of her plaints

was identical. Much as I should like to see  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  Father the Sun once more

before I die, nothing doing until --- if ever --- life recovers from the

blight of regulations. Luckily, one thing she said helps us out: some-

one had told her that I had written on Education in Liber Aleph --- The  $\,$ 

Book of Wisdom or Folly --- which has been ready for the printer for more

than a quarter of a century --- and there's nothing I can do about it!

However, I looked up the typescript. The book is itself Education;

there are, however, six chapters which treat of the subject in the

Special sense in which your question has involved us.

So I shall fling these chapters headlong into this letter.

### DE VOLUNTATE JUVENUM

Long, O my Son, hath been this Digression from the plain Path of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

 $\,$  My word concerning Children; but it was most needful that thou

shouldst understand the Limits of true Liberty. For that is not

the Will of any Man which ultimateth in his own  $\mbox{\sc Ruin}$  and that of

all his Fellows; and that is not Liberty whose Exercise bringeth  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

him to Bondage. Thou mayst therefore assume that it is always an  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,n\right\}$ 

essential Part of the Will of any Child to grow to  $\mbox{\tt Manhood}$  or to

 $\label{thm:manhood} \mbox{ \footnote{thm} Momanhood in Health, and his Guardians may therefore prevent $\mbox{him}$}$ 

from ignorantly acting in Opposition thereunto, Care being always  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

taken to remove the cause of the Error, namely, Ignorance, as  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

aforesaid. Thou mayst also assume that it is Part of the  $\operatorname{Child}\nolimits^{\,\mathsf{L}}$ 

Will to train every Function of the Mind; and the Guardians may

therefore combat the Inertia which hinders its Development. Yet

here is much Caution necessary, and it is better to work by

exciting and satisfying any natural Curiosity than by forcing  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

Application to set Tasks, however obvious this Necessity may appear.

### DE MODO DISPUTANDI

Now in this training of the Child is one most dear Consideration,

that I shall impress upon thee as is Conformity with out holy

Experience in the way of Truth. And it is this, that since that

which can be thought is not true, every Statement is in some sense

false. Even on the Sea of Pure Reason, we may say that every

10

Statement is in some Sense disputable. Therefore in every Case,

even the simplest, the Child should be taught not only the Thesis,

but also its opposite, leaving the Decision to the child's own

Judgment and good Sense, fortified by Experience. And this  $\operatorname{Prac}$ -

tice will develop its Power of Thought, and its Confidence in  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1$ 

itself, and its Interest in all Knowledge. But most of all beware  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

against any Attempt to bias its Mind on any Point that lieth with-

out the Square of ascertained and undisputed Fact. Remember also,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

even when thou art most sure, that so were they sure who gave

Instruction to the young Copernicus. Pay Reverence also to the  $\,$ 

Unknown unto whom thou presumest to impart thy knowledge; for he may

be one greater than thou.

# DE VOLUTATE JVENIS COGNOSCENDA

It is important that thou shouldst understand as early as may be

what is the true Will of the Child in the Matter of his Career.

Be thou well aware of all Ideals and Daydreams; for the Child is

himself, and not thy Toy. Recall the comic Tragedy of Napoleon  $\,$ 

and the King of Rome; build not an House for a wild Goat, nor

plant a Forest for the Domain of a Shark. But be thou vigilant  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

for every Sign, conscious or unconscious, of the Will of the Child,

giving him then all Opportunity to pursue the Path which he thus  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

indicates. Learn this, that he, being young, will weary quickly

of all false Ways, however pleasant they may be to him at the  $\ensuremath{\text{Out-}}$ 

 $\operatorname{set};$  but of the true Way he will not weary. This being in this

Manner discovered, thou mayst prepare it for him perfectly; for

no man can keep all Roads open for ever. And to  $\mathop{\text{him}}\nolimits$  making  $\mathop{\text{his}}\nolimits$ 

Choice explain how one may not travel far on any one  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Road}}$  without

a general Knowledge of Things apparently irrelevant. And with

that he will understand, and bend him wisely to his Work.

# DE ARTE MENTIS COLENDI, (1) MATHEMATICA.

Now, concerning the first Foundation of Thy Mind I will say

somewhat. Thou shalt study with Diligence in the  ${\tt Mathematics}$ ,

because thereby shall be revealed unto thee the Laws of thine  $\operatorname{own}$ 

Reason and the Limitations thereof. This Science manifesteth unto

thee thy true Nature in respect of the Machinery whereby it worketh,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

and showeth in pure Nakedness, without Clothing of Personality or  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\} =$ 

Desire, the Anatomy of thy conscious Self. Furthermore, by this

thou mayst understand the Essence of the Relations between all

Things, and the Nature of Necessity, and come to the Knowledge of  $\,$ 

Form. For this Mathematics is as it were the last  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Veil}}$  before the

Image of Truth, so that there is no Way better than our  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Holy}}$ 

Qabalah, which analyseth all Things soever, and reduceth them  $\,$ 

to pure Number; and thus their Natures being no longer coloured

and confused, they may be regulated and formulated in  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{Simplicity}}$ 

by the Operation of Pure Reason, to their great Comfort in the

Work of our Transcendental Art, whereby the Many become One.

# SEQUITUR (2) CLASSICA

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{My}}$  son, neglect not in any wise the study of the Writings of

Antiquity, and that in the original Language. For by this thou

shalt discover the History of the Structure of thy Mind, that is,

its Nature regarded as the last  $\operatorname{Term}$  in a Sequence of Causes and

Effects. For thy Mind hath been built up of these Elements, so  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,2,\ldots \right\}$ 

11

that in these Books thou mayst bring into the Light thine own  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

sub-conscious Memories. And thy Memory is as it were the Mortar  $\,$ 

in the House of thy Mind, without which is no Cohesion or Indi-  $% \left\{ 1,2,...,n\right\}$ 

viduality possible, so that it is called Dementia. And these

Books have lived long and become famous because they are the  $\,$ 

Fruits of ancient Trees whereof thou art directly the  $\mbox{\em Heir},$  where-

fore (say I) they are more truly germane to thine own Nature than  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

Books of Collateral Offshoots, though such were in themselves  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right$ 

better and wiser. Yes, O  $\ensuremath{\text{my}}$  son, in these Writings thou  $\ensuremath{\text{mayst}}$ 

study to come to the true Comprehension of thine own Nature, and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

that of the whole Universe, in the dimensions of Time, even as

the Mathematic declareth it in that of Space: that is, of Exten-  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,2,3,\ldots \right\}$ 

sion. Moreover, by this Study shall the Child comprehend the

Foundation of Manners: the which, as sayeth one of the Sons of

Wisdom, maketh Man.

# SEQUITUR (3) SCIENTIFICA

Since Time and Space are the conditions of Mind, these  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{two}}$ 

Studies are fundamental. Yet there remaineth Causality, which

is the Root of the Actions and Reactions of Nature. This also

shalt thou seek ardently, that thou mayest comprehend the

Variety of the Universe, its Harmony and its Beauty, with the

Knowledge of that which compelleth it. Yet this is not equal

to the former two in Power to reveal thee to thyself; and its

first Use is to instruct thee in the true  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Method}}$  of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Advancement}}$ 

in Knowledge, which is, fundamentally, the observation of the  $\,$ 

Like and Unlike. Also, it shall arouse in thee the  ${\sf Ecstasy}$ 

of Wonder; and it shall bring thee to a proper Understanding

of Art Magick. For our Magick is but one of the Powers that

lie within us undeveloped and unanalysed; and it is by the

Method of Science that it must be made clear, and available to

the Use of Man. Is not this a Gift beyond Price, the Fruit

of a Tree not only of Knowledge but of Life? For there is that

in Man which is God, and there is that also which is Dust; and

by our Magick we shall make these twain one Flesh, to the  $\ensuremath{\text{Ob-}}$ 

taining of the Empery of the Universe.

I suppose I might have put it more concisely: Classics is itself

Initiation, being the key of the Unconscious; Mathematics is the Art

of manipulating the Ruach, and of raising it to Neschamah; and Science

is co-terminous with Magick.

These are the three branches of study which I regard as fundamental.

No others are in the same class. For instance, Geography is almost

meaningless until one makes it real by dint of honest travel, which

does not mean either "commuting" or "luxury cruises," still less

"globe-trotting." Law is a specialized study, with a view to a career;

History is too unsystematic and uncertain to be of much use as mental

training; Art is to be studied for and by one's solitary self; any

teaching soever is rank poison.

The final wisdom on this subject is perhaps the old "Something of everything, and everything of something."

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours ever,

12

666

P.S. Better mention, perhaps, that literacy is no test of education.

For ignorance of life, the don class leaves all others at the post;

clatter and cackle, "The tittering, thin-bearded, epicene,"
"Dwarf,

fringed with fear," the obscene vole, dweller by and in backwaters  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

that has foisted upon us the grotesque and poisonous superstition  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

that wisdom abides only in dogs-eared, worm-eaten, muleinspired  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

long-forgotten as misbegotten folios.

I like the story  $\operatorname{---}$  it is a true tale  $\operatorname{---}$  of the old Jew millionaire who

bought up the annual waste of the Pennsylvania Railroad --- a matter of

Three Million Dollars. He called with his cheque very neatly made

out --- and signed it by making his mark! The Railroad Man was naturally

falbbergasted, and could not help exclaiming, "Yet you made all those  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

millions of yours --- what would you have been if only you had been able

to read and write?" "Doorkeeper at the Synagogue" was the prompt

reply. His illiteracy had disqualified him when he applied for the job after landing.

256

The story is not only true, but "of all Truth;" see my previous letter on "Certainty.

Books are not the only medium even of learning; more, what they teach

is partial, prejudiced, meagre, sterile, uncertain, and alien to

reality. It follows that all the best books are those which make no  $\,$ 

pretence to accuracy: poetry, theatre, fiction. All others date

Another point is that Truth abides above and aloof from intellectual

expression, and consequently those books which bear the Magic Keys  $\,$ 

of the Portal of the Intelligible by dint of inspiration and suggestion

come more nearly to grips with Reality than those whose appeal is only

to the Intellect. "Didactic" poetry, "realistic" plays and novels,

are contradictions in terms.

P.P.S. One more effort: the above reminds me that I have said no  $\,$ 

word about the other side of the medal. There are many children who

cannot be educated at all in any sense of the word. It is an abonin-

able waste of both of them and of the teacher to push against brick walls.

Yet one last point. I am as near seventy as makes no matter, and  $\ensuremath{\mathrm{I}}$ 

am still learning with all my might. All my life I have been taught:

governesses, private tutors, schools, private and public, the best of

the Universities: how little I know! I have traveled all over the

world in all conditions, from "grand seigneur," to "holy man;" how

little I know!

What then of the ninety-and-nine, dragged by the ears through suicide  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{N}}$ 

examinations, and kicked out of school into factory in their teens?

They have learnt only just enough to facilitate the swallowing of the

gross venal lies of the radio and the Yellow Press; or, if mother-

wit has chanced to warn them, they learn a little  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  very little  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$ 

more, getting their Science from a Shilling Handbook and so on, till

they know just enough to become dangerous agitators.

No, anything like a real education demands leisure, the conversation

13

of the wise, the means to travel, and the rest.

There is only one solution: to pick out the diamonds from the clay,

cut them, polish them, and set them as they deserve. Attempt no idiot

experiments with the muck of the mine! You will observe that I am  $\,$ 

advocating an aristocratic revolution. And so I am!

 $\operatorname{P.P.S.}$  Short of the ideals above outlined, you may as well have

a pis aller --- words of astonishing insight and wisdom, not alien to

the Law Thelema, and written by one who was trained on The Book of the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Law}}$  .

"Self-confidence must be cultivated in the younger members of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

the nation from childhood onwards. Their whole education and

training must be directed towards giving them a conviction that  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

they are superior to others", wrote Hitler.

"In the case of female education," I read on, "the main stress  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

should be laid on bodily training, after that on character, and,

last of all, on the intellect; but the one absolute aim of female

education must be with a view to the future mother."

They are quoted as an extreme example of all that is horrible and evil

by Mr. George E. Chust of the Daily Telegraph --- from Mein Kampf!

P.P.P.S. There is a game, an improvement on the "Spelling Bee" --- I have anti-christened it "Fore and aft" so as to be natty and naval --which is in my opinion one of the three or four best indoor games for

two ever invented., Here are the rules, in brief: any disputed points?

Apply to me.

- 1. A "Word" consists of four or more letters.
- 2. It must be printed in big black type in the Dictionary chosen for

reference. (Nuttall's is fairly good, though some very well-known

words are omitted. The Oxford Pocket Dictionary is useless; it is

for morons, illiterates, wallowers in "Basic English" --and [I suppose]

Oxonians. No proper names, however well-known, unless used as common:

e.g. Bobby, a flatfoot, a beetlecrusher, a harness bull; or Xantippe,

a shrew, a lady. X-rays is given in the plural only: ditto

rays", and they give "R"ntgenogram". "You never can tell!" Participles,

plurals and the like are not "words" unless printed as such in big

black type. E.g. Nuttall's "Juttingly" is a word; "jutting" is not,

being in smaller type. "Soaking" is in small type, but also in big

type as a noun; so it is a word.)

3. The Dictionary is the sole and final arbiter. This produces blas-

phemy, but averts assassination.

4. The first player starts with the letter A. The second may put any

letter he chooses either before or after that A. The other continues

as he will, and can.

5. The player who cannot add a letter without completing a "word"

loses.

They proceed to B, and so on to Z.

6. A player whose turn it is must either add his letter within a  $\,$ 

reasonable (This is a matter of good feeling, courtesy and considera-

tion) time, may say "I challenge" or, alternatively, "That is a 'word'."

The other must then give the "word" that he intends, or deny that it

is a "word" within the meaning of the Art, as the case may be. The  $\,$ 

Dictionary decides the winner. The challenged player may give one

word only, and that in the form which is printed in the Dictionary;

e.g. if he were challenged at BRUSS, and answered Brussels, he would  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,2,3,\ldots \right\}$ 

lose; if BRUSSELS-SPROUTS, he would win. Hyphens need not be given.

CASHMERE is a "word"; it is a kind of shawl, etc., so is CHARLEY, a

night-watchman. Don't argue: the Dictionary decides.

7. This game calls not only for an extensive vocabulary but for courage;

foresight, judgment, resource, subtlety and even low cunning. It can

be played by more than two players, but the more there are, the more  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{T}}$ 

the element of chance comes in; and this is hateful to really fine

players and diminishes the excitement. The rapier-play of two experts,

when a word changes from one line of formation to another, and then

again, perhaps even a third time, is as exhilarating as a baseball-

game or a bull-fight.

And what the Tartarus-Tophet-Jehanna has all this to do with Education.

and the Great Work? This, child! H.G.Wells and others have pointed

out with serene justice that a gap in your vocabulary implies a gap in

your mind; you lack the corresponding idea. Too true, "Erbert! But

I threap that a pakeha with such xerotes as his will chowter with an

arsis of ischonophony, beyond aught that any fub, even in Vigonia and

dwale mammodis with a cascade from a Dewan tauty, a kiss-mequick, a  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{L}}$ 

chou over her merkin and a parka over her chudder could do to save him, and have an emprosthotonos, when he reads this. Sruti! (Whaur's your Wullie Chaucer noo?) I put this in for you because an American officer3, very dear to me, flited from the Front for a few days to ask me a few questions --- oh, "very much above your exalted grade" my dear --- and I thought it might be useful to him to learn this game, needing, as it does, such very meagre apparatus, to wile away some of the long hours between attacks. He picked it up quickly enough; but, after a bit when I suggested that he should pass it on to his comrades-in-arms, he jeered at me openly! Their vocabulary to mine, he said, holds just about the same proportion as mine does to yours; I hypothesized modestly, "about five per cent." (After all, I am forty-five years his senior.) He roared at "Not one in a hundred," he said, "know so much as the names of nine-tenths of the subjects that I discuss habitually and fluently. They gasp, they gape, they grunt, the gibber; it is almost always black bewilderment4. And some of them are college graduates --- which I'm not." 3^ WEH NOTE: Probably Grady Louis McMurtry, who became "Caliph" or acting head of O.T.O. many years later. 4\* They attach no meaning to these words: Palaeontology Criterion Vector Synthesis (They know "synthetic" but can't connect it with the noun) Epitome

He was snatched from school, and given a commission on the spot, apparently because he was one of very few that could be

ently because he was one of very few that could be differentiated from the average Learned Pig.

All this made me exceeding sorrowful. I began to understand why  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{m}} \ensuremath{\mathsf{y}}$ 

Liber OZ, written entirely in words of one syllable only, with this

very idea in mind, turned out to be completely beyond the average man's

(or woman's) understanding. I had some Mass Observation done on it.

"But this is rank socialism," "Sy, ayn't this all Fascism?" "Oh

Golly!" "Cripes!" "Coo!" "How dreadful!" about the nearest most of

them got to Ralph Straus and Desmond MacCarthy!

Words of one syllable! Louis Marlow5 had already told  $\ensuremath{\text{me}}$  what a fool

I was to expect that. "All they can digest," said he, "is a mess of  $\ \ \,$ 

stewed clich,s with Bird's custard Power."

Damn everything --- it's true, it's true.

So do you at least get together the stones that you need to  $\ensuremath{\text{build}}$ 

your Basilica!

CHAPTER LXXIII.

"MONSTERS," NIGGERS, JEWS, ETC.

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

Come now, is this quite fair? When I agreed to tip you off about

Magick and the rest, I certainly never expected to be treated as if  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

were being interviewed by an American Sunday Newspaper. What do  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

prefer for breakfast, and my views on the future of the theatre, and

is the Great White Brotherhood in favour of Eugenic Babies? No, dear  $\,$ 

sister --- I nearly said sob-sister. But this I will say, you have been  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

very artful, and led me on very cleverly --- you must have been a terror

to young men --- for the matter of that, I dare say you are still!

And I don't see how to get out of swallowing this last sly bait; as you say, "Every man and every woman is a star." does need some attention to the definition of "man" and "woman". What is the position, you say, of "monsters"? And men of "inferior" races, like the Veddah, Hottentot and the Australian Blackfellow? There must be a line somewhere, and Foreign Policy (To them a mere phrase; no idea of its connotation or principles) Demology Entrepreneur Correspondent and Co-respondent. (They don't know the difference) Subcutaneous Chordee) Gleet ) (Although they have them!) Histology ("Something to do with history") 5^ WEH NOTE: Louis Umfraville Wilkinson wrote under this pen name. He was one of two individuals named to be literary executors under Crowley's Last Will and Testament. 16 will I please draw it? You make me feel like Giotto! There is one remark which I must make at the beginning. poet or other, Tennyson or Kipling, I think (I forget who) that wrote: "Folks in the loomp, is baad." It is true all round. Someone wisely took note that the vilest man alive had always found someone to love him. Remember the monster6 that Sir Frederick Treves picked up from an East End peep-show, and had petted by princesses? (What a cunning trick!) Revolting, all the same, to read his account of it. He --- the monster, not Treves! --- seems to have been a most charming individual --ah! That's the word we want. Every individual has some qualities

that endear him to some other. And per contra, I doubt if there is any

class which is not detestable to some other class. Artists, police,

the clergy, "reds," foxhunters, Freemasons, Jews, "heaven-born," women's

clubwomen (especially in U.S.A.), "Methodys," golfers, doglovers;

you can't find one body without its "natural" enemies. It's right,

what's worse; every class, as a class, is almost sure to have more

defects than qualities. As soon as you put men together, they somehow

 $\operatorname{sink},$  corporatively, below the level of the worst of the individuals

composing it. Collect scholars on a club committee, or men of science  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

on a jury; all their virtues vanish, and their vices pop out, rein-

forced by the self-confidence which the power of numbers is bound to bestow.

It is peculiarly noticeable that when a class is a ruling minority, it

acquires a detestation as well as a contempt for the surrounding "mob."

In the Northern States of U.S.A., where the whites are overwhelming in  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,2,\ldots \right\}$ 

South, where fear is a factor, Lynch Law prevails. (Should it? The  $\,$ 

reason for "NO" is that it is a confession of weakness.) But in the  $\,$ 

North, there is a very strong feeling about certain other classes: the  $\,$ 

Irish, the Italians, the Jews. Why? Fear again; the Irish in poli-

tics, the Italians in crime, the Jews in finance. But none of these

phobias prevent friendship between individuals of hostile classes.

I think that perhaps I have already written enough  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  at least enough

to start you thinking on the right lines. And mark well this! The

submergence of the individual in his class means the end of all true  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

human relations between men. Socialism means war. When the class  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

moves as a class, there can be no exceptions.

This is no original thought of mine; Stalin and Hitler both saw it

crystal-clear; both, the one adroitly, the other clumsily, but with equally consummate hypocrisy, acted it out. They picked individuals to rule under their autocracy, killed off those that wouldn't fit, destroyed the power of the Trades Unions or Soviets while pretending to make them powerful and prosperous, and settled down to the serious business of preparing for the war which both knew to be inevitable. It is this fundamental fact which ensures that every democracy shall end with an upstart autocrat; the stability of peace depends upon the original idea which aggrandized America in a century from four millions to a hundred: extreme individualism with opportunity. Our own longest period of peace abroad (bar frontier skirmishes like the Crimean war) and prosperity at home coincided with Free Trade and Laissez-faire. 6^ WEH NOTE {needs research}: Is this the "Elephant Man"? 17 Now we may return, refreshed, to the main question of monsters, real (like Treves') or imaginary like Jews and niggers. 'Arf a mo! Haven't we solved the problem, ambulando? Everything would be okydoke and hunkydory if only we can prevent classes from acting as such? I suppose so. Then, what about a spot of pithy paradox for a change? Why should the classes want to act as classes? It's obvious; "Union is strength." The worst Fifteen can do more with a football than the

best opposing team of one --- excuse my Irish!

Well, that tortoise is that elephant based upon? Why, still obviously,

upon the universal sense of individual weakness. We all want a big

bruvver to tell of him! Hence the Gods and the Classes. It's fear  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

at the base of the whole pyramid of skulls.

How right politicians are to look upon their constituents as cattle!

Anyone who has any experience of dealing with any class as such knows

the futility of appealing to intelligence, indeed to any other quali-

ties than those of brutes.

And so, whenever we find one Man who has no fear like  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Ibsen's}}$   $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Doctor}}$ 

Stockmann or Mark Twain's Colonel Grainger that strolled out on his

balcony with his shotgun to face the mob that had come to lynch him,

he can get away with it. "An Enemy of the People" wrote Ibsen, "Ye

are against the people, O my chosen!" says The Book of the Law. (AL II, 25).

Not only does it seem to me the only conceivable way of reconciling

this and similar passages with "Every man and every woman is a star."

to assert the sovereignty of the individual, and to deny the right-  $\,$ 

to-exist to "class-consciousness," "crowd-psychology," and so to mob-

rule and Lynch-Law, but also the only practicable plan whereby we may

each one of us settle down peaceably to mind his own business, to

pursue his True Will, and to accomplish the Great Work.

So never lose sight for a moment of the maxim so often repeated in  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$ 

one context or another in these letters: that fear is at the root of

every possibility of trouble, and that "Fear is failure, and the fore-

runner of failure. Be thou therefore without fear; for in the heart  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

of the coward virtue abideth not."

Good-night; and don't look under the bed!

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours fraternally,

CHAPTER LXXIV.

OBSTACLES ON THE PATH.

Cara Soror,

Theognis."

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

18

Peccavi! And how! But my excuse is good, and I will try to make amends.

First, a little counter-attack --- your letter is so rambling and diffuse that at first I couldn't make out what you were getting at, and at last decided that it is much too random to reproduce, or even to deal with in detail. I shall simply formulate the case for the Prosecution, plead

The gravamen is that the Path of the Wise is gay with flowers, gilded with kiosks, and beset with snares; that every step is the Abode of Terror and Rapture --- and all that! Yet I habitually write in the manner of a drunken dominie! You "gaped for Aeschylus, and got

I tempted you, it seems with The Chymical Marriage of Christian  $\,$ 

Rosencreutz, its incomparable mystery and glamour, its fugitive

beauty, its ineffable romance, its chivalry and its adventure, pellucid

gleams as of sunlight under the sea, vast brooding wings of horror  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

overshadowing the firmament, yet with strong Starlight constant over-

bead. And then I let you down!

guilty, and appeal for clemency.

You did expect at least something of the atmosphere of the  $\operatorname{Arabian}$ 

Nights; if not so high, of Apuleius and Petronius Arbiter; of Rabelais,

Meinhold, de la Motte Fouqu,; and the Morte d'Arthur in later times, of

Balzac, Dumas, Lytton, Huysmans, Mabel Collins and Arthur Machen.

You look at me with strange sad eyes: "But you, too, Master, have not

you too led a life as strange, as glamourous, as weird and as romantic,

as the best of them? Then why this cold detachment from that ambience?"

Well, if you put it like that, I can only say that I feel at the same

time more guilty and entirely innocent!

For, while the charge is true, the defence is not to be shaken.

The worst of all teachers are the Boloney Magnates, of whom

already given some account. But the next worst are just exactly those

who try to create an atmosphere of romance, and succeed only in a crude

theatricalism. So, avoiding the swirling turmoil of Scylla,

broken the ship on the barren rock Charybdis. {Editorial Q. --- isn't this basakwards? WEH}

Now let me hearten you, brave sister! All the old tales are

You can have as many dragons, princesses, vampires, knightserrant,

glendowers, enchanted apes, Jinn, sorcerers and incubi as you like to

fancy, and --- whoa Emma! did I tell you about Cardinal Newman? Well,

I will.

The one passage in his snivelling Apologia which impressed me was a

tale of his childhood --- before the real poet, lover and mystic had

been buried beneath the dung-heap of Theology. He tells us

read the Arabian Nights --- in a heavily Bowdlerized edition, bet you

a tosser! --- and was enchanted, like the rest of us, so that he sighed

"I wish these tales were true!" The same thing happened to

I set my teeth, and muttered: "I will make these tales true!"

Well, I have, haven't I? You said it yourself!

19

Let me be very frank about one point. It has always puzzled me com-

pletely why one is forbidden to relate certain of one's adventures.

You remember, perhaps, in one of these letters  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$  started out gaily to

tell you some quite simple things --- I couldn't, can't, see quite what

harm could come of it --- and I was pulled up sharp --- yes, and actually

punished, like a school-boy! I had often done much more impudent

things, and nobody seemed to give a hoot. Oh somebody tell me why!

The only suggestion that occurs to me is that I might somehow be

"giving occasion to the enemy to blaspheme." Let it go at that!

"Enough of Because! Be he damned for a dog!"

Yes child, my deepest attitude is to be found in my life. I have been

to most of the holy inaccessible places, and talked with the most holy

inaccessible men; I have dared all the most dangerous adventures, both  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

of the flesh and of the spirit; and I challenge the world's literature  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{$ 

to match for sublimity and terror such experiences as those in the  $\,$ 

latter half of The Vision and the Voice.

You understand, of course, that I say all this merely in indication;

or rather, as I said before, as an appeal for clemency.

On the contrary (you will retort) you are a mean cat (Felis Leo.

please!) not to let us all in on the ground floor of so imposing a Cathedral!

To atone? Not a catalogue, which would be interminable; not a classi-

fication, which would be impossible, save in the roughest terms; nothing but a few short notes, possibly an anecdote or so. Just a tickle or a dram of schnapps, to enliven the proceedings. ordeals --temptations --- that sort of thing. A general Khabardar karo! With now and then a snappy Achtung! Oh, curse this mind of mine! I just can't help running to hide under the broad skirts of the Qabalah! It's Disk, Sword, Cup and Wand again! Sorry, but c'est trop fort pour moi. Disks. To master Earth, remember that the Disk is always spinning; fix this idea, get rid of its solidity. Commonly, the first tests of the young Aspirant refer to cash --- "that's God's sol solid in this world." The proper magical attitude is very hard to describe. (I'm not talking of that black hen's egg any more; that is simple.) Very sorry to have to say it, but it is not unlike that of the spendthrift. Money must circulate, or it loses its true value. A banker in New York once told me that the dollar circulated nine times as fast as the English equivalent, so that people to themselves to be nine times as rich. (I told you about the œ100 note in a special letter on Money). But here I am stressing spiritual effect; what happens is that anxiety vanishes; one feel that as it goes out, so it comes in. This view is not incompatible with thrift and prudence, and all that lot of virtues, far from it, it tucks in with them quite easily. You must practise this; there's a knack in it. Success in this leads to a very curious result not only does the refusal to count (Fourpen'north or Yoga, please miss, and Mum says can I have a penny if I bring back the bottle!), bring about the needlessness of counting, but also one acquires the power

to command!

A century ago, very nearly, there lived in Bristol and "Open Brother" names Muller, who was a wizard at this; Grace before breakfast, the usual palaver about the Lord and His blessings and His bounty et cetera, da capo; to conclude "and, Blessed Lord, we would venture to remind Thee that this morning Thou art @3 4s. 6 1/2d. short in the accounts; trusting that Thou wilt give this small matter Thine immediate attention, for Jesus' Christ's sake, Amen." enough, when he came to open his post, there would be just enough, sometimes exactly enough, to cover that amount. This story was told me by an enemy, who thought quite seriously that he would go to Hell for being "Open." ("Open" Brethren were lax about the Lord's Supper, let people partake who were not sound upon the Ramsgate Question; and other Theological Atrocities!) It meant that the facts were so undeniable that the "advertisement for Answer to Prayer" outweighed the "miracle by a heretic." I knew a poetess of great distinction who used to amuse herself by breaking off a conversation and saying, "Give me a franc" (or a shilling, or any small sum) and then going on with her previous remarks. She told me that of over a hundred people I was the second who had passed the coin to her without remark of any kind. This story --- do you think? --- is neither here no there. No, my remarks are rarely asyntartete. The Masters, at one stage or another of initiation --- it is forbidden to indicate the conditions --arrange for some test of the Aspirant's attitude in some matter, not necessarily involving cash. If he fails, goodnight!

Swords, now. The snags connected with this type of test are probably

the nastiest of any. Misunderstanding, confusion, logical error (and,

worse, logical precision of the kind that distinguishes many lunatics),

dispersion, indecision, failure to estimate values correctly --- oh! ---

there is no end to the list. So much so, indeed, that there is no  $\,$ 

specific critical test, it is all part of the routine, and goes on  $\vdots$ 

incessantly.

Well, there is just one. Without warning a decision of critical

importance has to be made by the candidate, and he is given so many  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

minutes to say Yes or No. He gets no second chance.

But I must warn you of one particular disgrace. You know that people

of low mentality haunt fortune-tellers of equal calibre, but with more

low cunning. They do not really want to know the future, or to get

advice; their real object is to persuade some supposed
"authority"

to flatter them and confirm them in their folly and stupidity.

It is the same thing with a terrifying percentage of the people that

come for "teaching" and "initiation." The moment they learn anything  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right$ 

they didn't know before, off they fly in a temper! No sooner does

it become apparent that the Master is not a stupid middle-class  $\operatorname{prig}$ 

and hypocrite --- another edition of themselves, in short -- they are  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

frightened, they are horrified, they flee away on both their feet,  $% \frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac$ 

like the man in the Bible! I have seen people turn fishbelly pale

in the face, and come near fainting outright, when it has dawned upon  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

them suddenly that magick is a real thing!

It's all beyond me!

Cups: we are much more definite again. The great test is so well

known, and accounts have already been published, that it can be here

plainly stated. Early in his career, the Aspirant is exposed to the

seductions of a Vampire, and warned in due form and due season.

"Sleep with A,B,C,D,E and F, my lad, and our hearty best wishes! But

not with G on any account, on peril of your work!"

So off he goes to G, without a second's hesitation. This test may be

prolonged; the deadliness and subtlety of the danger has been recog-

nized, and he may have half a dozen warnings, either direct or springing

from his relations with her. And the penalty is not so drastically

final; often he gets off with a term of penal servitude.

On the other hand, the Aspirant who can spot at the first hint why the  $\,$ 

Masters think that particular woman a danger, and acts promptly and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

decisively as he should, is secretly marked down as a sword of very

fine temper indeed!

The rest of the Cup Ordeals consists for the most part of progressive

estimations of the quality of the Postulant's devotion to the work;

there is not, as a rule, anything particularly spectacular or dramatic  $% \frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right$ 

in it. If you stick to your Greetings and Adorations and all such  $\,$ 

mnemonics, you are not likely to go very far wrong.

Wands: this obviously a pure question of Will. You will find as

you go on that obstacles of varying degrees of difficulty confront you;

and the way in which you deal with them is most carefully watched.

The best advice that I can give is to remember that there is little  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

need of the Bull-at-a-Gate method, though that must always be ready

in reserve; no, the best analogy is rapier-play. Elastic strength.

Warfare shows us.

That seems to cover your question more or less; but don't forget that

it depends on yourself how much of the dramatic quality colours your  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

Path. I suppose I have been lucky to have had the use of all the

traditional trappings; but it is always possible to make a "coat of

many colours" out of a heap of rags. To show you that you have had

Chaucer and John Bunyan  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  yes, and Laurence Sterne: to bring up the

rear, James Thomson (B.V.) to say nothing of Conrad and Hardy. Nor  $\,$ 

let me forget The Cream of the Jest and The Rivet in  $\mbox{\tt Grandfather's}$ 

Neck of my friend, James Branch Cabell.

So now, fair damozel, bestride thy palfrey, and away to the Mountains of Magick!

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

P.S. One danger I had purposely passed over, as it is not likely to come your way. But, since others may read these letters ---

Some, and these the men of highest promise, often of great achievement,  $\$ 

2.2

are tempted by Treason. The acquire a "Judas-complex,' think how

splendid it would be if they were to destroy the Order --- or, at the  $\,$ 

very least, unhorse the Master.

This is, of course, absurd in itself, because if they had crossed the  $\,$ 

Abyss, they would understand why it is impossible. It would be like

"destroying Electricity," or "debunking" the Venus of Milo. The maxi-

 $\operatorname{\mathsf{mum}}$  of success possible in such an operation would be to become a

"Black-Brother;" but what happens in practice, so far as my own

experience goes, is complete dispersion of the mental faculties amount-

ing to suicide; I could quote no less than four cases in which actual

physical self-murder was the direct result.

CHAPTER LXXV.

THE A.'. A.'. AND THE PLANET

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

You Write:

"Am I to understand that the A.'. A.'. has two main lines of Work.

(1) The initiation of Individuals, (2) Action on the world in

general --- say "Weltpolitik"? Because your letters on the History  $\ \ \,$ 

of Magick do imply (2); and yet the A.'. A.'. discourages any

form of group working. Is it that the Masters (80 = 3b Magistri

Templi) having been admitted to the Third Order --- the A.'. A.'.

proper; below this are R.R. et A.C. and G.'. D.'. --- are no longer  $\,$ 

liable to the dangers which make group activity in lower grades

undesirable. Or do they still work as Individuals, yet, because

they are initiates, appear to act as a corporate body? You have

often expressed yourself as if this were so. 'Of course, They had

to pick on me to do the dirty work' is a typical growl of the old  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

 $\mbox{\sc Big Lion!}$  But again there is that Magical Memory of yours when

you came down from that Hermitage in the little wood overhanging

the nullah below the Great Peak 'somewhere in Asia' and sat in  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

some sort of Consistory in the valley where the great Lamaserai  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$ 

or whatever it was --- towers over the track, (I quote some of your  $\,$ 

phrases from memory.) Which is it?"

My dear child, that is all very sensibly put; and the answer is that

Convenience would decide. Then you go on, after a digression:

Word, Thelema, made upon the planet? What are we to expect as a  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) ^{2}$ 

result? And can we poor benighted outsiders help Them in any way?

I know it's 'cheek' to ask."

then turn the other cheek, and repeat the question! I will do my best  $\,$ 

to make it all clear. But do not forget that I am myself completely

in the dark with regard to the special functions of most of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  colleagues.

To begin, then!

Achtung! I am going to be hard-boiled; my first act is to enlist the

23

Devil himself in our ranks, and take the Materialistic Interpretation  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

of History from Karl Marx, and accept economic laws as the manifest  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

levers which determine the fortune of one part of the earth or another.

I shall take exception only by showing that these principles are second-

ary: oil in Texas, nitrates on the Pacific slope of the Andes, suphur

in Louisiana (which put Etna's nose out of joint by making it cheaper  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

for the burgers of Messina to import it from four thousand miles away

instead of digging it out of their own back garden), even coal and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right$ 

timber, upset very few apple-carts until individual genius had found  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

for these commodities such uses as our grandfathers never dreamed.

The technical developments of almost every form of wealth are the

forebears of Big Business; and Big Business, directly or indirectly,

is the immediate cause of War.

In the "To-day and to-morrow" series is an essay called Ouroboros, by

Garet Garrett; one of the most shrewd and deep-delving analysis of

economics ever written. May I condense him crudely? Mass Production  $\,$ 

for profit fails when its markets are exhausted; so every effort is

made to impose it not only on the native but the foreigner, and should  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

guile fail, then force!

But the process ineluctably goes on; when the whole world buys the  $\,$ 

nasty stuff, and will accept no other, the exploiter is still faced by  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

diminishing returns. No possibility of expansion; sooner or later

dividends dwindle, and the Business is Bust.

To even the most stupid it becomes plain at this stage that war is

wholly ruinous; organization breaks down altogether; one meaningless

revolution follows another; famine and pestilence complete the job.

Last time --- when Osiris replaced Isis --- the wreck was limited in scope

--- note that it was the civilized, the organized part that broke down.

(Jews and Arabs could remain aloof, and keep a small torch burning  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

until Light returned with the Renaissance.)

This time there is no civilization which can escape being involved in

the totality of the catastrophe.

Towards this collapse all totalitarian movements inevitably tend.

Bertrand Russell himself admits that, although himself "temperamentally

Anarchistic," Society must be yet more organized than it is to-day if

it is to exist at all.

But his, as Garet Garrett shows, is the John Gilpin type of horseman-

ship. We are to-day more or less at the stage where "off flew Gilpin's hat and wig."

Achievement of high aims, which tends ultimately to the well-being, the

prosperity of the republic, depends on the proportion of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{masters}}$  to

servants. The stability of a building depends on the proportion of

superstructure to foundations. The rule holds good in every department

of Nature. There is an optimum for every case. If there is one barber

for ten thousand men, most of them will remain unshorn; if there are

five thousand barbers, most of them will be out of a job.

Apply this measure to society; there must be an optimum relation between

24

industry and agriculture, between town and country. When the proper

balance is not struck, the community must depend on outside help,

importing what it lacks, exporting its surplus. This is an unnatural

state of affairs; it results in business, and therefore ultimately in

war. That is, as soon as the stress set up by the conditions becomes

insupportable. So long as "business" is confined to luxuries, no great

harm need result; but when interference with the flow of foreign trade

threatens actual necessities, the unit concerned realizes that it is in  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

danger of strangulation. Consider England's food supply! Switzerland,

Russia, China, the U.S.A. can laugh at U-boats. England must support

a Navy, a wealth-consuming, not a wealth-producing, item in the Budget.

Similar remarks apply to practically all Government Departments. The

minimum of organization is desirable; all artificial doctrinaire

multiplication of works which produce no wealth is waste; and for

many reasons (some absurd, like "social position") tend to create fresh

unnecessary necessities. Ad infinitum, like the fleas in the epigram!

When laws are reasonable in the eyes of the average man, he respects  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

them, keeps them, does his best to maintain them; therefore a minute

Police Force, with powers strictly limited, is adequate to deal with the  $\,$ 

almost negligibly small criminal class. A convention is laudable when

it is convenient. When laws are unjust, monstrous, ridiculous, that

same average man, will he-nill he, becomes a criminal; and the law  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

requires a Tcheka or a Gestapo with dictatorial powers and no safeguards

to maintain the farce. Also, corruption becomes normal in official

circles; and is excused. I refer you to Mr. J. H. Thomas.7

One evil leads to another; the seven devils always take possession of

a house that is swept and garnished to he point at which people find

it uncomfortable.

But is not all this beside the point, you ask? No. It was needful to

indicate this cumulative progression to social shipwreck, because,

to-day an obvious peril of the most menacing, in 1904 no ordinary sane  $\,$ 

person foresaw anything of the sort. But special knowledge alters

things, and it is certain that the Masters anticipated, with  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{great}}$ 

exactness of calculation, the way things would go in the political world.

Practically all the messages received during the "Cairo Working" (March-

April 1904 e.v.) came to me through Ouarda. No woman ever lived who

was more ignorant of, or less interested in, anything to do with poli-

tics, or the welfare of the race; she cared for nothing beyond her

personal comfort and pleasure. When the communications ceased, she

dropped the whole affair without a thought.

when asked who "They" were, she would say haltingly and stupidly "the

gods," or some equally unhelpful term. But she was always absolutely  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

279

clear and precise as to the instructions. The New Aeon was to supersede  $\,$ 

the old; my special job was to preserve the Sacred Tradition, so that

a new Renaissance might in due season rekindle the hidden Light. I was  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

accordingly to make a Quintessence of the Ancient Wisdom, and publish

it in as permanent a form as possible. This I did in The Equinox. I

should perhaps have been strictly classical, and admitted only the  $\,$ 

7\* The Chancellor of the Exchequer, having fixed the increase of Income

Tax at threepence, proceeded to defraud the Insurance Companies by

insuring himself against a rise of the sum!

25

"Publication in Class "A", "A-B", "B " and "D" material. But I had the

idea that it would be a good plan to add all sorts of other stuff, so

that people who were not in any way interested in the real  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Work}}$  might

preserve their copies.

This by the way: the essence this letter is to show that "They",

not one person but a number acting in concert, not only foresaw a

planet-wide catastrophe, but were agreed on measures calculated to

assure the survival of the Wisdom worth saving until the time, perhaps

three hundred or  $\sin$  hundred years later, when a new current should

revive the shattered thought of mankind.

The Equinox, in a word, was to be a sort of Rosetta Stone.

There is one other matter of incomparable importance: the wars which

have begun the disintegration of the world have followed, each at an

interval of nine months, the operative publications of The Book of the

Law. This again seems to make it almost certain that "They" not only

know the future, at least in broad outline, but are at pains to arrange

it. I have no doubt that the advance of Natural Science is in the

charge of a certain group of "Masters." Even the spiritually and

morally as well as the physically destructive phenomena of our age must

be parts of some vast all-comprehensive plan.

Putting two and two together, and making 718, it looks as if the Masters

acquiesced in and helped to fulfill, the formula of the catastrophic  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

succession of the Aeons.

An analogy. We have the secret of the Elixir of Life, and could carry

on in the same body indefinitely; yet at least some masters prefer to  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

reincarnate in the regular way, only taking care to waste no time in

Amennti, but to get back to the Old Bench and pick up the  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{\textsc{New}}}$  Tools

with the minimum of delay.

By having attained the Freedom of "Elysian, windless, fortunate abodes

Beyond Heaven's constellated wilderness" "we are blessed; and bless"

by refusing to linger therein, but shouldering once more "Atlantean

the load of the too vast orb of" the Karma of Mankind.

This hypothesis does at least make intelligible Their action in riding

for a fall instead of preventing it. It may also be that They feel  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\}$ 

that human progress has reached its asymptote so far as the old Formula

can take it. In fact, unless we take some such view, there does not

seem to be much point in taking an action so fundamentally revolutionary

(on the surface) as the proclamation of a New Word.

But then (you will object, if an objection it be) people like Lenin,

Hitler, Mussolini, the Mikado, et hoc genus omne, are loyal emissaries  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

of the Masters, or the gods! Well, why not? An analogy, once more.

In the Christian legend we find  $\operatorname{God}$  (omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent)

employing Judas, Pilate and Herod, no less than Jesus, as actors in the  $\,$ 

Drama which replaced Isis by Osiris in the Great Formula. Perfectly

true; but this fact does not in any way exculpate the criminals. It is

no excuse for the Commandants of Belsen and Buchenwald that they were  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

acting under orders. The Drama is not mere play-acting, in which the  $\,$ 

most virtuous man may play the vilest of parts.

Your further objection, doubtless, will be that this theory makes the

26

Masters responsible for the agony of the planet. I refer you to The  $\,$ 

Book of the Heart Girt with a Serpent, Cp I, v. 33-4-0.

33. Let us take our delight in the multitude of men!

Let us shape unto ourselves a boat of Mother-ofPearl from

them, that we may ride upon the river of Amrit!

 $34. \ \ \,$  Thou seest you petal of Amaranth, blown by the wind from the

low sweet brows of Hathor?

- 35. (The magister saw it and rejoiced in the beauty of it) Listen!
- 36. (From a certain world came an infinite wail) That falling

petal seemed to the little ones a wave to engulph their

continent.

37. So they will reproach thy servant, saying: Who hath set thee

to save us?

- 38. He will be sore distressed.
- 39. All they will understand not that thou and I are fashioning

a boat of Mother-of-Pearl. We will sail down the river of

 $\mbox{\sc Amrit}$  even to the yew groves of Yama, where we may rejoice

exceedingly.

40. The joy of men shall be our silver gleam, their woe our blue gleam --- all in the Mother-of-pearl.

And again, Cp. I, v. 50-52 and v. 56-62.

50. Adonai spake yet again with V.V.V.V. and said: The earth is ripe for vintage; let us eat of her grapes, and be drunken thereon.

- 51. And V.V.V.V. answered and said: O my Lord, my dove, my excellent one, how shall this word seem unto the children of men?
- 52. And He answered him: Not as thou canst see. It is certain that every letter of this cipher hath some value; but who shall determine the value? For it varieth ever, according to the subtlety of him that made it.

. . .

- 56. And Adonai said: The strong brown reaper swept his swathe and rejoiced. The wise man counted his muscles and pondered, and understood not, and was sad. Reap thou and rejoice!
- 57. Then was the adept glad, and lifted his arm. Lo! an earthquake, and plaque, and terror on the earth! A casting down of them that sate in high places; a famine upon the multitude!
  - 58. And the grape fell ripe and rich into his mouth.
- 59. Stained is the purple of thy mouth, O brilliant one with the white glory of he lips of Adonai.

60. The foam of the grape is like the storm upon the sea; the ships tremble and shudder; the shipmaster is afraid.

61. That is thy drunkenness,  ${\tt O}$  holy one, and the winds whirl away

the soul of the scribe into the happy haven.

62. O Lord God! Let the haven be cast down by the fury of the

 $$\operatorname{storm}!$$  Let the foam of the grape tincture my soul with thy

light!

. . . .

. . .

Yes, I dare say. But is there not here a sort of moral oxymoron? Are

not the Masters pursuing two diametrically opposed policies at the same time?

Genius  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  or Initiation, which implies the liberation and development of

the genius latent in us all (is not one of names of the "Holy

Guardian Angel" the Genius?) --- is practically the monopoly of the "crazy

adventurer," as the official mind will most certainly rate  $\mathop{\mbox{\rm him}}\nolimits.$  Then

why do not the Masters oppose all forms of organization tooth-and-nail?

It depends, surely, on the stage which a society has reached on its fall

to the servile state. Civilization of course, implies organization up

to a certain point. The freedom of any function is built upon system;

and so long as Law and Order make it easier for a man to do his  $\operatorname{True}$ 

Will, they are admirable. It is when system is adored for its own sake,

or as a means of endowing mediocrities with power as such, that the  $\,$ 

"critical temperature" is attained.

It so happens that I write this on the eve of a General  ${\tt Election\ in}$ 

England; and it seems to me that whichever wins, England
loses:

The Socialists openly proclaim that they mean to run the country on

the lines of a convict prison; but the Tories, for all their fine talk,

would be helpless against the Banks and the  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{Trusts}}$  to whom they must

look for support.

Still, perhaps with a little help from Hashish, one can imagine a Mer-

chant Prince or a Banker being intelligent, or even, in a weak moment,

human; and this is not the case with officials. The standard, moreover,

of education and  ${\tt Good\ Manners}$  , low as it is, is less low in  ${\tt Tory\ circles}$  .

As I think that totalitarian methods are already on the way to extinguish  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

the last spark of manly independence --- that is, in self-styled civilized

countries --- it seems to me that we all should regard with shrewd suspi-

cion any plans for "perfecting" social conditions. The extreme horror

is the formula of the gregarious type of insect. Inherent in the

premises is the impossibility of advance.

One may sum the policy of the A.'. A.'. as follows:

- 1. To assist the initiation of the individual.
- 2. To maintain a form of social order in which the adventure of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$

initiation is easy --- to undertake!

3. To work out the Magical Formula of the New Aeon.

28

"Ye-e-ss, I s-e-e."

I doubt it. But what you are asking is how to decide upon your personal programme.

The intelligent visitor from who knows what planet was puzzled. He chanced to have landed in England --- to find a General Election in full

blast. (The operative word is "blast".) They must be absolute imbeciles,

was his first reaction, to risk upsetting the policy of Government with  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

a first-class war on.

(There would have been no need of such nonsense --- I interrupted --- if

Parliament was elected by my simple plan. I'll give you the main idea;

I don't insist on the figures. When a candidate is returned by 50 per-

cent over his runner-up, he sits for five years. If forty percent,

four years; and so on. An alternative --- to "stagger" the assembly, as

(I think) is done in the Senate of the United States.)

How are you going to vote?

Rather like the question of the dentist8. The teeth can be tinkered:

of course, sooner or later they have to go. Is it worth the trouble

and expense? The Socialists would have them all out right away, and

replaced by a set of "dentures," which (obviously) are perfect. Arrange

them, change them, choose your own pattern; no trouble, no pain: all

one's dream come true! But hardly biological.

You may argue that convicts are examples of living individuals whose

safety, shelter, nourishment and the rest are organized with the utmost

care; but accidents will happen in the best-regulated "brown stone

jugs." The one ideally automatic case is the foetus. You will agree  $\,$ 

that here is lack of initiative; in fact, its "True Will" is to escape,

albeit into a harsh and hostile universe, fraught with  ${\tt unknown}$  and

incalculable dangers.

As the Ritual says: "Prepare to enter the Immeasurable Region!"

I think your decision should depend on how far caries has travelled on  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,n\right\}$ 

its road of destruction.

I do not think that the Masters need be unanimous.

A practical plan might be for them to concentrate on one particular

group, or one part of the world, and to keep this in as good shape as  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

possible until the time has come for Nature to grow a new set.

They will be grown on a new Formula, to meet the new needs, just as

when our "permanent" (Alas, not much!) set replace our milk-teeth.

You ask me if I think this change can be made without bloodshed.

No. The obscure autocrats of Diplomacy and  $\operatorname{Big}$  Business are infinitely

stupid and short-sighted; they cannot see an inch beyond their too

 $\$^{\mbox{\sc NOTE:}}$  Crowley suffered from bad teeth in his last years, finally

having them extracted about six months before his death in  $1947 \ \text{e.v.}$  It is

speculated that secondary infection from the extraction may have contributed

to his death from pneumonia in December of that year.

29

often stigmatically shapen probosces, except where the profit of the  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

next financial year is concerned. They live in perpetual panic, and

shy at their own shadows. The accordingly attack even the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{most}}$  innoc-

uous windmills in suicidal charges.

Yes: bella, horrida bella,

Et flavem Tibrim spumantem sanguine cerno.

So, whichever way you vote, you are asking for trouble, or would do,

if the vote had any meaning. The result of any election, or for the  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

matter of that any revolution, is an almost wholly insignificant compo-

nent of those stupendous and inscrutable Magical Forces which determine  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

the destinies of the planet.

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours fraternally,

666

CHAPTER LXXVI.

THE GODS: HOW AND WHY THEY OVERLAP

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

Your last letter.

I am glad: it shows you have been putting in some genuine original

work. Result! You make a very shrewd observation; you have noticed

the curious fashion in which Gods seem to overlap. It is not the same

(you point out) with Angels. In no other system do we find a parallel

for the Living Creatures. Wheels, Wings, Fiery Serpents, with such

quasi-human cohorts as the Beni Elohim who beget the children on women,

to whom the Qabalah has introduced us. The Beni Elohim is actually

an exception; there is the Incubus and some of the Fairy Folk, as

well as certain  $\operatorname{Gods}$  and  $\operatorname{demi-Gods}$ , who act thus paternally. But you

are right in the main. The Arabs, for example, have "seven heavens"  $\,$ 

and seven Orders of Angels, also Jinn; but the classes are by no means

identical. This, even though certain Archangels, notably Gabriel,

appear in both systems. But then Gabriel is a definite individual, a

person --- and this fact is the key to your puzzle.

For, as I have explained in a previous letter, Gods are people: macro-

cosms, not mere collocations of the elements, planets and signs as are

most of the angels, intelligences and spirits. It is interesting to

note that Gabriel in particular seems to be more than one of these;

he enjoys the divine privilege of being himself. Between you and me

more or less as Aiwass describes himself as "...the minister of Hoor-paar-  $\,$ 

kraat." (AL I, 7) His name implies some such function; for  ${\tt G.B.R.}$ 

is Mercury between the Two Greater Lights, Sol and Luna. This seems  $\,$ 

to mean that he is something more than a lunar or terrestrial arch-

angel; as he would appear to be from 777. (There now! That was my

private fiend again --- the Demon of Digression. Back to our  $\operatorname{Gods!}$ )

30

777 itself, to say nothing of The Golden Bough and the Good Lord

knows how many other similar monuments of lexicography (for really

they are little more), is our text-book. We are bound to note at  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{T}}$ 

once that the Gods sympathise, run into one another, coalesce much

more closely than any other of the Orders of Being. There is not

really much in common between a jackal and a beetle, or between a  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

wolf and an owl, although they are grouped under Pisces or  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Aries}}$ 

respectively. But Adonis, Attis, Osiris, Melcarth, Mithras, Marsyas

--- --- a whole string of them comes tripping off the tongue. They all

have histories; their birth, their life, their death, their subsequent  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

career; all goes naturally with them exactly as if they were  $(\operatorname{\mathsf{say}})$  a

set of warriors, painters, anything superbly human. We feel instinc-  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

tively that we know them, or at least know of them in the same sense

that we know of our fellow men and women; and that is a sense which

never so much as occurs to us when we discuss Archangels. The great  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\}$ 

exception is the Holy Guardian Angel; and this as I have shewn in

another letter is for exactly the same reason; He is a Person, a

macrocosmic Individual. (We do not know about his birth and so on;

but that is because he is, so to speak, a private God; he only appears

to the world at all through some reference to him by his client; for

instance, the genius or Augoeides of Socrates).

Let us see how this works in practice. Consider Zeus, Jupiter, Amon-

Ra, Indra, etc., we can think of them as the same identical people

known and described by Greeks, Romans, Egyptians and Hindus; they

differ as Mont Cervin differs from Monte Silvio and the Matterhorn.

(They are bound to appear different, because the mountain does not look  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

the same from Zermatt as it does from Domodossola, or even as seen by

a French-Swiss and a German-Swiss.) In the same way read the Life of

Napoleon written by one of his marshals, by Michelet (a rabid Republi-

can), by Lord Rosebery, by a patriotic Russian, and by a German poet

and philosopher: one can hardly believe that the subject of any two

of these biographies is the same man.

But upon certain points the identity is bound to transpire; even when

we read of his crushing and classic defeat at Waterloo by the Belgians,

the man is detected. Transferring the analogy to the Gods, it is then

open to us to suppose that Tahuti, Thoth, Hermes, Mercury, Loki, Hanuman  $\,$ 

and the rest are identical, and that the diversity of the name and the series of exploits is due merely to the accidents of time

and space.
But it is at least equally plausible to suggest that these

Gods are

different individuals, although of the identical Order of Being,

characteristics and function. Very much as if one took Drake, Frobisher,

Raleigh, Hood, Blake, Rodney and Nelson, as seen through the mists of

history, tradition, legend and plain  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{mythopoeia}}.$  Add a few names not

English, and our position is closely parallel. Personally, I incline

to the latter hypothesis; but it would be hard to say why, unless that

it is because I feel that to identify them completely would be to re-  $\,$ 

duce their stature to that of personifications of various cosmic energies.

History lends its weight to my view. When the philosophic schools,

unable to refute the charge of absurdity leveled at the orthodox

devotee who believed that Mars actually begot Romulus and Remus on  $\boldsymbol{a}$ 

Vestal Virgin, explained that Mars was no more than the martial instinct,

and the Virgin a type of Purity, their faith declined, and with it

Roman Virtue. "Educate" Colonel Blimp's children and we have the

"intelligentsia" of Bloomsbury. I am very sorry about all this; but

life must always be brutal and stupid so long as it depends upon  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,n\right\}$ 

31

animals and vegetables for nourishment.

How restore faith in the Gods? There is only one way; we must get to

know them personally. And that, of course, is one of the principal  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

tasks of the Magician.

One further remark. I have suggested that all these "identical" gods

are in reality distinct persons, but belonging to the same families.

Can we follow up this line of thought? Yes: but I will defer it to a subsequent letter.

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours fraternally,

666

CHAPTER LXXXVII

WORK WORTH WHILE: WHY?

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

Your remarks on my 0 = 2 letter are very apt and inspiriting --- that is if I have rightly understood what you want to say. (Really, you know, they are a bit muddled --- or I am!) May I frame your question, if it is a question, in my own terms? Yes? Right. You say that I have advanced an invulnerable theory of the Universe in philosophical and mathematical language, and you suppose (underlined three times with two question marks) that one could, with a great effort, deduce therefrom perfectly good reasons for an unswerving contemplation of one's umbilicus, or the performance of strange dances and the vibration of mysterious names. But what are you to say (you enquire) to the ordinary Bloke-on-the-Boulevard, to the man of the world who has acquired a shrewd knowledge of Nature, but finds no rational guide to the conduct of life. He observes many unsatisfactory elements in the way things go, and for his own sake would like to "remould them nearer to the heart's desire," to refurbish the clich, of Fitzgerald about "this sorry scheme of things." He is not in the least interested in the learned exposition of 0 = 2. But he that the A.'. A.'. professes a sound solution of the problem of conduct and would like to know if its programme can be justified in terms of Common Sense. As luck would have it, only a few weeks ago I was asked to address a group of just such people --- and they gave me threequarters of an hour's notice. It was really more like ten minutes, as the rest of the time was bespoke by letter-writing and posting which could in no wise be postponed. So I had to devise an adequate gambit, one which ruthlessly excluded any touch of subtlety, or any assumption of previous

subject on the part of the audience.

knowledge of the

It came off. For the first time in history, the laymen elicited intelligent and relevant questions. There were only three halfwits in the

32

five score or so persons present, and these (naturally!) were just those people who claimed to have studied the subject.

What follows is a rough outline of my argument.

I began by pointing out that Nature exercises many forms of Energy,

which are not directly observable by the senses. In fact, the History

of Science for the last hundred and fifty years or so has consisted

principally of the discovery of such types, with their analysis, measure-

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{ment}}$  and  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{manipulation}}.$  There is every reason to suppose that  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{many}}$  such

remain to be discovered.

But what has in no case been observed is any trace of will or of

intelligence, except through some apparatus involving a nervous and cerebral system.

At this point I want especially to call your attention to certain  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

species of animals (bees and termites are obvious cases)

collective consciousness seems to exist, since the community acts as  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{L}}$ 

a whole in evidently purposeful ways, yet the units of that community

are not even complete in themselves. (Isn't there some series of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

worms, each sub-type able only to subsist on the excrement of its  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

preserver in the series?)

Then there are the phenomena of mob psychology, where a crowd gleefully

combine to perform acts which would horrify any single individual. And

there is the exceeding strange and interesting psychology of the "par-  $\,$ 

touse" --- this is a little more, in my judgment, than a spinthria.

In all such cases the operative consciousness does not reside in any

single person, as one might argue that it did when an orator "carries

away" his audience. But these remarks have rather shunted one into a

siding away from the main line of argument. My most important point

is to insist that even with the most familiar forms of energy, man has

done no creative work so ever. He has discovered, examined, measured

(rather clumsily) and used, but in no case has he understood, still

less explained, the causes of phenomena. Sometimes he cannot even

reconcile different "laws of Nature." So we find J.W.N. Sullivan

exclaiming "The scientific adventure may yet have to be abandoned, "

and to me personally he confessed "It may yet turn out that the mathe-

matical approach to Reality may have to be supplanted by the Magical."

Now in Nature it leaps at one that Will and Intelligence are behind

phenomena. My old friend and colleague Professor Buckmaster, who

wrote a book on "Blood" which, he admitted, could not possibly be

understood by more than six people, told me that the ingenuity of the

structure of the human kidney "almost frightened" him. Yet in all

Nature there is no trace whatever of any purpose such as human mentality

can grasp. Again, apparent purpose often appears to be baffled. Take

one example. Evolution, working through thousands of years to estab-

lish a most subtle scheme of cross-fertilization, found, just as it was

perfect, conditions so altered that it was completely useless.

The "law of cause and effect" itself took a death-blow when Hesinger

showed that the old formula "If A then B" was invalid, and must be

altered to "If A, then B or C or D or E or . . . "

But at least we know enough phenomena to make it certain that Will and

Intelligence do exist somehow apart from any nervous and cerebral system of which we are aware, and that these must be of a type

of which we are aware, and that these must be of a type which transcends

our human consciousness as that does that of a limpet or a lichen.  $\,$ 

It follows that somehow, somewhere, there must be "gods" or "Masters"

--- whatever name you like. And that, I suppose, is what you may call  $\,$ 

the premise major of my syllogism.

The minor, I confess, is not so apodeictic. No one, I suppose, is

going to point proudly to the present state of human affairs, as evi-

dence that we are all becoming wiser and nobler every minute, as

people did seventy years ago. (I was brought up in the faith that  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

Queen Victoria would never die, and that Consols would never go below par.

In face, one may suspect that the majority of well-instructed  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{men}}$ 

expect nothing but that History will repeat itself, and our civiliza-

tion go the way of all the others whose ruins we dig up in every quarter of the earth.

(Our own destruction may be more compete than theirs; for most of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) =$ 

the monuments to our intelligence, sobriety and industry are made of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

steel, and would vanish in a very few years after the smash.)

Well, if we have to wait for the calamity, and for evolution to begin

all over again in a number of centuries --- with luck! --- one thing is

at least quite certain: we can do nothing about it. Any form of

activity must be as futile and as fatuous as any other; and the only

sensible philosophy must be "Let us eat and drink for tomorrow we die."

Is there a conceivable alternative?

Well, consider the cause of the impending collapse. It is quite simple:

Knowledge is loose, without control of Will and of Intelligence. (How

clearly the Qabalah states and demonstrates this doctrine! But  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{I}}$ 

musn't be naughty; let me stick to Common Sense!)

Now, these qualities in us having failed to measure up to the situation  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

of the world, one hope remains; to get into communication with those  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

"gods" or "masters" whose existence was demonstrated in my Premise Major and learn from Them.

But is this possible?

Tradition and experience unite to assert that it is so; moreover.

various forms of technique for accomplishing this are at our disposal.

This is what is called The Great Work; and it is abundantly clear that

no other aim is worth pursuit.

So much for the argument; it will be agreed readily enough that to

put it into practice we shall need an Alphabet, a Grammar and a Diction-  $\,$ 

ary. Follow the Axioms, the Postulates, the Theorems; finally, the Experiments.

And that is what all these letters are about.

Love is the law, love under will.

34

Yours fraternally,

666

CHAPTER LXXVIII.

## SORE SPOTS

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

Three in one and one in three --- it's the Athanasian Creed in the Black

Mass --- eh! What's that you say? Oh, quite right, quite, quite right

of you to remind me. "Definition first!"

A "sore spot" is one which reacts abnormally and violently, however

gently you touch it; more, all the other bits of you give a painful

jerk, however disconnected they may seem. Still more, the entire

System undergoes a spasm of apprehension; and the total result is  $% \left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left($ 

that the mental as well as the physical system is quite unable to  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

grasp the situation with any accuracy, and the whole man is temporarily

engulphed in what is naturally not far from a condition of insanity.

(Now, Athanasius! It's all right; the lady has gone away to think it over.)

In --- shall I say "Anglo-Saxondom," or "Teutonic breeds,"
or "bourgeoisie,

so as to include some of the French whom when they are good are very  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

good indeed, but when they are bad, they are horrid? --- the presiding

God/Gods of this Trinity is/are: 1. Sex, 2. Religion, 3.
"Drugs;" and

the greatest of these is Sex, actually the main root of which the other

two are tough and twisted stems, each with its peculiar species of  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,2,\ldots \right\}$ 

poisonous flowers, sometimes superficially so attractive that their  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

nastiness passes for Beauty.

I shall leave it to the psychoanalysts to demonstrate the reduction to  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

Sex, merely remarking that though I agree with their analysis as far as

it goes, I do not allow it to stop where they do.

For us, Sex is the first unconscious manifestation of Chiah, the Creative

297

Energy; and although (like everything else) it is shown both on the spiritual and the physical planes, its most important forthshowing is on the "Magical" plane, because it actually produces phenomena which partake of all these. It is the True Will on the creative plane: "By Wisdom formed He the worlds." So soon as its thaumaturgy is accomplished, it is, through Binah, understood as the Logos. Thus in Sex

we find

every one of the primary Correspondences of Chokmah. Being thus inef-

fable and sacrosanct, it is (plainly enough) peculiarly liable to

profanation. Being profaned, it is naturally more unspeakably nasty

than any other of the "Mysteries." You will find a good deal on this

subject implied in Artemis Iota, attached to another of my letters to you.

Before tackling "Sore Spots" seriously, there is after all, one point which should be made clear as to this Trinitarian simplification.

One of the most interesting and fruitful periods of my life was when

35

I was involved in research as to the meaning of Sankhara: "tendencies"

may be, indeed is, a good enough translation, but it leaves one very

much as deeply in the dark as before. You remember --- I hope! --- that

Sankhara lies between Vinnanam, Pure Consciousness, and Sanna, Percep-

tion. For instance, an electric fan in motion: a house-fly

to see the vanes as we do when they are still, we "tend" to see a

diaphanous blur.

Then, in delirium tremens, why do we tend to see pink rats rather

than begonias or gazelles?

We tend to see the myriad flashing colours of the humming bird; the

bird itself does not; it has no apparatus of colour-sense; to him

all appears a neutral tint, varying only in degrees of brightness.

Such were some of the fundamental facts that directed the course of

my research, whose results you may read in "The Psychology of Hashish",

by Oliver Haddo in The Equinox, Vol. I, No. 2. The general basis of

this Essay is Sankhara; it shows how very striking are the analogies

between, (1) the results obtained by Mystics --- this includes the Ecstasy

of Sexual Feeling, as you may read in pretty nearly all of them, from

St. Augustine to St. Teresa and the Nun Gertrude. The stages recounted

by the Buddha in his psychological analyses correspond with almost

incredible accuracy. (2) The phenomena observed by those who use

opium, hashish, and some other "drugs" (3) The phenomena of various

forms of insanity.

The facts of this research are infuriating to the religious  $\mbox{mystic};$ 

and the fact of its main conclusion is liable to drive  $\mbox{him}$  into so

delirious a frenzy of rage as to make one reach for one's notebook  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$ 

one more typical extreme case!

Now of course very few religious persons know that they are mystics  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$ 

protest too much, or too little, the fact is that they are. There is

no true rational meaning in religion. consider the Athanasian Creed itself!

Observe that the rationalist dare not yield a millionth of a millimetre.

"First cut the Liquefaction, what comes next But Fichte's clever cut at God himself? . . . The first step, I am master not to take:"

says Bishop Blougram, and is pinned to the cork labelled
"St. Januarius"!

This dilemma, consciously or subconsciously, is well rooted in the  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$ 

minds of everybody who takes Life, in any one of its forms, seriously.

He feels the touch of the rapier, however shrewdly or cautiously

wielded. The salute itself is more than enough; he feels already

the thrust to his vitals.

I remember sailing happily in to breakfast at Camberwell Vicarage, and

saying cheerfully, in absolute good faith: "A fine morning, Mr. Kelly!"

I was astounded at the reply. The dear old gentleman  $\operatorname{---}$  and he really

was one of the best! --- half choked, then gobbled at me like a turkey!

"You're a very insolent young man!" Poor, tiny Aleister! How was I

to know that his son had driven it well home that the hallmark of

36

English stupidity was that the only safe topic of conversation was the

weather. And so my greeting was instantly construed as a deliberate  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

insult!

A typical example of the irrationality of the reactions of a sufferer!

Now, from this schoolboy level, let us rise and put the case a little  $\,$ 

more strongly. Let us quit the shallows of social backchat for the

gloomy and horrific abysses of a murder trial!

To every man and woman that has not seen  $\operatorname{Sex}$  as it is, faced it,

mastered it  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  you will find elsewhere in these letters sufficient on

this matter --- it is his secret guilt. Imagine, then, how at any  $\,$ 

reference however remote, the "sinner" quails, his inmost mystery laid

bare, his evil conscience holding up a tarnished mirror to his deformed

and hideous face! Often enough, he does not mind gross jests which

admit complicity on the part of the other; but any allusion to the

Truth, and his soul shrieks: I am found out! Then apoplectic Fear

puts on the mask of Indignation and Disgust.

As for a serious discussion of anything concerned therewith, why, every

word is a new rasping tear. The mind takes refuge in irrational and

irrelevant outbursts of feigned rage and horror.

In the case of religion, the consciousness of guilt extended to cover

everything from "playin' chuch-farden on the bless,d tombstones" to  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

"the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost." Against this vague and mon-

strous bogey, religion is the only safeguard, and therefore to suggest  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

the unsoundness of the guarantee is to strike at the roots of all

security. It is like hinting to some besotted and uxorious oldster,

that his young wife may be unfaithful. It is the poison that Iago

dripped so skillfully into the long hairy ear of the dull Moor. So he  $\,$ 

reacts irrationally --- every bush conceals a bear --- nay, more likely a

Boojum, or a Bunyip, or some other creature of fear-spurred Imagination!

"Monstrum informe, ingens, horrendum." Note well the "informe."

And because the guarantee is unsound (and must be, or where would be

the point of "Faith"?) reassurance is in the nature of things impossible.

Like the demented rider in The Erl-King, the chase goes ever wilder

and wilder, until he plunges at the end into the bottomless bog of

madness and destruction.

I wonder how many lunatics there are in the "bughouse" to-day  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{---}}$  in the

times of "evangelical revival" the number was fantastic --- who got there

through fear that they had somehow committed the aforesaid "blasphemy"

against the Holy Ghost." The unknown again. The Bible does not tell

us that it is; only that it is unpardonable. Nor Grace, nor Faith,

nor predestination avail in the least; for all you know, you may have

committed it. Reassurance is impossible; no ceinture de chastet,

avails to avert this danger.

Again with drugs, it is the unknown which is the horrific factor. Most

people get their information on the subject from the yellowest of yellow

newspapers, magazines and novels. So darkly deep is their ignorance

that that do not know what the word means --- like us so often, yes?

Wide sections of the U.S.A. are scared of tea and coffee. They blench

when you point out that bicarbonate of soda is a drug just as much as

cocaine; at the same time they literally shovel in the really danger-

37

ous Aspirin, to say nothing of the thousand Patent Medicines blared at

them from every radio  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  as if the Press were not enough to poison the

whole population! Blank-eyed, they gasp when they learn that of all

classes, the first place among "drug addicts" is that of the doctor.

But the crisis in which fear becomes phobia is the unreasoning aversion,

the shuddering of panic, above all, the passionate refusal to learn

anything about "drugs," to analyse the conditions, still less to face

them; and the spasmodic invention of imaginary terrors, as if the  $\ensuremath{\text{real}}$ 

dangers were not enough to serve as a warning.

Now why? Surely because in the sub-conscious lies an instinct that  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

in these obscure medicines indeed lies the key of some forbidden sanc-

tuary. There is a fascination as irrational and therefore as strong,

as the fear. Here is the point at which they link up with  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{sex}}$  and

religion. Oh, how well nigh almighty is the urgency to him who reads

those few great writers who understood the subject from experience:

de Quincey, Ludlow, Poe and Baudelaire: into whom burn the pointed

parallels between their adventures and those of all the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{mystics}}$  ,  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{East}}$ 

and West!

The worst of this correspondence-form is that you are always asking

simple elementary questions which require half a dozen treatises to

answer: so, take this, with my blessing!

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours fraternally,

666

P.S. One further reflection. With all these "sore spots" is closely

linked the idea of cruelty. I need not touch upon the relation of

cruelty to sex; the theme has been worn threadbare. But in religion,

note the Bottomless Pit and the Eternal Flame; in Buddhism, the eighteen

hot and eighteen cold Hells, with many another beneath. Hindu eschatol-

ogy has countless Hells; even pedestrian, precise Islam, and the

calculating Qabalists, each hoast of Seven. Again with drugs as with

insanity, we are confronted constantly with nameless terrors; the idea

of formlessness, of infinity pervades them alike. Consider the man who

takes every chance gesture of a stranger in the street as a secret

sign passed from one of his persecutors to another; consider those

who refuse food because of the mysterious conspiracy to poison them.

All sanity, which is all Science, is founded upon Limit. We must be

able to cut off, to define, to measure. Naturally, then, their oppo-

sites, Insanity and Religion, have for their prime characteristic, the  $\,$ 

Indefinable, Incomprehensible, Immeasurable.

The healing virtue of these words is this: examine the sore spot,

analyse it, probe it; then disinfection and the Vis Medicatrix Naturae, complete the cure.

I had just finished this when in comes your very pertinent  $\mbox{\tt "Supplemen-}$ 

tary" Postcard. "Doesn't hypocrisy fit in here, somehow?"
Indeed it
does, my child!

Corresponding to, and the poison bacillus of, that centre of infection,

38

is a Trinity of pure Evil, the total abnegation of Thelema. Well known  $\,$ 

to the psycho-analyst: the name thereof Shame --- Guilt --- Fear. The  $\,$ 

Anglo-Saxon or bourgeois mentality is soaked therein; and his remedy

so far from our exploratory-disinfection method, is to hide the gan-

grened mass with dirty poultices. He has always a text of Scripture  $\,$ 

or some other authority to paint his foulest acts in glowing colours;

and if he wants a glass of beer, he hates the stuff, but "doctor's  $\,$ 

orders, my boy, doctor's orders."

There is really nothing new to be said about hypocrisy; it has been

analysed, exposed, lashed by every great Artist; quite without effect.

It gets worse as the socialistic idea thrives, as the individual leans

ever harder on the moral support of the herd.9

"My friend Freddy Lyon . . . told me a story . . . of the Volga Famine.  $\hfill \ensuremath{\text{Lyon}}$ 

Some A.R.A. 'higher-ups' from New York were making a tour of inspection

. . Among them was a worthy but sentimental citizen who gushed about  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,2,\ldots \right\}$ 

the unhappy Russians and the poor little starving children and what  $\boldsymbol{a}$ 

privilege it was for Mr. Lyon to be doing this noble work for humanity  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{N}}$ 

and so on and so forth until Lyon said he was ready to choke  $\ensuremath{\text{\text{him}}}$  . .

After lunch the visitors suggested they would like to visit the ceme-

tary. It was, said Freddy, a horrid sight, nude, dead bodies piled up

ten high like faggots, because the population was so destitute that

every stitch of clothing was needed for the living. The visitors were

sickened by what they saw, and even the gushing one was silent as they

walked back to the cemetery gate. Suddenly he caught Freddy by the arm.

'Look there!' he said, 'Is not that something to restore our faith in

the goodness of  $\operatorname{God}$  in the midst of all these horrors?'  $\mbox{\ \ He}$  pointed to

a big woolly dog lying asleep on a grave with his head between his paws,

and continued impressively. 'Faithful unto death and beyond. I have

often heard of a dog refusing to be comforted when his master  $\operatorname{died}$ ,

lying desolate on his grave, but I never thought to see such a thing  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}\xspace$ 

self.' That was too much for Freddy Lyon. 'Yes,' he said cruelly, 'but

look at the dog's paws and muzzle' --- they were stiff with clotted blood

--- 'he's not mourning his master, he's sleeping off a meal.'

'At which point,' Lyon concluded his story with gusto, 'that talkative

guy did the opposite of sleeping off his lunch in a very thorough manner,

and there wasn't another peep out of him until we put him on the train.'"

P.S. Here is a very different set of reactions. I do not quite  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{know}}$ 

Anyhow, here it is; call it

## LA POULE AUX RATS

Time: a fine Sunday evening in June, just one and twenty years ago.

Place: Paris, just off the Place des Tertres, overlooking the city.

A large and lovely studio, panelled in oak. Strange: it was completely

bare, and so far as one could see, it had no door. The skylights,  $\mbox{\em mind-}$ 

ful, were carefully screened with broidered stuff. A gallery, some ten  $\,$ 

feet from the floor, ran round one corner. Here was a buffet loaded

with priceless wines and liquors of all sorts --- except the "soft" ---  $\!\!\!$ 

and excellent variety of all cold "snack" refreshments. One gained it  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

by a staircase from the lower floor.

9\* Here is a most pertinent story from I Write as I Please by my old

friend, Walter Duranty. It shows how the sentimental point of  $\operatorname{view}$ 

blinds its addicts to the most obvious facts.

39

By the buffet, the old butler: oh, for a painter to portray his Weari-  $\,$ 

ness of Evil Wisdom!

Our host led us to the gallery; "we ate and drank and saw" not  $\operatorname{God}$ 

also, but the lady responsible for the heavy tread upon the stairs.  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{A}}$ 

woman of the Halles Centrales, in her early forties; coarse, brutal,

ugly, robust, square-set, curiously radiant with some magnetic form of energy.

I cannot describe her clothes --- for lack of material. She greeted us

all round with a sort of surly good humour. The butler took a pot of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

very far-gone Roquefort cheese, and smeared her all over. She drank

to us, and clumped away downstairs. She came out into the studio from  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

under the gallery, braced herself and shook her mop of hair as if about  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

to wrestle, waved to us and waited.

A minute later a small trap at the far end of the studio was smartly  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

pulled up; in rushed a hundred starving rats. There was a moment's  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

hesitation; but the smell of the cheese was too much, and they rushed

her. She caught one in both hands, bit through its spine, and flung

it aside.

Softly repeating to myself passages from The Revenge by the late  ${\tt Alfred}$ 

after rat, for half an hour, flung back as fast as it came." Their

courage wilted; the hunted became the huntress; I thought of Artemis

as I sang softly to myself, "When the hounds of spring are on winter's  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

traces." But she pursued; snapped the last spine, and flung it into

the gallery with a yell of triumph.

It was not so easy a victory as I have perhaps described it, once she

slipped in the slime and came down with a thud; and at the end blood

spurted from innumerable bites.

The whole scene was too much for most of the men; they literally

howled liked famished wolves, and shook the balustrade until it creaked

and groaned. Presently one slipped over, let himself lightly to the

floor and charged. Others followed. All had their heart's desire.  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

was reminded of Swinburn's Laus Veneris,

"I let mine eyes have all their will of thee I seal myself upon thee with my might."

As for the women, the ferocious glitter of their eyes was almost terri-

fying. One of them, true, would have joined the happy warriors below;

but the butler roughly pulled her back, saying in a shocked voice,

"Madame est normale." (I enjoyed that!) Others consoled themselves

by capturing those males who were too timid to risk the jump.

I swallowed a last glass of champagne, and then "je filai a l'Anglais."

Summary: a pleasant time was had by all.

Note for political economists: the woman took 10,000 francs (at about

125 to the  $\ensuremath{\alpha}\xspace$ ); she took three weeks in hospital and three weeks' holi-

day between the shows. She was, or had been, the mistress of a Minister

40

with "peuple" ideas, though he was an aristocrat of very old vintage;

and he helped her to have her daughters brought up in one of the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{most}}$ 

exclusive convents in France.

CHAPTER LXXIX

## **PROGRESS**

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

You will certainly have to have an india-rubber medal for persistence:

this is the nth time that you have tried to catch me contradicting myself.

Well, so I do, and must, every time I make any statement whatever, as  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

has been shown several times in this chatty little interchange of views.

But that is not what you mean.

You say --- permit me to condense your more than somewhat tautological,

pleonastic, prolix, diffuse and incoherent elucubrations! -- that the

whole idea of the Great Order is based on faith in Progress. The doc-

trine of successive aeons is nothing else. The system of training is

nothing else. Nothing, in fact, is anything else. Maugr, this and in

despite thereof (you continue, with a knavish gleam in your hither eye)

I am everlastingly throwing down the whole jerry-built castle by  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{m}} \ensuremath{\mathsf{y}}$ 

cynical reflections. (Some one --- Anthony Hope in a lucid moment,  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

thing --- says that cynicism is always a confession of failure --- "sour

grapes.") Maybe, some of the time. But the explanation is very simple,

and you ought to have been able to think it out for yourself. It is a

question of the "Universe of Discourse," of Perspective. An engineer

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{may}}$  swear himself ultra-marine in the map all the time at the daily

mistakes and mishaps that go on all the time under his nose, yet at

dinner tell his friends complacently that the bridge is going up better  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

than he ever expected.

Just so, my gibes are directed at incidents; but my heart's truth is

fixed on the grand spiral.

All the same, I am glad you wrote; it is a text for a little sermon

that I have had in mind for a long while on the conditions of progress

Number One is obviously Irregularity, Eccentricity, Disorder, the Revolutionary Spirit, Experiment.

I have no patience whatever with Utopia-mongers. Biology simply shouts

at us that the happy contented community, everyone with his own (often

highly specialized) job, nobody in need, nobody in danger, is necessarily

stagnant. Termites and other ants, bees, beavers; these and many

another have produced perfect systems. What is the first characteristic?  $\ \ \,$ 

Stupidity. "Where there is no vision, the people shall perish." What is

the Fighter Termite to do, after he has been blocked out of his home?

None of these communities possess any resource at all against any unfore-

seen unfavourable change of circumstance. (We look rather like that just  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

now at the end of 1944 e.v.) Nor does anyone of them show any achievement;

having got to the end of their biological tether, they stay out, without

an aim, an idea, an effort. The leech, an insufferable pest in its  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

belt --- it has killed off tiger, rhinoceros, anything with a nostril! ---

309

is the curse of our military station at Lebong --- or was when I was  $\,$ 

there. At Darjeeling, a few hundred feet higher, devil a one! They

have no one to think: now how can we flourish up higher? Those old

forlorn-hope Miss-Sahibs --- how wide are their nostrils! Then --- how?

Consider for a moment our own Empire. How did that spread all over the

planet? It was the imaginative logic, the audacity, the adroit adapta-

bility, of the Adventurer that blasted the road.

The sunny Socialist smiles his superior smile, and condescends to  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

instruct us. That was an unfortunate, though perhaps sometimes neces-

sary, stage in the perfection of Society.

Something in that. But there are other kinds of Adventure. My imagina-

tion can set no limit to the possibilities of Science, or of  $\operatorname{Art}$ : our

own Great Work is evidence of that.

Last Sunday I looked through an interview with the least brain-bound

of these ruminators --- poor old, dear old G. for gaga Bernard Shaw.

The artist, said he, was a special case. he should have a nice easy

job, three or four hours a day, and be free for the rest of it to devote

himself to his Art. I wonder how much of his own work would have seen

daylight if he had been tied to some silly robot soulkilling, nerve-

crushing, mind-infuriating routine job for even one half-hour a day!

When I am on a piece of work, I grudge the time for eating; and when

it's done, I need the absolute relaxation of leisured luxury.

Then what of the Work itself? If the Idea be truly new and important,

God help it! The whole class of men affected jump on it with one accord,

if haply they may crush it in the germ. Read a little of the History of  $\,$ 

Medicine! Any man who shows a sign of independent thought is watched,

is thwarted. He persists and is threatened and bullied. He persists;

every engine of oppression is set in motion against  $\operatorname{him}$ . Then some-

thing snaps; either they succeed in killing him (Ross, who defeated

malaria, nearly starved to death) or they make him a baronet, or a peer,

or make his death a Day of National Mourning, and bury  $\mathop{\text{\rm him}}\nolimits$  in the Pan-

theon --- "auc grands hommes la patrie reconnaissante" --- like Pasteur after

one of the most infamous campaigns of persecution in history.

Then, of course, entertainment must be standardized. It costs money to

produce; and who will produce anything which can only appeal to the

very few --- to none at all, soon, if these swine have their way. So, if

it is new, is original, is worth one's while, it must be ignored.

Besides, being new and incomprehensible to the great Us, it may be

dangerous, and must be suppressed.

In all literature I know no pages so terrifying as those in Louis  $% \left\{ 1,2,...,n\right\}$ 

Marlow's Mr. Amberthwaite, which describe his dream. I wish I could

quote it, with Sinai as the orchestra; never mind, read it again. And

we are on the way --- far on the way --- to That!

Now, obviously, the robot education, robot textbooks stuffed in by robot

teachers, will have done wonders with the help of the bovine  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{well-being}}$ 

to produce a race of robot boys.

All independence, all imagination, all spirit of Adventure, will have

42

been ground down and rolled out smooth by this ghastly engine. But ---

Nature is not so easily beaten; a few boys and girls will somehow

escape, and either by instinct or by observation, have the sense to  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

keep secret. Now whatever their own peculiar genius may select as their

line, they will realise that nothing is possible in any way while the

accursed system stands. Their first duty is Revolt. And presently  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

some one will come along with the wit and the will and the weapon, and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

blow the whole most damnable bag of tricks sky-high.

We had better busy ourselves about this while it is still possible to

get back to freedom without universal bloodshed.

"All right, Master, you win! Now give us your own idea of Utopia."

An Utopia to end Utopias? Very good, so I will. Education, to begin

with; well, you've had all that in another letter. The main thing to

remember is that I want every individual taught as such, according to

his own special qualities. Then, teach them both sides of every ques-

tion: history, for example, as the play of economic forces, also, as

due to the intervention of Divine Providence, or of "Sports" of genius:

and so for the rest. Train them to doubt --- and to dare!

Then, somehow, as large a number of the most promising rebels should be

selected to lead a life of luxury and leisure. Let every country, by

dint of honouring its old traditions, be as different as possible from  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

every other. Restore the "Grant tour," or rather, the roving Englishman

of the Nineteenth Century. Entrust them with the secrets of discipline,

of authority, or power. Hardship and danger in full measure: and responsibility.

A great deal of such material will be as disgustingly wasted as it has

been in the past; and there will be much abuse of privilege. But this

must be allowed and allowed for; no very great harm will result, as the  $\,$ 

weak and vicious will weed themselves out.

The pure gold will repay us ten thousandfold. You ask examples? With

312

us, the Elizabethan and the Victorian periods stand out. What is most wanted is opportunity and reward. Under Victoria there was some --- taste the late Samuel Smiles Esquire, D.D. (wasn't he?) --- but not enough, and Industrialism, the mother and nurse of Socialism, was destroying the soul of the people.

In my not very maternal remarks on Mother-love, was included the substance of the one wise saying of my pet American lunatic "You can't get

past their biology." This is so true, and so disheartening,

arouses me to combat. Must we for ever be bound to the inconvenient

habit of sows and cabbages? I pick up the glove.

Isn't it Aldous Huxley who says somewhere that some species or other  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

can never develop higher powers because its brain is shut in by its

carapace? I thought this too, long ago; and I went into interminable

conferences with my old friend, Professor Buckmaster; I wanted to

extend brain surgery to produce the phenomena of Yoga. Also, I wondered

what would happened if we wedged apart the sections of the cranium at, or  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right$ 

shortly after, birth, so as to prevent them closing and giving the brain  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

a chance to grow.

I suspect, by the way, that something of the sort is done in China and

43

Bruma; but the object is merely to produce megalocephalic idiots as a valuable addition to the financial resources of the family.

I thought that modern physiology, with its great recent advances in  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

knowledge of the specialized functions of the brain, might quite

possibly succeed in producing genius.

You would not surprise me if you told me that something of the sort is

being tried in Russia, with its Communism modelled so closely on that

of Ivan the Terrible at the moment, war or no war! Qui vivra verra.

Anyhow, all that I really want you to get into your head "sunning over

with little curls" is that Progress demands Anarchy tempered by Common

Sense, and that the most formidable obstacle is this Biology.

The experience of the Magician and the Yogi does suggest that there is

 ${\tt room}$  in the human brain as at present constituted for almost limitless

expansion. At least our system of Training is more immediately practi-

cal than digging up our Corpora Quadragenina and planting them in a  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$ 

Monkey's Medulla just to see what will come of it. So put down that  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

bread-knife!

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours fraternally,

666

CHAPTER LXXX

LIFE A GAMBLE

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

In one or two --- no, I think more like three or four --- letters of yours

to hand in the last couple of months, you have put forward various

excuses for slackness, the necessities of your economic situation.

You say you must have "regular work," and a "steady income" and all  $\mbox{\ }$ 

that sort of thing. My innocent child, that species of Magick is  $\,$ 

quite simple. Take the horns of a hare . . . That's enough for the  $\,$ 

present: I'll tell you what to do with them when you've got them.

In Macbeth we read ---

. . . . "Security

Is mortals' chiefest enemy."

but this is another kind of security; it is the Hubris which "tempts

Providence," the insolence of thinking that nothing can go wrong.

Anyhow, there's no such thing as safety. Life is a gamble. From the  $\,$ 

moment of incarnation a million accidents are possible. Miscarriage,

still-birth, abortion; throughout life, until your heart beats for the

last time, "you never can tell" - - - - and then you start all over

again with your next incarnation!

(I wish I had a copy of a short story of mine called "Every Precaution."

44

The gallant young Uplift Expert, the one hundred per cent red-blooded,

clean-living, heir of the Eternities, takes his young fianc, e and

female counterpart to the "Old Absinthe House" in New Orleans to show

her the terrible results of Wrong-Doing. They are going to avoid all  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right$ 

that; their child is going to be the Quintessence of Americanism.

They marry and take a cottage by Lake Pasquaney. Presently, he being

(so she said) away on a business trip, the tradesmen complained that

she seemed to need very little pabulum. Somehow, people got suspicious,

and sure enough, when they broke in, they found that she had pickled

him! This story is founded on fact; damn it, why did the MS
have to
get lost?)

observers often mistook him of a man --- who tried three times, pistol,

rope and poison. Something always went wrong. (Like the Babbacombe

315

murderer, who went to the scaffold three times, and lived to a green

old age!) Finally he did poison himself, by accident, when he had no

intention whatever of doing anything of the sort.

"Where's the Book of Lies? Ah, here we are. "It is chance, and chance

only, that rules the Universe; therefore, and therefore only, life is good."

Then, is it mere fatuity and folly to make plans? Was not the IXth

Atu, the Hermit, also at one time called "Prudence?" Of course.

Abstract philosophy rarely coincides with common-sense. We should

plan as carefully as we can; but we should always allow a margin for  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

every conceivable accident.

Nor should we trust to luck, like England, when she goes to war. Bret

Harte has an admirable story "The Outcasts of Poker Flat" in which the  $\,$ 

"bad man," the crooked gambler, gives his life for the safety of the

having the luck of the cards, but in playing a poor hand well."

Yes, I daresay, all very fine; but what you wanted to know was about

the propriety of taking risks in Magick.

So off we go.

Risks, we have agreed, are always unavoidable; but we can calculate

them. The best and wisest man I ever knew, the late Oscar Eckenstein,

was once offered a job which gave him a fifty percent chance of survi-

val. He calmly sat down, worked out his "expectation of life," his

"expectation of income," and the Lord alone knows what other factors.

It came out that the pay offered was a thousand pounds or so less than  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

he might expect normally, so he turned down the offer. Not a trace of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

sentiment of any kind!

Now let us consider an "A.B. case." John Jeremiah Jenkins sees a short

cut to his performance of the Great work. To seize this opportunity,

he must give up a steady job with good prospects and as near safety as  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

is possible in the nature of things, for a slim chance of a career in

the most insecure of all the professions.

He can do it; that is at the mercy of his Will; but he risks something

very close to the utter wreck and ruin of his future. Only a miracle  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

45

can bring him through. Just so! But is he not neglecting one factor

in his problem? Who put this romantically insane opportunity in his

way? The Gods: it must be, since he is performing the Great Work. Very

well then! It is up to Them to watch: "he shall give his angels charge

over thee to keep thee in all thy ways: in their hands they shall bear

thee up lest thou dash thy foot against a stone."

What's more, he must leave it at that; he must not insult Them by

constantly looking out for extra safeguards, or "hedging." (You remember

the Major in The Suicide Club when Prince Florizel was picking seconds

for a duel? "In all my life I never so much as hedged a bet.") You

must give Them plenty of opportunity to show Their approval by steering

you miraculously through one crisis after another.

This course of conduct may seem to you a little like the "Act of Truth"

but this is only superficially the case. The latter is usually an

emergency measure, and either not particularly serious or as serious

as anything can be. But what I have said above amounts really to a  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\}$ 

regular Rule of Life.

Need I add that the prime and essential requisite in all this Work is

that you so devote yourself to, and identify yourself with, the  $\operatorname{Gods}$ ,

that there is never any doubt in your mind as to what They intend you to do?

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours fraternally.

CHAPTER LXXXI

METHOD OF TRAINING

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

In your well-worn copy of the Bagh-i-muattar you have no doubt triply underlined that great verse:

"Who hath the How is careless of the Why,"

which shows how cunning I was to induce you to put all your "why" questions first.

But now let us get down to orichalc taques, as the Norman peasant might say.

The first and absolutely essential task for the Aspirant is to write his Magical Record.

You know some elementary Mechanics --- the Triangle of Forces, and all  $\,$ 

that. Well, if we have a body acted on by two equal forces, one pulling  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

it East, the other south, it will tend to move in a south-Easterly

direction. But if the "south" force is (say) twice as strong, it will

move south of South-East.

Now you, sitting in your study reading this letter, got there and were

compelled to do that, as the result of the impact upon you of countless  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

quintillions of forces of every kind. I don't expect you to discover

all these and calculate and report them; but I want you to set down

all the main currents. For so you should be able to get some sort of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

answer to the question "Where do we go from here, boys?"

I am not a guesser; and I cannot judge you, or advise you, or help you,

unless and until I know the facts as thoroughly as you are able to allow  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

The construction of this Record is, incidentally, the first step in the

practice called Sammasati, and leads to the acquisition of the Magical

Memory --- the memory of your previous incarnations. So there is another  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

reason, terrifically cogent, for writing this Magical Record as clearly  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

and as fully as you can.

This best explanation of how to set about the task is given in Liber
Thisharb.

some of this sounds rather advanced and technical; but it ought to give

you the general idea. You should begin with your parents and the family

traditions; the circumstances of your birth and education; your social

position; your financial situation; your physique, health, illnesses; your vita sexualis; your hobbies and amusements; what you

are good at, what not; how you came to be interested in the Great Work;

you have been on false trails, Toshophists,

Antroposophagists, sham

what (if

Rosicrucians, etc.) has been "your previous condition of servitude;"

how you found me, and decided to enlist my aid.

That, by itself, helps you to understand yourself, and me to understand you.

From that point the keeping of the Record is quite easy. All you have

to do is to put down what practices you mean to begin, how you get on

with them from day to day, and (at intervals) what I have to say about your progress.

Remember always that we have no use for piety, for vague chatter, for

guesswork; we are as strictly scientific as biologists or chemists.

We ban emotion from the start; we demand perception; and (as you will

see later on) even perception is not acceptable until we have made sure

of its bases by a study of what we call the "tendencies."

That is all about the Magical Record; the way is now clear to set

forth our Method. This is two-fold. (1) Yoga, introversion, (2)

Magick, extroversion. (These are rough but useful connotations.) The  $\,$ 

two seem, at first glance, to be opposed; but, when you have advanced

a little in both, you find that the concentration learnt in Yoga is

of immense use in attaining the mental powers necessary in magick; on

the other hand, the discipline of Magick is of the greatest service in Yoga.

Let me remark, by the way, that to my mind one of the greatest beauties,

and most encouraging confirmations of the validity of our  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{system}}$  , is

the matchless harmony of its elements. Always, when we pursue any one

path to its end, we find that it has become one with some other path  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

which at the outset appeared utterly irreconcilable with it.

47

("Write down that the tearing apart is the crushing together"  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{comes}}$ 

from an actual experience. See Liber 418, The Vision and the Voice,  $\,$ 

which teems with similar passages, and is itself an outstanding example

of the unity of the Yogic and the Magical methods.)

To study Yoga, you have my Book 4 Part I and my Eight Lectures on Yoga.

Then there is Vivekananda's Raja Yoga and several little-known Hindu

writers; these latter are very practical and technical, but one really

320

needs to be a Hindu to make much use of them. The former is very  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{good}}$ 

indeed, if your remember to switch off when he slides into sloppiness,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

which luckily is not often.

To study Magick" Book 4, Parts II, III (Magick in Theory and Practice)

and IV (The Equinox of the Gods.) Add The Book of Thoth and the you  $\,$ 

are: ---

"Being furnished with complete armour and armed,

he is similar to the goddess."

Of other writers, you have The Book of the Sacred Magic of Abramelin

the Mage," and any of the works of Eliphaz L,vi. But that's all.

But --- I suppose you knew all this long ago. It may help if I try to

expound the essence of these two Methods in very simple language, and

very different language. By contrast and comparison, you should be

able, without reading even one of all those books, to get a perfectly

clear idea in perspective of "what's coming to you!"

The process of analysing, developing and controlling the  $\min d$  is the

essence of all Yoga practices.

Magick explores and learns to control those regions of Nature which lie

beyond the objects of sense. Reaching the highest parts of these

regions, called the divine, one proceeds by the exaltation
(? = intoxi-

cation? Yes, of a sublime sort) of the consciousness to identify oneself  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

with those "celestial" Beings.

In Yoga, various practices prevent the body and its functions from  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

interrupting the mental process. Then, one inhibits that process  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

itself: the stilling of "thoughts" allows one to become aware of men-

tal functions beyond the intellectual; these functions have their own

peculiar properties and powers. Each sheath, as one goes deeper, is

discarded as "unreal;" finally one apprehends that nothing which is

the only true and real form of existence. (But then it does not exist:

in these regions of thought words always become nightmares of self-  $\,$ 

contradiction. This is as it should be.)

In Magick, on the contrary, one passes through the veil of the exterior  $\ \ \,$ 

world (which, as in Yoga, but in another sense, becomes "unreal" by

comparison as one passes beyond) one creates a subtle body (instrument

is a better term) called the body of Light; this one develops and con-

trols; it gains new powers as one progresses, usually by means of what

is called "initiation:" finally, one carries on almost one's whole life

in this Body of Light, and achieves in its own way the mastery of the Universe.

The first step in Yoga is "Keep still."

48

The first step in Magick is "Travel beyond the world of the senses."

There, that is the whole business in a nutshell, and expressed so that anyone, however ignorant of the subject, may grasp the

essentials (I hope).

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours fraternally.

CHAPTER LXXXII

EPISTOLA PENULTIMA: THE TWO WAYS TO REALITY

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

How very sensible of you, though I admit somewhat exacting!

You write --- Will you tell me exactly why I should devote so much of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{m}} \ensuremath{\mathsf{y}}$ 

valuable time to subjects like Magick and Yoga.

That is all very well. But you ask me to put it in syllogistic form.

I have no doubt this can be done, though the task seems somewhat compli-  $\,$ 

cated. I think I will leave it to you to construct your series of

syllogisms yourself from the arguments of this letter.

In your main question the operative word is "valuable." Why, I ask, in

my turn, should you consider your time valuable? It certainly is not

valuable unless the universe has a meaning, and what is more, unless

you know what that meaning is  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  at least roughly  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  it is millions to

one that you will find yourself barking up the wrong tree.

First of all let us consider this question of the meaning of the universe.

It is its own evidence to design, and that design intelligent design.

There is no question of any moral significance --- "one man's meat is  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{N}}$ 

another man's poison" and so on. But there can be no possible doubt  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

about the existence of some kind of intelligence, and that  $\operatorname{kind}$  is far

superior to anything of which we know as human.

How then are we to explore, and finally to interpret this intelligence?

It seems to me that there are two ways and only two. Imagine for a  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\}$ 

moment that you are an orphan in charge of a guardian, inconceivably

learned from your point of view. Suppose therefore that you are puzzled

by some problem suitable to your childish nature, your obvious and most

simple way is to approach your guardian and ask him to enlighten you. It

is clearly part of his function as guardian to do his best to help you.

Very good, that is the first method, and close parallel with what we

understand by the word Magick. We are bothered by some difficulty about  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

one of the elements --- say Fire --- it is therefore natural to evoke a

Salamander to instruct you on the difficult point. But you must remember  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

that your Holy Guardian Angel is not only far more fully instructed than

yourself on every point that you can conceive, but you may go so far as

to say that it is definitely his work, or part of his work; remembering

always that he inhabits a sphere or plane which is entirely different

49

from anything of which you are normally aware.

To attain to the Knowledge and Conversation of the Holy Guardian  ${\tt Angel}$ 

is consequently without doubt by far the simplest way by which you can  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

yourself approach that higher order of being.

That, then, is a clearly intelligible method of procedure. We call it Magick.

It is of course possible to strengthen the link between him and your-

self so that in course of time you became capable of moving and.

generally speaking, operating on that plane which is his natural habitat.

There is however one other way, and one only, as far as I can see, of

reaching this state. It is at least theoretically possible to exalt

the whole of your own consciousness until it becomes as free to move

on that exalted plane as it is for him. You should note, by the way,

that in this case the postulation of another being is not necessary.

There is no way of refuting the solipsism if you feel like that.

Personally I cannot accede to its axiom. The evidence for an external  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

universe appears to me perfectly adequate.

Still there is no extra charge for thinking on those lines if you so wish.

I have paid a great deal of attention in the course of  ${\tt my}$  life to the

method of exalting the human consciousness in this way; and it is

really quite legitimate to identify my teaching with that of the Yoqis.

I must however point out that in the course of my instruction I have

given continual warnings as to the dangers of this line of research.

For one thing there is no means of checking your results in the  $\operatorname{ordi-}$ 

nary scientific sense. It is always perfectly easy to find a subjective

explanation of any phenomenon; and when one considers that the greatest

of all the dangers in any line of research arise from egocentric vanity,

I do not think I have exceeded my duty in anything that I have said to

deter students from undertaking so dangerous a course as Yoga.

It is, of course, much safer if you are in a position to pursue in the

Indian Jungles, provided that your health will stand the climate and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

also, I must say, unless you have a really sound teacher on whom you

can safely rely. But then, if we once introduce a teacher, why not go  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

to the Fountain-head and press towards the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Knowledge}}$  and  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{conversation}}$ 

of the Holy Guardian Angel?

In any case your Indian teacher will ultimately direct you to seek

guidance from that source, so it seems to me that you have gone to a  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{a}}$ 

great deal of extra trouble and incurred a great deal of unnecessary

danger by not leaving yourself in the first place in the hands of the  $\,$ 

Holy Guardian Angel.

In any case there are the two methods which stand as alternatives.  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

do not know of any third one which can be of any use whatever. Logi-

cally, since you have asked me to be logical, there is certainly no  $\,$ 

third way; there is the external way of Magick, and the internal way

of Yoga: there you have your alternatives, and there they cease.

Love is the law, love under will.

50

CHAPTER LXXXIII

## EPISTOLA ULTIMA

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

The suggestion in your last letter to me is a very sensible one. I do  $\,$ 

think that people in general would like to get some idea of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  system

of training as a whole, in a comprehensive form. In the past there has

been far too much of referring them to one quite unprocurable document

and then to another which probably has not even been written. No wonder  $\,$ 

that they go away sorrowful. So I am going to put in as the last of  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,n\right\}$ 

this series of Letters an account, as clear and as succinct as the  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{gods}}$ 

enable me to do, of what they may expect to have to do to get good marks  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

from Grandfather. Of course I shall not be able to avoid altogether  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

reference to the various official documents, but I will make these as  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

short and as few as I can.

First of all then, my system can be divided into two parts. Apparently

diametrically opposed, but at the end converging, the one helping the

other until the final method of progress partakes equally of both elements. For convenience I shall call the first method Magick, and the  $\operatorname{second}$ 

method Yoga. The opposition between these is very plain for the

direction of Magick is wholly outward, that of Yoga wholly inward.

I will deal first then with Magick. How do I define this word?

Magick is the science and art of causing change to occur in accordance  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$ 

with the will. (Obviously then all scientific methods can be included in this term.)

I have to assume in all that follows that you have thoroughly understood the doctrine of 0 = 2.

All Magical action may be classed as under the formula of progression

from the "0" to the "2"; in other words it is complete extraversion.

The aspiring Magician only analyses himself for the purpose of finding

new worlds to conquer. His first objective is the astral plane; its

discovery, the classification of its tenants, and their control.

All his early practises therefore are devoted to exploring the worlds

which surround (if you choose, or if your prefer --- are contained in)

the object of sense. If there is a tree in your garden, you want to

find out whether that tree is occupied by a nymph or a nat, and if so.

what are they like? How do they act? How can you make them useful to

your purpose? It is in fact the ordinary every-day scientific method

of exploration. The only difference is that in the course of one's  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

experiments one becomes aware of parts of the nature of the object to  $\ \ \,$ 

be examined which are subtler and perhaps more powerful, nearer to  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

reality, than those which ordinary scientific examination discloses.

You will notice, however, that the qualities above-mentioned are iden-

tical. The chemical elements which go to form a tree are subtler,

51

more powerful and nearer to reality than the tree as it is presented to the senses.

Finally, we reach the conception of molecules, atoms, electrons, protons,

neutrons and so on, and nobody needs telling nowadays what unfathomable

potencies lie hidden in the atom.

When I say subtler, moreover, I mean it. The analysis of matter has  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

resulted in the extraordinary discovery that the definition of matter

as given by the physicist of to-day is very similar indeed to the

definition of spirit as stated by the mystics of the middle ages.

Henry Poincar, has well pointed out that the results of scientific

experiment as we know them, are altogether in their way dependant on  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

the existence of our own peculiar natures. If, for example, we had no

sense to use in our exploration but that of hearing, we should have

worked out a classification of trees entirely different from that which

we now possess. We should have taught our students how to distinguish

the sounds made by an oak and an elm respectively in a storm; the

differences in the rustling of various kinds of grass, and so on.

Similarly the results of our magical experiments are naturally and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

necessarily very distinct from those which we obtain by ordinary

methods. to begin with we must build up an apparatus of examination,

and this we do by discovering and developing qualities in our own sturc-  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

ture which ware suitable for the purpose.

The first step is the separation of (what we call, for convenience) the

astral body from the physical body. As our experiments proceed, we find

that our astral body itself can be divided into grosser and subtler  $\operatorname{\mathsf{com-}}$ 

ponents. In this way we become aware of the existence of what we call,

for convenience, the Holy Guardian Angel, and the more we realise the  $\,$ 

implications of the theory of the existence of such a being, the clearer

it becomes that our supreme task is to put ourselves into intimate

communication with him.

For one thing, we shall find that in the object of sense which we

examine there are elements which resist our examination. We must raise

ourselves to a plane in which we obtain complete control of such.

It is found furthermore in the course of experiment that a great many

of the apparent differences in our study conceal a hidden unity, and

vice versa. Like every other science, both the subject and the object

of the work increase as that work proceeds.

Take a simple matter like Mathematics as our analogy. The schoolboy

struggling with the Rule of Three is a very rudimentary image of the

advanced mathematician working on the differential calculus.

From the above it ought to be clear to you that I have said all that  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

really needs to be said in explaining the whole of Magick as the science  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

and art of extending, first in oneself, one's own faculties, secondly

in external nature their hidden characteristics.

Before closing the subject entirely I think it well to point out that

there are quite a number of worlds on which a good deal of work remains

to be done. In particular I cannot refrain from mentioning the work of

Dr. Dee and Sir Edward Kelly. My own work on this subject has been so

52

elaborate and extensive that I shall never sufficiently regret that  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

never had an opportunity of completing it, but I should like to empha-

size that the obtaining of a book like Liber 418 is in itself so  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

outstanding an achievement that it should serve as an encouragement to all Magicians.

In the case of many worlds, in particular that of Abra Melin, of the

greater and lesser Keys of Solomon, of Pietro di Abano, of Cornelius

Agrippa, while we have perfectly adequate information as to the  $\operatorname{methods}$ 

we have very meagre examples of the results, especially so far as refers  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

to the technical side of the work.

I must conclude with a warning. So many of these branches of magick

are so fascinating that any one of them is liable to take hold of the

Magician by the short hair and upset his balance completely. It should

never be forgotten for a single moment that the central and essential

work of the Magicians is the attainment of the Knowledge and Conversa-

tion of the Holy Guardian Angel. Once he has achieved this he must of

course be left entirely in the hands of that Angel, who can be invari-

ably and inevitably relied upon to lead him to the further great step  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$ 

crossing of the abyss and the attainment of the grade of Master of the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Temple}}.$ 

Anything apart from this course is a side issue and unless so regarded

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{may}}$  lead to the complete ruin of the whole work of the Magician.

ΙI

The second part of this letter, which appears to be expanding into a sort of essay, will be devoted to Yoga. You will have noticed that the grade of Master of the Temple is itself intimately associated with Yoga.

It is when one reaches this plane that the apparently contradictory

forms of the Great Work, Magick and Yoga, begin to converge, though even

earlier in the course of the work it must have been noticed that achieve-

ments in Yoga have been of great assistance to magical operations, and

that many of the mental states necessary to the development of the

Magician are identical with those attained in the course of the strictly  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$ 

technical Yogic operations.

The literature necessary to the study of Magick is somewhat variegated;

there are quite a number of classics on the subject and though it would

be easy enough for me to draw up a list of not more than  $half-a\ dozen$ 

which I consider really essential, there may be as many as an hundred  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

which in the more or less subsidiary forms are useful to the magician.

With Yoga the case is very different indeed. The literature on the

subject is so enormous and contains so vast a number of more or less

secret documents which circulate from hand to hand, that I believe

that the best advice I can give anyone is to cut one's cloth  $\ensuremath{\text{very}}$ 

sparingly if one is to make a fitting suit. I do not think I am going

too far if I say that Part I of Book 4 and my Eight Lectures on Yoga

form an absolutely sufficient guide to the useful practise of the  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$ 

subject; anything else is almost certain to operate as a distraction.

Swami Vivekananda summarised Yoga under four headings, and I do not

think that one can improve on that classification. His four are: Gnana,

Raja, Bhakti and Hatha, and comprise all divisions that it is desirable

to make. As soon as one begins to add such sections as Mantra Yoga, you

are adding to without enriching the classification, and once you begin

where are you to stop? But I honestly believe that the excessive

simplication given in Eight Lectures on Yoga is a practical advantage.

Any given type of Yogas is the work of a lifetime and for that reason

alone it is desirable to confine oneself from the beginning to an

absolutely simple programme.

What then is the difference between Yoga and Magick? Magick is extra-

verson, the discovery of and subsequently the classification of and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

finally the control of new worlds on new planes. So far as it concerns

the development of the mind its object and method are perfectly simple.

What is wanted is exaltation. The aim is to identify oneself with the

highest essence of whatever world is under consideration.

With Yoga you might easily slip into saying that it was identical, with

the exception that the new worlds are from the start recognised as

already existing within the human cosmos, but nobody is asked to extend  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

these worlds in any way; on the contrary the object is to analyse ever

more minutely, and the control to which one approaches is not external  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

but internal. At all times one is concentrated on the idea of simpli-  $\,$ 

cation. The recognition of any new idea or form of ideas, is invariably

the signal for its rejection: "not that, not that."

One might simplify this explanation by constructing some sort of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

apophthegm; Magick is the journey from 0 to 2, Yoga from 2 to 0. It

is a very good rule for the Yogi to keep this mind constantly fixed on

the fact that any idea soever is false. There is actually a  $\operatorname{Hindu}$ 

proverb "That which can be thought is not true." consequently the

existence of any idea in the mind is an immediate refutation of it,

but equally the contraries as well as contradictory of that idea are

false, and the result of this is to knock the second law of formal logic to pieces.

One puts up a sort of sorites --- A is B, therefore A is not B; therefore

not A is not B; and all these contrary statements are equally false,

but in order to realise this fact they must themselves be announced by

the mind as ecstatic discoveries of truth.

The result of all this naturally is that the mind very rapidly becomes

a discredited instrument, and one attains to a totally different and  $% \frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right)$ 

much more exalted type of mind, and the same destructive  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{criticism}}$ 

which one applied to the original consciousness applies equally to

this higher consciousness, and one gets to one higher still which is

again destroyed. In The Equinox, Vol. I there is an essay called "The

Soldier and the Hunchback: ! and ?" In Liber Aleph too there are

several chapters about attainment by what is called the  $\mbox{Method}$  of  $\mbox{Ladders}$ .

All these operations are equally valid and equally invalid, and the  $% \frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right)$ 

result of this is that the whole subject of Yoga leads to constantly

increasing confusion. The fineness of the analytical instrument seems  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

to defeat its own purpose and it is perhaps because of that confession

that I have always felt in  ${\tt my}$  deepest consciousness that the  ${\tt method}$  of

Magick is on the whole less dangerous than that of Yoga. This is parti-

cularly the case when discussing these matters with a Western  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{mind}}\xspace.$ 

It is true that our 0 = 2 formula remains infinitely useful because it

is of such potency in destroying the scepticism which so often  $\operatorname{dis}$ -

heartens one, especially in the highest realms of Magick. The criticism  $\,$ 

which the enemy directs against your sun-kissed tower is thrown back  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

from those glittering walls,  $\ \mbox{You}$  accept the criticism at the same time

as you dismiss it with a laugh.

On the whole therefore I continue to regard the discipline of Yoga as

its most valuable feature. The results attained by pushing Yoga to its

end are on their own showing worthless, whereas the attainment of Magick,

however lofty, is still immune to all criticism and at every  $period\ of$ 

its construction has been perfectly sympathetic with the normal conscious-  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

ness of man.

On this view indeed, one might laughingly remark that Yoga at its best  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

is a smoke-screen thrown out by a battleship in self-protection.

It may seem to you strange as you read this letter to have watched how

the pendulum has swung always a little more and more towards the side  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

of Magick. I do not know why this should have been, but that it is so

I have no doubt whatever. I see quite clearly now that Yoga from its

very first beginnings is liable to lead the  $\min$  away into a condition

of muddle, and though for each such state Yoga itself provides the

necessary cure, may not one ask oneself if it is really wise to begin

one's work with axioms and postulates which are inherently dangerous.

The whole controversy might be expressed as a differential equation.

Their curves become identical only at infinity, and there is no doubt,

at least to  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  mind, that the curve of Magick follows a more pleasant

track than that of Yoga.

To take one point alone: it is evidently more satisfactory to have

one's malignant demons external to oneself.

As I have written it has become clearer to me that this is the case,

but I should not like you to arise from its perusal with any idea that

I have been in some way derogating Yoga. I would not like to maintain

that it is necessary to Magick because there have been many very great

magicians who knew nothing at all of the subject but I am just as  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

strongly convinced as I was before that the practice of Yoga in itself

is of enormous assistance to the Magician in his more intelligible  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

path, only adding that he should beware lest the logical antinomies

inherent in Yoga divert him from or discourage him in his simple path.

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours,

666

THELEMIC BOOKS REFERRED TO IN THIS VOLUME.

BOOK 4, PART I --- A concise and clear

treatise on Yoga and mysticism.

BOOK 4, PART II --- An introductory treatise

on the

practice of Magick.

BOOK OF LIES, The --- Which is --- This book deals with

many matters

55

also falsely called "Breaks" on all planes of the

highest im-

portance.

COLLECTED WORKS --- These works contain many

mystical

and magical secrets,

both stated

clearly in prose, and

woven into

the Robe of sublimest poesy. DAIRY OF A DRUG FIEND, The --- A true story of drug addicts who were cured of their affliction by a strict r,gime and the constant quidance of a Master. EQUINOX, The Vol. I, No. 1 - 10 Vol. III, No. 1 --- Contains an immense number and variety of official publications, rituals, treatises, etc. Also special Supplements such as The Vision and the Voice; translation of Eliphas L, vi's The Key of the Mysteries; Sepher Sephiroth; H. P. Blavatsky's The Voice of the Silence, with a Commentary by Fr. O.M., etc., etc. Vol. III, 3 --- The Equinox of the Gods Vol. III, 4 --- Eight Lectures on Yoga --- the deepest book written on the subject of Yoga. --- The Book of Thoth --- a Vol. III, 5 masterpiece on the Egyptian Tarot, with Appendices, and designs with an entirely new pack of Tarot cards, executed by Frieda Harris. GOETIA, The --- The most intelligible of the mediaeval rituals of Evocation. Contains also the favourite Invocation by the

Master Therion.

describing

Holy Hill

HEART OF THE MASTER, The --- A sublime Masterpiece,

a vision given upon the

preface on mysticism and

of Sidi Bou Said.

THELEMIC BOOKS

KNOX OM PAX --- Four invaluable

treatises and a

Magick.

LIBER ALEPH --- The Book of Wisdom or

Folly. This book contains some of

the deepest secrets of initiation,

with a clear solution of many

cosmic and ethical problems.

LIBER ARARITA --- This book describes in

magical

process

language a very secret

56

of initiation.

LIBER CORDIS CINCTI SERPENTE --- The Book of the Heart

Girt with

of the

Guardian

the Serpent: an account

Aspirant with his Holy

Angel.

LIBER 418 --- THE VISION AND --- First published in

Equinox I, 5. THE VOICE

issued

full text, an

extensive Com-

Therion.

A new publication was

subsequently with the

Introduction, and

mentary by The Master

LIBER LEGIS --- THE BOOK OF --- This Book is the foundation of THE LAW the New Aeon, and thus of the whole Work. LIBER VII --- THE BOOK OF --- Gives in magical language an LAPIS LAZULI account of the initiation of a Master of the Temple. This is the only parallel, for beauty of ecstasy, to The Book of the Heart Girt with the Serpent. LIBER TRIGRAMMATON --- Describes the course of Creation under the figure of the interplay of Three Principles. The book corresponding to the Stanzas of Dzyan. LITTLE ESSAYS TOWARD TRUTH --- (Formerly called The Wine of the Graal) --- --- A collection of 17 Essays which constitute in themselves a complete system of initiation. MAGICK IN THEORY AND PRACTICE --- A complete work on Magick, with Appendices, the more important columns from 777, etc. 777 --- A complete Dictionary of the correspondences of all magical elements. It is to the language of occultism what Webster is to the English language.

INDEX

A.'. A.'. xvii, xxiii, xxvii, 46, Alexandria, 36 47, 48, 53, 60, 70, 83, 146, Alexandrines, xviii 151, 167, 202, 210, 212, 214, Alkali, deposit in S. Africa, 270 217, 237, 276, 322, 323, 324, Allah, 311 349, 354 Alphabets --- see Ch. LXVIII, pp. 307 312, 326 Abano, Pietro di, 98, 379 --- Greek, xxiii, Abrahadabra, 81 xxvii 57 Abbey of Cefal-, 128, 180 (see also Amalantrah, 48, 161 Cefal-) Amennti, xxii, xxiii, 346 Abramelin, xxvi, 132, 193, 198, 379; American Tourists, 255 --- demons, 263 --- officer story, 333 --- scorns astrologers, 100 A.M.O.R.C., 55 --- Sacred Magic of, 98, 198, Amoun-Ra, 352 242, 374 Amrit, 37 Ab-ul-Diz, 48, 226, 234, 235, 236 Ananda, 283, 284 Abyss, xxiv, 48, 60, 62, 64, 65, Ananga Ranga, 48, 83 66, 67, 69, 120, 194, 214, Angels, 18, 196, 264, 266, 300, 342, 379 307, 351 --- Oath of, 215 Anima, 127 Achad, 18, 180, 219 Animal Automatism, 301 Adam Qadmon, 93, 94 Animism, 34 Adept, 48, 227, 266 Animus, 127 Adept Minor, 47, 61, 193 Ankh, 155, 286 Adeptus Exemptus, 60, 228, 229 Ankh-f-n-khonsu, xvi, xxvi, 170, Adler, Dr. Alfred, 117 179, 189, 238 Adonai, 132 Antichrist, 35, 211, 316 Antinomianism, 39 Adonis, xviii, 351 Advaitism, 21, 25 Aphrodite, 97, 197 Advaitist, 21, 23 Apocalypse, 17, 29, 163 Advent, Second, 177 Apollo and the Fates, (Browning) 36; Adytum, 67 --- Invocation of, 193 Aenead, First Book of, 47 --- God of Music, 287

Aeon, 49, 216, 228, 346, 365,	Apollonius of Tyana,
115, 116, 130 of Isis, Osiris, Horus, 216 Aesopus Island, 161; Hermit of, 166 Agrippa, Cornelius, 98, 379 Aha! 201 339	Apophis, 63 Apostles, 327 Apuleius, 83, 338 Arabian Nights, 338,
Ahamkara, 191, 192, 284 Ahaz, 146 Aheba, 18	Arabs, xxiii, 344, 351 Arahat, 129 Archangels, 18, 351,
Ahriman, 21 56, 57	Archetypes (Plato),
Aiwass, 48, 218, 237, 351 A ka dua, 109 Akasha, 116 Alchemy, 40 Alder, 53 Aleph, 65	Ark, 67 Armada, 98 Armadale, 233 Arnold, 111 Arnold, Mathew, 199 Asana, 92, 121, 213 D E X
Asar, 311	Balzac, 83, 338
Asankyas, 192 Ascendent, 103	Banishings, 110 Baphomet, xix
Asi, 37, 311	Barbey d' Aurevilly,
193 Asiatic God, 36	Barrett, Elizabeth,
117 Assyrian, 48 Astroth, 197, 311 Astarte, 197, 311 Astral Body, xxiii, 167, 324, 378, dangerous, 243	Bartzabel, 180, 226 Basilisk, (Egg), 63 Baudelaire, 163, 361 Beachy Head,
Plane, xxii, xxvi, 19, 110 231, 260, 263, 264, 272, 287, 300, 377 Projection, 123, 167 Travel, xxiii, xxv, 273, 276, 287, 310	Beast, 216 Beatific Vision, 64 Beer, 223 Beerbohm, Max, 199 Bees, 355 Belsen, 347
Astrology, 326	Beni Elohim, 351
58	
Asuras, 21 129, 157, 190 Athanasian Creed, 358, 359 Athanasius, 358 Coll. Works) Athanor, 64 Athene, 193	Bennett, Allan, 122,  261, 262, 307 Berashith (Crowley,  20, 24 Berkeley, Bishop, 23,
301	

Atma, 127, 192	Besant, Annie, 42, 55
Atmadarshana, 22, 23, 62	Bethlehem, 30
Atman, 23	Bhagavad-Gita, 22
Atonement, 315	Bhikkhu, xiv, 191
Attila, 30	Bhikkhu Ananda
Metteya: see	Billimila Illialiaa
	D
Attis, xviii, 351	Bennett, Allan
Atziluth, 57	Big Business, 344, 350
Aucassin et Nicolette, 247	Binah, 77, 78, 91,
222, 358	
Augoeides, 132, 193, 352	Black Brothers, xvi,
xvii, 33, 60	
Augustus Caesar, 36	63, 66, 67, 82,
133, 151, 191,	
Aumont, G,rard, 9, 28, 44	193, 230, 342
Auphanim, 196	Dragon, 40
Auto-Hagiography, 122	Lodges, 74, 201
Autolycus, 204	Magician, 60, 71
Ayin, 18	Mass, 358
Ayılı, 10	•
D	Prince, 168
В	School of Magic,
29 sqq.;	
defined,	
Ba, 127, 132	33 sqq., 42
Babalon, 30, 66, 67, 237	Star, 224
Babe of the Abyss, 61	Blake, William, 305,
352	
Babylon, 68	Blavatsky, Helena
Petrovna, 41,	2,
Bach, Joh. Se., (Vision), 90	42, 43, 52, 192,
212, 228,	12, 13, 32, 132,
Bacchae of Euripides, 70	262
Bacchus, xviii	Blitz (London)
episode, 85, 283	
Bacon, Francis, 225	Blougram, Bishop, 359
Baghdad, xxix	Bodleian Library,
Oxford, 231	
Bagh-i-Muattar, 83, 372	Boccaccio, 83
Balfour, Jabez, 105	Bodhisattva, 148
Baltis, 245	Body of Light, 203,
374	
	Bog, 134, 307
I N	DEX
Boleskine, 108, 231	Byzantium, 36
Book of the Dead, xxiii	By Zaire Lam, 30
Book 4, details on, 226, 234	
	G.
Book 4, Part I, 23, 84, 380, 92	C
II, 97, 107, 108	
III, see "Magick"	Cabell, James Branch,
73, 342	
of Thoth, v, xxvii, 20, 134,	Cadiz, 288
153, 155, 219, 311, 373	
168	. , ,
of the Law, xi, xii, xxi, 17,	Cairo, 36, 232, 236.
238	11110, 30, 232, 230,

```
44, 48, 80, 87, 89, 111, Cairo Working, xi,

189, 234, 345

147, 150, 152, 159, 173, Caithness, Lady, 168

178, 180, 189, 194, 208, Cakravarti-Rajah, 286

209, 227, 248, 251, 258, Caldarazzo, Villa, 236

286, 305, 331; difficulties Cambridge, 177, 186

of, 216, 218

--- of Lies, xxiv, 88, 113, 138, Carthage, 93

172, 282, 286, 304, 305, Catholic Church, 31

314

--- Mysticism, 39

--- of Heart Girt with Serpent, Cato, xxvii

(LXV), 347 with quotations Cato, Scipio, 93
```

59

- 11 150	~
Boulak Museum, 179	Catullus, 6, 79, 83,
153, 191, 284	Garage of an experience of describe
Brahma, 192	Caucasians (don't
believe in Vedas),	0.40
Brahmacharya, 242	243
Brahma Lokas, 167, 192	Cefal-, 128, 130, 178,
253, 326	
Brahman, 22, 23, 192	Diaries from,
166	
Brahmin (caste), 242, 243, 317	Centaur, 299
Bralduh, 110	Centuries of
Nostradamus, 117	
Brewer's, Dr., Guide, v	Ceres, 65
Brocken, 304	Chamelion, Path of, 47
Bront‰, Emily, 153	Chaldea, School of, 38
Browning, Robert, 36, 97, 117, 139,	Chaldean Square system
(Astrol-	
144, 202, 177, 256, 312	ogy), 104
Brunton, 55	Chant, Mrs. Ormiston,
199	
Buchari-siddhi, 121	Chaos, 63
Buchenwald, 347	Charybdis, 151, 338
Buckmaster, Professor, 355, 368	Chaucer, 342
Buddha, 33, 34, 38, 52, 122, 129	Ch,ron, Jane, 238
191, 192, 359	Chesterton, J.K., 307
Buddhahood, xxiv	Chiah, 172, 212, 222,
358	
Buddhi, xxii, 127, 192	Chimaera, 90
Buddhism, connected with Black	China, walk across,
157, 214,	
School of Magick, 33, 35, 37,	290, 368
111, 113, 129, 228, 361	Chinese system of
thought, 25,	
Buddhist, 112, 128, 135, 155, 159,	26, 33, 157, 158
165, 284, 285	Chokmah, 46, 77, 78,
358	

Buer, 262, 263 Choronzon, 66, 67, 68, 322 Bunyan, John, 342 Christ, 21, 119, 241, 260 Buridan's Ass, 174 Christian - attitude, Burin, 63 --- path, xvi, 84, 317, 347 Burma, 299, 368 --- Home, 249 --- Science, 35, Business, 344, 345 36, 233 INDEX Christian Scientist, 23 Darshana, 192 Christianity, xviii, 34, 35-42, 312 Davy, Sir Humphrey, illumination, Church of Rome, 275 16 Churchill, Winston, (reference to), Death, Fear of, 281 75 Dee, Dr. John, 98, 231, 379 Chymical Marriage of C.R., 338 Demiurge, 21 City of the Pyramids, 68, 71, 224, Democracy, 336 245 Demon, Demons, 163, 194, 196; Cleopatra, 6, 168 Mercurial, 263 Denikin, General, 243 Cloud upon the Sanctuary, 205 Clymer, 55 Descartes, 225 Desdemona, 120 Collected Works of Aleister Crowley, 24 Destiny, xxiv, 11 Collins, Mabel, 338 Devachan, 167, 212 collins, Wilkie, 223 Devas, 21 Collon, Mont, 261 Devil(s), 21, 22, 120, 145, 197 Communism, 289, 368 Dhamma, Three Baskets of, 283 Jewish, 35, 327 Dhammapada, 35, 157 Co-Masonry, xvi, xvii Dharana, xxvi, 92, 131 Combes, 317 Dhyana, 92, 152 Comment/Commentary, 227 Diabolism, 30 Concentration Camps, 84, 218 Dialogue before eating, xii Diana, 60 Confucius, xx Diary, Magical, xii, Conrad, 342 203, 281, Consols, 356 372, 373 60 Contes Cruels, 193 Diary of a Drug Fiend, 154 Coriolanus, 249 Diez, 73

Cotytto, 197, 309 Dionysus, 36, 193, 223 Cou, ism, 95 Disks (Tarot), 97, 109 Courtier, Jules, 239 Dittany of Crete, 262 Crawford, F. Marion, 255 Divine Pymander, 139 Creative Dyad, 18 Dobson, Austin, 247 Crippen, 134 Dogme et Rituel (L, vi), 115 Crucifixion, 39 Dolphin, 67 Crux Ansata, 155 Domodossola, 352 Cumaean Sybil, 47 Donne, 83 Cup, 109 Doodle-Bug, 145 Curie (s) The, 218 Dostoievsky, 35 Curtius, 313 Doubt, 303 Curzon, George Nathaniel, 135 Doughty, Dr., 248 Czechoslovakia, rape by Hitler, Dover (Browning story), 313 183 Draco, 222 Dracula, 298, 300 Dragon, 287 D Drake, 352 Dreams, analysis of, 189, 190 Da, th, 62, 66, 77, 229 Drugs, 358, 359, 360, 361 Daleth, 77 Dryads, 197 Dualism, Dualists, 22, Damascus, 36; Burden of, 177 Dante, 6, 116 Dumas, 338 Daphnis and Chloe, 247 Duns Scotus, 56 INDEX Duranty, Walter, 116 Excalibur, 43 Dweller of the Threshold, 191 Exempt Adept, see Adept Dyad, Creative, 18 Dying God, xviii, 21 F Ε Fabre, 42 Fabre d'Olivet, 308 Eblis, 286 Fama Fraternitatis, 62 Ecclesiastes, 35 Family system, 250 FarrŠrre, Claude, 302 Eckenstein, Oscar, 157 Fascism, 334 Ecstasy, xxv Eden (and the Fall), 210 Fate, xxiv Ederle, Gertrud, 318 Faubourg St. Germain Aristocracy,, Egyptian Theogony, xxvi; School, 38 Eight Lectures on Yoga, xi, xxii, 84 Ferranti (stove), 108 112, 219, 227, 316, 373, 380 Fielding, Henry, 184 Eight Limbs of Yoga, xxii Fifth Dimension, 53 Einstein, Albert, 42 Fountainebleau (Mor<sup>^</sup>t), 237 Eire, 61 Forth Bridge, 219 Elementals, 163, 262 Fourth Dimension, 155 Elemental Tablets (Watch Towers), France, Anatole, 127 231, 232 Franco, 117

Elephant, 163 Frater O.I.V.V.I.O., 29 Elias, 211 Frazer, Sir William, 28, 36, 146 Elixir of Life, 36 Freemasonry, 74 Elizabethan period, 367 Free Will, xxiv, 11 Elohim, xx Freud, Sigmund, xxv, 11, 30, 117 Eloi, eloi, Iama, sabacthani, 69 132 Empire State Building, 176 Freudian Forgetfulness, 165 61 Empress (Tarot Card), 171 Frobisher, 352 Encyclopaedists, 30 Fugue, 91 End (justifies the means), 221, 225 Fu-Hsi-Trigrams, 270 Endor, Witch of, 116 Fuller, J.F.C., 256, 323 Engergized Enthusiasm, 42, 83 Fundamentalists, 34 England, General Election, 348, 449 Enochian Tablets, see Elemental Epicurus, 21 G Equinox, The, general, why begun, Gabriel, 6, 48, 351 --- of the Gods, reporter's Gale, Norman, 247 story quoted, 228 Galileo, 141, 168 Erdmann, 117 Gallio, 146 Ethics of Thelema, 208, 209, 218 Gamiani, 83 228, 318 Ganges, 289 Ethyl Oxide, 266 Garret, Garet, 344 Euclid, 226 Gaulle, G,n,ral de, 117 Euripides, 70 Gebhardi, Otto, 217 Evangelical (cults), 35 Geburah, 46, 229 Gematria, xxiii, 19 Everest (mystery), 185 Evolution and Ethics, 33 Genius, 82, 192, 315, 348, 352, 368 Exaltation, xxiii Geomancy, 268 INDEX Gertrude, Nun, 359 Hardy, Thomas, 247, 342 Gestapo, 19, 345 Harpocrates, 90, 95 Harte, Bret, 369 Gethsemane, 69 Gilbert, William Schwenk, 150, 200, Haseltine, Philip, 98 281 Hashish, 349, 359 Gillette, William, 196 Hatha Yoqa, 121, 222

Hathor, 197

Hawk, Golden, 123, 124

Get any book for free on: www.Abika.com

Gimel, xx, 222

Gnomes, 261

Hebrew, Alphabet, 308,

336, 347; mag. child

217

Gnostics, 36, 308

```
309;
Goat of Mendez, 35
                                               --- Gods, 311
                                           Heindl, Max, 55
Gobineau, de, 217
Goclenian Sorites, xxviii
                                           Heinzelm, nner, 261
God, xxvi, xxvii, xxix, 5, 14, 19, Henley, W.E., 14, 148
    21, 27, 52, 70, 112, 127, 132, Henry VIII, 168

134-136, 144, 145, 155, 163, Heraclitus, 159

176, 193, 222, 238, 259, 264, Herbert, A.P., 83, 201

266, 286, 347, 358 Hereward the Wake, 224
 --- Asiatic Dying, xviii
                                          Hermaphrodite of
Panormita, 20
God-form, 90, 95
                                           Hermes, xxiv, xxvi,
65, 140, 352
Gods, 95, 115, 163, 193, 196-198,
                                         Hermes Eimi, xxi, 48
                                        Hermit, 217
     206, 231, 237, 264, 287, 309-
     311, 336, 347, 351-353, 356,
                                          Herod, 347
     358, 371, 377
                                           Herrick, 83
Goetia, 73, 262
                                           Hertz, 4, 6, 30; rays,
239
Golden Bough, 351
                                           Heru-pa-kraath, 171
Golden Dawn, Order of The, (G.'.D.'.), Hesinger, 355
     280, 323, 343
                                           Hexagram, Unicursal,
109; of Yi
Golden Hawk, 123, 124
                                                 King, 26, 270,
286
Good and Evil, 21
                                           Hezekiah, 146
Gordian Knot, 132
                                           Hierophant, 171
Grant, Gregor, 261
                                          Higher Manas, 127, 192
Great Work, xi, xii, xiv, xv, xxv,
                                         Higher Self, 132, 192,
xxix
     77, 80-82, 86-89, 148, 149
                                        Hill, Raven, 199
     151, 204, 212, 223, 229,
                                         Hilton, James P., 151
62
     241-243, 256, 276, 288, 290, Himalayan Sheep, 300 325, 333, 337, 356, 366, 372, Hindu, xxi, 52, 92,
144, 159, 192,
     379
                                                  285, 308, 317,
361, 373, 380;
Great Work "a tea party," xv
                                          Orders, xiv, xxi, 39;
Proverb
Greene, Grahame, 210
                                                  about women, 258
Guernica, 218
                                           Hinton, P., 155
                                           Hismael, 117
Gunas, xix
Guru, xxv, xxvii, 204, 222, 289
                                          Hitler, 60, 77, 104,
259, 288, 331,
```

of I.W.E.,

Η Hitler Speaks, 217 Hod, xx, 18 Hadit, 74, 169, 171, 212 Hodos Camelionis, 47 Haeckel, Ernst, 22, 129, 130, 169 Holy Deadlock, 201 Haldane, J.B.S., 282 Holy Ghost, 359, 360 Hamilton, Sir William, 265 Holy Guardian Angel, xxiii, 22, 132, Hammurabi, 20 193, 196, 222, 348, 252, 375, Hanuman, xxvi, xvi, 352 378 (see also K. and C. of H.G.A.) INDEX Holy Man, 316, 317, 318 I.W.E., Soror, 217 Home, D. D., 117, 184 Homer, 180 Hong Kong, 123 J Hood, 352 Hoor-paar-kraat, 182, 351 Jacobs, Indian Rothschild, 255 H.P.B. --- see Blavatsky Jeans, Sir James, 16 Horoscope, xii Jechidah --- see Yechidah Horus, 174, 180, 216, 250, 318 Jehannum, 286 Hume, 35 Jehovah, xix Huxley, Aldous, 248, 368 Jerusalem, 36 --- Thomas Henry, 33, 35, 146, Jesuits, 94, 221 299, 301 Jesus, xviii, 22, 177, 311, 347 Huysmans, 338 Jesus Christ, xv, 115 Jew, 289, 344 Hybris, 95 Jewish (Communism), 327 --- Theology, xxvi Jinn, 91, 351 I Johannesburg, 268 I, 26 John, 311 Joshua, 146, 310 Iacchus, 59, 65 IAO, xxvi, xvi, xix Judaism, 34, 35, 38 Ibsen, 336, 337 Judas, 347 Iddhi, 290 Jung, 117, 139, 249 Jupiter, xix, 198, 352 Iehi Aour s. Allan Bennett "If" (Kipling), 84 Juvenal, 83 Incarnations, past, xiii, xiv, 281 Incubi, 300 India, xxii, 163 Indifference, 284 K Indra, 352 Inertia (Formula of Nature), 250 Ka, 127 Kama Loka, 167, 212 Initiates, xxii, xxiii, 342 Initiation, xxii, 133, 136, 141, Kama Shastra, 83 223, 224, 241, 324, 330, 348 Kama Sutra, 83 Inquisitor, 193 Kandy, 92, 122, 157 Instinct, 222, 223 Kant, 35, 222

63

<pre>Interlaken, 233 Invocation, 86, 110, 193, 194, 311, 211, 212, 224,</pre>	Kaph, xix Karma, xv, xxiv, 88,
324	228, 244, 245,
346; Lords	-£ 245
Iophiel, 117 Ipsissimus, 70 231, 379	of, 245 Kelly, Edward, 98,
Ireland, 102; Irish, 336	Kephra, xv
Iroquois, 20	Kether, 108, 222
Isaacs, Mr., 255	Khabs, 132, 171
Isis, 35, 174, 204, 219, 250, 344, 347	Khamsin, 61 Khen, 35
Islam, 39, 311, 317, 361; parable	Khu, 127, 141
from, 282	Kiblah, 308
Italians, 336	Kidneys, defective,
280	
Itzatccihuatl, 300 AL, II, 171,	King, The, quoted from
Ivan the Terrible, 368	208, 209
INDEX	
King Kang Khang, 153	Liber CCCLXX, 83
Kingsford, anna, 41	DCCCXXXI, 83
King's Scale, 18, 57, 87, 98	CLXXV, 83
Kinks in Time, 124	CLVI, 83
Kipling, Rudyard, 84, 104, 179, 335	418 = The Vision
and The Voice, 29	
Kiriloff, 35	III vel Jugorum,
92	Tidian 210
Knowledge and Conversation of Holy Guardian Angel, xxiii, 61, 193,	
219, 229, 375, 376, 379	Lingam, xix, 287
Konx Om Pax, 323	Little Essays toward
Truth, xiv,	Electe Essays coward
Krishna, xviii	xxii, 166, 211,
284	
Krishnamurti, 42	Lion Serpent, xxvi
Kwa, 26	Litton, 299
	Logic, xv, 24
	Logos, 358
L	Loki, 352
Tafanaha (1	London, Jack, 51
Lafayette, 61	Longfellow, 324
Lakhs, 142 Lamb, 67	Longus, 247 Lorraine, 61
Lamen, xxii	Lost Horizon, 151
Lao Tse, 11, 135, 153, 158, 160	Love under will, xv
172	Lovers, The, 222
Lapis Lazuli, 37	Lower Manas, 192

```
La Poule aux Rats, 364
                                    Ludlow, 361
Laughter, Trance of, 285
                                    Lunn, Colin, 185
                                     Lupin, ArsŠne, 224
Law of Thelema, 43
                                     Luxor, 189
Laylah, 234
Leech, 366
                                     Lycanthropy, 289
                                   Lynch Law, 335, 337
Left-hand Path, 60, 61, 63, 191
Legge, 161, 162
                                    Lytton, 338
Lehrjahre, 278
Lenin, 346
Leo, Alan, 225
                                                  Μ
Leonardo da Vinci, 2
Lethe, River of, 167
                                    MacCarthy, Desmond,
334
Levant, 36
                                     Machen, Arthur, 338
L, vi, Eliphas, xii, 115-119, 168,
                                   Macroprosopus, 17
     212, 298, 300, 374
                                     Magical Child, 217
Leviathan, 66
                                       --- Formula, 218,
219
                                      --- Link, 288
Levitation, 289
64
Liber Aleph, 113, 284, 327-330 --- Memory, 372 --- Legis, xxiii, 76, 80; Find- --- Power, 256,
Liber Aleph, 113, 284, 327-330
289
      ing of MS, 212; see also
                                       --- Record, see
Diary
                                       --- Theory, 275,
      Book of the Law
288
--- OZ, 333
                                     Magick, v, xi, xii,
xxii, xxiii,
 --- Resh vel Helios, xii, 92, 281
                                            xxvii, 20, 27,
28, 76, 77,
--- Thisarb, xii, 129, 165, 211,
                                            84, 85, 165,
200, 209, 226,
       213, 214, 215, 372
                                             262, 289, 301,
302, 322, 330,
--- LII, xvii
                                             373, 374, sqq.
                                       --- Defined, 28
 --- LXV, xvii
--- VII, xvii
                                       --- History, 288
--- LXVI, 83
                                       --- Wand, xxviii
                                INDEX
Magick in Theory and Practice, 20, Medici, Catherine de,
105
     211, 219, 266, 373; genesis, 180 Medicine Man, 34
Magician, 66, 368
                                    Meinhold, 338
Magus, Magi, 46, 65, 238, 319 Mein Kampf, 331
Maha Brahma, 135
                                    Melander's Millions,
```

185

Mahaparinibbana Sutta, 52 351	Melcarth, xviii, 22,
Mahasatipathana, 41, 58, 155	Mendez, Goat of, 35
Mahatmas, xxix	Mercury, xix, xxvi, 98
Maitland, Edward, 41	Meru, 163
Malaria, 366	Messiach, 210
Maliel, 57	Messiah, 42, 210
Malkuth, xx, 166, 195	Michelet, 352
Manas, xxii, 127, 192	Mikado, 347
Mandrake, 65	Milinda, Questions of
King, 135	
Manifesto (of O.T.O.), 70	Mill, John Stuart, 222
Mansoul, 41	Minerval, xxvii
Mantra, 73	Ministry of Fear, 210
Mantra Yoga, 311	Minutum Mundum, 97
Manu, 222	Mirabeau, 61
Maremma, 93	Mithras, xviii, 22,
351	
Marie Antoinette, 168	Mohammed, 6, 289, 351
Marlow, Louis, 334	Mohammedan Orders, xiv
Mars, xx, 352	Molinos, 130
Marsyas, 351	Money, xv, 251, 252,
253 Martial, 83	Monist, Monism, 21,
22, 23	MOHISC, MOHISM, ZI,
Marx, Karl, 30, 343	Mont Cervin, 352
Marxism, 35	Monte Carlo, 187
Mary, blasphemy against Babalon,	Monte Silvio, 352
66; Inviolate, 82	Montgomery, General,
117	nenegemer, ceneral,
Mary, Queen of Scots, 168	Moon, salutation, 92;
Vision,	,
Masoch, Sacher, 83	90; Tarot Card,
xx	
Mason, xv	Mor^t, 237
Masonry, xi	Morningstar, Otto, 272
Mass (Christian), 39	Morte d'Arthur, 338
Master, (opposed to Slave), 217	Moses, 52, 127
of the Temple, xvii, 46,	Moslem, 37
64, 66, 88, 89, 141, 142,	Motte Fouqu,, de la,
338	
148, 208, 228, 229, 319,	Motto, xviii
343, 379	Mozart, 256
Masters, xxi, 243, 244, 245, 259,	M•ller, Max, 158
345, 346, 347, 348, 350,	Munich, 183
351, 356	Music Halls,
described, 199	
Who are not magicians, 99	Musset, Alfred de, 83
"Hidden", xxix	Mussolini, 347

Masturbation, 194 Masucci, 83 path, 193	Mystic, 26, 89 danger of the
Mathematics, 330 Matriarchy, 216	Mysticism, xi, 39, 87
Matterhorn, 352 Maya, 22	N
Means (does it justify the end?), 221, 225	Nagasena, Arahat, 135 Naples, 255 D E X
Naples Arrangement, 20 Napoleon (Bonaparte) 8, 30, 104, 239 sexual inter-	Ommeya, xxix Onanism, opposed to
259, 352 Nats, 197 xvi, xvii, xxiv	course, 193 One Star in Sight,
Nazi (School), 35; party, 289 Nechesch, Serpent, 210 Necromancy, 289	70, 322 Ontology, 126 Ophidian Vibrations,
Nelson, 352 Philips, 187	Oppenheimer, E.
Nemo, 66 Nemyss, 109 Neophyte, xxi, 64, 70, 231, 323 Monkhood, xiv	Opus Lutetianum, 212 Oradour-sur-Glane, 218 Orders, Christian,
ceremony of Golden Dawn, 280 Nephesch, 127, 166, 222, 223, 224	Hindu, xiv Mohammedan,
xiv Nerciat, Andr, de, 83 Neroda-Sammapatti, 23, 159 Neschamah, 103, 113, 127, 135, 136, 142, 155, 172, 192,	A.'.A.'. xiv Orgasm (s), 78, 152 Ormzd, 21 Osiris, xviii, xxii,
xxiii, 21, 212, 222, 223, 224, 330	36, 59, 174, 175,
319, 344, Neschamic, 63, 142	347, 351; in
Amennti, xxiii Nettles (boyhood exper.), 260 Neuberg, 231, 232 New Aeon, 180	Aeon of, 250 Othello, 120 O.T.O., xi, xii, xv,
xvi, xvii, Newman, Cardinal, 338	xxi, xxiii, 47,
124, 125, Newman, John Henry, 298 322	203, 217, 300,
New Orleans, xx, 48 of, xii	Grand Treasurer
Newton's Third Law of Motion, 211	Rituals, xxiii,
New York Times, 299 sqq.	System of, 70
New York World, 180 Nibbana, 11, 33, 52 Neitzsche, Friedrich, 16, 36, 316	Ottilia (vision), 90 Ouarda, 234, 345 Ouspensky, 55

Prophet of Thelema, 217 Owen, Professor, 299 Nihilist, 21 Nineveh, Burden of, 177 Nirmanakaya, 51 Nirvana, 33, 51, 52, 111 Noah, 29 Paccheka-Budhha, 167 Nominalists, 56 Padmasana, 122 Northcliffe, Lord, 104 Paganism, 38 Nostradamus, 117 Pairs of Opposites, 21 Nous, 127 Pan, 287 Nu, Nuit, 62, 142, 165, 169, Pantheism, 36, 39 172, 222, 238 Parabrahm, 34 Nymph, 197 Paramahamsa, 148 Parananda, Shri, 157 Parinibbana, 52 0 Paris Working, 212 Parsimony, Law of, 265 Oath (of Abyss), 244 Partouse, 355 66 Occult (Sciences), 126 Passover, 67 O.H.O. = Outer Head of O.T.O., xxi Pasteur, 366 Olcott, Colonel, 224 Pastos, 62 Olympus, 163 Patanjali, 157 INDEX Path of Ayin, 18 Purana, 157 Path of Gimel, 222 Purusha, 127, 192 Path of Samekh, 18 Pylon, 67, 68 Patriarchy, 216 Pymander, Divine, 139 Paul, Saint, 222, 305, 327 Pyramid (s), 64, 67, 68, 189, 287; Peer Gynt, 249 City of, 214; Ritual of, 214 Pentagram, 18, 63, 286 Pyramis, xviii, xix, Pentagram Ritual, xxiii Pythagoras, 31 Perdurabo, xxiii, 49, 84, 121, 181, 184 Persian, 48 Q Petronius Arbiter, 83, 338 Petuchio, 146 Qabalah, xi, xix, xx, xxiii, xxvi, xxvii, 13, 14, Phallos, xx 17, 57, 58, 66, Phallus, xix, 119 87, 90, 120, 121, 150, 155, Phidias, 256 160, 166, 219,

222, 226, 291, 309,

Phoenicians, xxiii 323, 339, 351, 356, 361 Phren, 127 --- Arabic, xxi, 219 --- Greek, 219 Phryne, 33 Picasso, 62 Qabalistic Zero, 153, 192 Oedemel, 196 Pickwickianism, 31 Plato, 30, 159, 222, 286 Qliphoth, 116, 117, 166 Platonic concepts, 160 Qoph, xx Plymouth Brethren, 94, 260 Queen Scale, 57, 98 Poe, Edgar Allen, 361 Quincey, 361 Poincar,, Henrie, 42, 378 Point Event, 11, 14, 155, 173 Poirot, 142 R Poland, 102 Politics, 259 Rabelais, Francois, 83, 113, 138 Raffles, 224 Polymnia, 287 Pope, 275 Ra Hoor, xv Posilippo, 235 Ra Hoor Khuit, 79 Possessed, The, 35 Rajas, xix "Potted Sex Appeal," 120 Raleigh, 352 Poulain, Father, S.J., 120 Rameses I, 189 Prana, 115 Raphael, 104 Pranayama, 121, 122, 152 Rats (story Le Poule aux), 363 Praxiteles, 204 Ratziel, Archangel, 196 Price, Harry, 303 Reformation, 39 Priestess, The, 222 Re-incarnamtion, xxviii, 168 Prince, 98 Religion, 358, 361, 362 Princess Scale, 98 Religious Experience, 23 Probation, xxii Remus, 352 Probationer, 109, 231, 322 Renaissance, 344, 346 Propitiation, 39 Reuss, Dr. Theodor, xxi, 71, 124 Protestant Mysticism, 39 Rhys-Davids, 158, 283 Protestants, 39 Riddle of the Universe, The, 21, Psyche, 127 22, 26 Psychoanalysis, 281 Riemann, 141 Psychology of Hashish, 359 Riemann-Christoffel, 179 Ptolemy, 101 Right-Hand Path, 60

## INDEX

Rig-Veda, 127 Sand, Georges, 83 Robbery, breach of Thelema, 224 Sangha, 157 Robin Hood, 224 Sankhara (tendency), 58, 168, 359 Rodney, 352 Sankhya, 157 Rome, 235; Church of, 275 Sanna (perception), 58, 359 Romulus, 352 Sannyasi, 242, 255 R"ntgen, Professor, 4, 218 Sanskrit, 307, 310 Rosebery, Lord, 352 Santa Barbara, 180 Rosencreutz, Christian, 62, 338 Sat, 92
Rosetta Stone, Equinox to be, 346 Satan, 65, 94, 179, 233 Rosetti, 153 Sattvas, xix Rosicrucians, xxi, 42, 55, 108, 284 Saturn, 90, 91, 233 Rosicrucian system, 243; custom, 278 Saviour, 243 Rosicrucianism, 40 Saul, King, 116, 176 Ross, 366 Scarlet Pimpernel, 224 Rosy Cross, 109, 155 Scarlet Woman, 216 Scented Garden of the Rotterdam, 218 Sheikh Rousseau, 313 Nefzawi, 83 RR et AC, 47, 343 Schopehauer, 35, 36, 169 Ruach, xxi, 77, 101, 115, 116, 118, Science, method of, 10, 85, 151 135, 136, 140, 166, 192, 195 Scipio, 93 212, 221, 330 Scott, Sir Walter, 260 Rupert of Hentzau, 185 Scylla, 151, 338 Sebek, 90 Russell, Bertrand, xxviii, 42, 51, 57, 129, 266, 344 Secret Chiefs, 231, 233, 234, 237, Russia, 116, 368 239, 324 Seele, 127 Ruysbroek, 130 Sepher Sephiroth, 18, 19, 91 Sephira, 229; Sephiroth, 166 Set, 21, 179, 311 Sex, 358, 360, 361 Sacrament, 45 Sex and Character, 173 Sexual Intercourse and Sade, Marguis de, 83 Onanism, 193 Sagittarius, 18 Shaivite, 157 Sahara, 158 Shakespeare, 168 Saint Augustine, 359 Shaman, 116 Saint Elmo's Fire, 299 Shavasana, 283 Saint Germain, Comte de, 120 Shaw, George Bernard, 179, 256, 366 Saint John, 133 Sheikh of Mish, 317 Shelley, 153 Saint Moritz, 233, 234 Saint Peter's in Rome, 226 Shiva, 153 Saint Teresa, 359 Shivadarshana, 23, 62 Salamander, 375 Shri Parananda, 157 Siberia, 116, 135 Salt, xix

Salvation Army, 34 Sibylline Books, 206 Samadhi, 23, 79, 121, 193, 281, 283 Sicily, 123 Siddhi, 165, 290 Samekh, 18 Sammasati, 129, 130, 131, 191, 198, Sierras (Spain), 158 232, 245, 372 Simpson, Mrs., 117 Samuel, 116 Skeat, xxvii, 119, 127, 132, 134 San Luis Potosi, story of confidence 146, 191, 313 trick, 306 Skooshocks, 167 INDEX Sludge, Mr., the Medium, 117, 144, Т 177 68 Socialism, 334, 336 Tahuti, xv, xxvi, 81, 352 Socialists, 348, 349, 366 Talisman (s), xxii, 71, 98, 178, 226, 286, 287 Society for Psych. Research, 239 Tamas, xix Socrates, 193, 352 Tantras, 34, 157 Solar System, xxiii Soldier and the Hunchback, 21, 129, Tao, 25, 88, 135, 136, 149, 155, 156, 229, 286, 139, 381 287 Solomon, xxvii, 36 Taoism, 31 --- The King, Greater and Taoist doctrine; sectaries, 11; Lesser Keys, 98, 379 aspect, 148, 149, 154 Solon, 222 Tao Teh King, 231, 41, 121, 153 154, 157, 158, Soviets, 336 160, 161, 166 Spain, walk through, 252, 253 Taphthartharath, xvi, xxvi Spedalieri, Baron, xii Tarot, 97, 98, 109 Spelling Bee, 331, 332 Tarquin, 206 Spencer, Herbert, 14 Tat, 92, 153 Sphinx, 73, 109; Four Powers of, Tau, path of, xxii 155; fully explained, 255 Tau Cross, xxii, 109 Spinoza, 36 Tcheka, 345 Spinthria, 355 Teh, 172 Spiritist, Spiritism, 115, 117, 176 Telekinesis, 239 Stalag, 218 Telepylus, 180 Stalin, 224, 259, 336 Telesmata, 97 Star, The, 222 Templar (position),

283

Steiner, Rudolph, xvii St,1, of Revealing, 108, 179, 2 Stern, 83 Sterne, Laurence, 342 324, 335	Temurah, 19 Temurah Thash Raq, 119 Tengyueh, 140, 299 Tennyson, Alfred Lord,
Stingaree, 224 Stoker, Bram, 298 341	Termite, 352, 355, 365 Tests, magical, 340,
Straus, Ralph, 334 27, 77, 222,	Tetragrammaton, xxvi,
Succubi, 300 Sufis, 39, 157, 159 Yin, 26	255 Thai Yang, 26; Thai
Sukshma-Khumbakam, 121 Sullivan, J.W.N., 193, 355 Sulphur, xix	Thebes, 189 Theism, 27 Thelema, Law of, 43,
44, 174, 221, Sun, Spirit of the, xvi	316
Sunday, Billy, 34 Supernal Triad, 62, 115, 140, 1	Theognis, 338 66, Theoricus, 323
195, 197, 211 Swami, 204	Theurgy, 38 Thomas, J.H., 345
Swastika, 289 342	Thomson, James, 111,
Swift, 83 Swinburne, Algernon, 6, 300	Thor, Hammer of, 289 Thora, 91
Sword, 109 326, 352	Thoth, xvi, xxvi, 307,
Sword of Song, 24 Dhamma, 283	Three Baskets of the
Diamina, 203	Tibet, 91, 221 Tiger, 149
108, 195	Tiphareth, 18, 57, 78,
	212, 222, 229 I N D E X
Titanic, 102 Titian, 256	Vatican, 42 Veda, Vedas, 34, 130,
157, 243 Tohu Bohu, 119	Vedana (sensation), 58
Tom Jones, 184 Tories, 349	Vedanta, 157 Vedantism, Vedantists,
36, 39, 135 Totalitarianism, 250	Venus, 196, 197
69	
Trance, 23 Masoch), 83	Venus in Furs (Sacher
Trance of Wonder, 130	Vergil, 47, 116

Transits, 101 356	Victoria, Queen, 115,
Transmutations, 123	Victorian Period, 367
Tree of Life, xxiv, 16, 57, 76,	Vinci, Leonardo da, 2
291	Vinnanam, 359
Treves, Sir Frederic, 335, 336	Virakam, Soror, 122,
226, 233-236	, , , ,
Trimurti, 192	Vishnu, 22
Trinc, 113	Vishvarupadarshana,
22, 101	
Tripitika, 34, 283	Vision and The Voice,
xiv, 59, 61,	
Trismegistus, Hermes, 140	63, 65, 120, 229,
230, 287,	
Trotsky, Leon, 243, 244	339, 373;
quotations, 63-69	77 <sup>1</sup> to 1 Florida 200
True Will, xv, 77, 80, 95, 96, 154,	
175, 221, 250, 263, 288, 289, 318, 373,	Vivekananda, 157, 201,
313, 319, 337, 348, 350, 358	380
Trusts, 348	Vladivostok, 288
Truth, of All Truth, 140, 141,	Volga Famine, Duranty
story, 362	verga ramine, paramer
142, 330	
Tsar, 116	
Twain, Mark, 336	W
Tyndall, 4	
Typhon, 63	Waite, A. E., 201
	Wand, 109
	Wanderjahre, 278
Ü	War of the Roses, 168
232, 237	Ward, Kenneth, 231,
U.B., 55	Warren, 283
Udgitha, 192	Waterloo, 352
Unicursal Hexagram, 109	Weiniger, 35, 173
Universe, Force of the, xviii	Wells, H.G., 146, 202,
302, 333	, , , ,
Riddle of the, xiv, xix, 10	Werewolves, 123, 300
Upanishads, 22, 34, 130, 157, 158	Wesley, John, 76
U.S.W. = German, und so weiter = and	
so forth, 265	Whisky anecdote, 273,
274	**1 '
Ut, 132, 192	White School of
Magick, 29 sqq. Utopia, 367	22 ~~~ 40
Utopia mongers, 367	33 sqq., 40 Whitehall, 75
ocopia mongers, so,	Whitehead, 42, 55
	Wilde, Oscar, 104, 201
V	Willett, 146
	Wilson, Woodrow, 104
Valhalla, 37	Wolfe, Jane, 284
ValliŠre, Louise de la, 120	Wonder, Trance of, 284
Vamacharya Schools, 34	Wren, 19
Vampirism, 249	
Vannus Iacchi, 245	

Y

Yang, xix, 26 Yechidah, 4, 127, 172, 212, 222 Yellow School of Magick, 29 sqq. 33 Yesod, xx, 18 Ygdrasil, 66 Yi King, xi, xx, 26, 88, 270;

70

Z

Zancig, 176, 177
Zelator, xxi
Zeno, 31
Zermatt, 352
Zero, 85, 250
Zeugnis der Suchenden, 217
Zeus, 193, 311, 352
Zola, 203, 247, 248
Zoroaster, 36, 38, 290
Z•rich, 233

BOOKS QUOTED OR REFERRED TO

Raphael's Shilling Handbook on Astrology 104 Barley's 101 "Notable Nativities" 104

```
"More Nativities"
104
City of Dreadful Night, James Thomson
111
Sir Palamede The Saracen, Equinox I, 4
Dogme et Rituel de la Haute Magie, L, vi
115
I Write as I Please, Walter Duranty
17, 116, 362
Mr. Sludge the Medium, Robert Browning
117, 144, 177
Lost Horizon, James Hilton
Diary of a Drug Fiend, Aleister Crowley
154, 229
Bhagavad Gita
157
Sex and Character, Weiniger
173
Tom Jones, Fielding
184
Rupert of Hentzau
185
John Chilcote, M.P.
185
Melander's Millions
Contes Cruels, Barbey d'Aureville
193
Holy Deadlock, A.P.Herbert
201
J'Accuse, Zola
203
Cloud on the Sanctuary, Equinox I, 1
Ministry of Fear, Grahame Greene
210
Hitler Speaks, Herman Rauschning
217
Armadale, Wilkie Collins
Spirit of Solitude, "Confessions", Crowley
231
La Terre, Emile Zola
247
Brave New World, Aldous Huxley
```

248