# **Magic without Tears**

By Aleister Crowey

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

1

#### MAGICK WITHOUT TEARS

2

Complete and Unabridged, edited with a Foreword by Karl J. Germer  $\,$ 

2

(c) 1954 Karl J. Germer for Ordo Templi Orientis

Renewed 1982

(c) BLURB

Ordo Templi Orientis

JAF Box 7666

New York, NY 10116 USA

3

### FOREWORD

In 1943 Aleister Crowley met a lady who, having heard of his wide  $\,$ 

knowledge and experience, asked his advice on occult, spiritual, and practical matters.

This chance connection resulted in a stimulating exchange of letters.

Crowley then asked others to put similar questions to  $\mathop{\text{him}}\nolimits.$  The result

was this collection of over eighty letters which are now being issued  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

over the title that he chose, "MAGICK WITHOUT TEARS".

Crowley did not keep copies of his early letters to the above-mentioned

lady, so was unable to include them in the collection that he planned

to publish. Fortunately they have been preserved and are now included  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

in the introduction to this book. Their original form has been retained

with the opening and closing formulae which Crowley used in all his letters.

Crowley at first intended to call the book "ALEISTER EXPLAINS EVERYTHING",

and sent the following circular to his friends and disciples asking them  $\,$ 

to suggest subjects for inclusion.

#### ALEISTER EXPLAINS EVERYTHING.

"Much gratified was the author of THE BOOK OF THOTH to have so

many letters of appreciation, mostly from women, thanking  $\lim_{n \to \infty} f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \, dx$ 

not 'putting it in unintelligible language', for 'making it all

so clear that even  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$  with  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  limited intelligence can understand

it, or think I do.'

"Nevertheless and notwithstanding! For many years the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Master}}$ 

Therion has felt acutely the need of some groundwork-teaching

suited to those who have only just begun the study of Magick and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

its subsidiary sciences, or are merely curious about it, or interested in it with intent to study. Always he has done his

utmost to make his meaning clear to the average intelligent edu-

cated person, but even those who understand  $\mbox{him perfectly}$  and are

most sympathetic to his work, agree that in this respect he has

often failed.

"So much for the diagnosis --- now for the remedy!

"One genius, inspired of the gods, suggested recently that the  $\,$ 

riddle might be solved somewhat on the old and well-tried lines

of 'Dr. Brewer's Guide to Science'; i.e., by having aspirants

write to the Master asking questions, the kind of problem that

naturally comes into the mind of any sensible enquirer, and getting

his answer in the form of a letter. 'What is it?' 'Why should I bother my head about it?' 'What are it's principles?' 'What use is it?' 'How do I begin?', and the like.

"This plan has been put into action; the idea has been to cover

the subjects from every possible angle. The style has been  $\operatorname{collo}$ -

quiel and fluent; technical terms have either been carefully

avoided or most carefully explained; and the letter has not been

4

admitted to the series until the querent has expressed satisfaction.

Some seventy letters, up to the present have been written, but  $\operatorname{still}$ 

there seem to be certain gaps in the demonstration, like those white

patches on the map of the World, which looked so tempting fifty years ago.

"This memorandum is to ask for your collaboration and support.  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{A}}$ 

list, indicating briefly the subject of each letter already written,

is appended. Should you think that any of those will help you in

your own problems, a typed copy will be sent to you at once  $\dots$ 

Should you want to know anything outside the scope, send in your  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

question (stated as fully and clearly as possible)  $\dots$  The answer

should reach you, bar accidents, in less than a month  $\dots$  It is

proposed ultimately to issue the series in book form."

This has now been done.

Karl J. Germer
Frater Saturnus Xø
Frater Superior, O.T.O.

January, 1954 e.v. Hampton, N.J.

5

## I N T R O D U C T I O N

## LETTERS WRITTEN BY MASTER THERION TO A STUDENT

Letter No. A

March 19, 1943

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law

I was very glad to gather from your conversation yesterday afternoon that  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

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

you have a serious intention of taking up the Great Work in the proper

spirit. Your criticisms of previous experience in the course of your ad-

ventures appeared to be singularly sane and just. As I promised I am

writing this letter to cover a few practical points which we had not time

to discuss and which in any case I think it better to arrange by correspondence.

1) It is of the first importance that you should understand my personal

position. It is not actually wrong to regard me as a teacher, but it

is certainly liable to mislead; fellow-student, or, if you like, fellow-

sufferer, seems a more appropriate definition.

The climax of my life was what is known as the Cairo Working, described in

the minutest detail in the Equinox of the Gods. At that time most of The

Book of the Law was completely unintelligible to me, and a  $\operatorname{\mathsf{good}}$  deal of it

- especially the third chapter - extremely antipathetic. I fought against

this book for years; but it proved irresistible.

I do not think I am boasting unfairly when I say that  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  personal researches

have been of the greatest value and importance to the study of the subject

of Magick and Mysticism in general, especially my integration of the vari-

ous thought-systems of the world, notably the identification of the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{system}}$ 

of the Yi King with that of the Qabalah. But I do assure you that the whole  $\,$ 

of my life's work, were it multiplied a thousand fold, would not be worth

one tithe of the value of a single verse of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{The}}$  Book of the Law.

I think you should have a copy of the Equinox of the  $\operatorname{\mathsf{Gods}}$  and  $\operatorname{\mathsf{make}}$  The

Book of the Law your constant study. Such value as  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  own work  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{may}}$  possess

for you should amount to no more than an aid to the interpretation of this book.

2) It may be that later on you will want a copy of Eight Lectures on Yoga

so I am putting a copy aside for you in case you should want it.

3) With regard to the O.T.O., I believe I can find you a typescript of

all the official documents. If so, I will let you have them to read,

and you can make up your mind as to whether you wish to affiliate to the

Third Degree of the Order. I should consequently, in the case of your de-

ciding to affiliate, go with you though the script of the Rituals and ex-

plain the meaning of the whole thing; communicating, in addition, the real

secret and significant knowledge of which ordinary Masonry is not possessed

4) The horoscope; I do not like doing these at all, but it is part of the

agreement with the Grand Treasurer of the 0.T.O. that I should under-  $\,$ 

take them in worthy cases, if pressed. But I prefer to keep the figure to

myself for future reference, in case any significant event makes consulta-  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

tion desirable.

б

Now there is one really important matter. The only thing besides  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{The}}$  Book

of the Law which is in the forefront of the battle. As I told you yester-  $\,$ 

day, the first essential is the dedication of all that one is and all that  $\ensuremath{\text{c}}$ 

one has to the Great Work, without reservation of any sort. This must be

kept constantly in mind; the way to do this is to practice Liber Resh vel

Helios, sub figura CC, pp. 425-426 - Magick. There is another version

of these Adorations, slightly fuller; but those in the text are quite al-

right. The important thing is not to forget. I shall have to teach you  $\,$ 

the signs and gestures which go with the words.

It is also desirable before beginning a formal meal to go through the fol-

lowing dialogue: Knock 3-5-3: say, "Do what thou wilt shall be the whole

of the Law." The person at the other end of the table replies: "What is thy Will?" You: "It is my Will to eat and drink." He: "To what end?" You: "That my body may be fortified thereby." He: "To what end?" You: "That I may accomplish the Great Work." He: "Love is the law, love under will." You, with a single knock: "Fall to." When alone make a monologue of it: thus, Knock 3-5-3. Do what, etc. It is my Will to, etc., that my body, etc., that I may, etc., Love is, etc. Knock: and begin to eat. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of performing these small ceremonies regularly, and being as nearly accurate as possible with regard to the times. You must not mind stopping in the middle of a crowded thoroughfare --- lorries or no lorries --- and saying the Adorations; and you must not mind snubbing your quest --- or your host --- if he or she should prove norant of his or her share of the dialogue. It is perhaps because these matters are so petty and trivial in appearance that they afford so excellent a training. They teach you concentration, mindfulness, moral and social courage, and a host of other virtues. Like a perfect lady, I have kept the tit bit to the last. It is absolutely essential to begin a magical diary, and keep it up daily. You begin by an account of your life, going back even before your birth to your ancestry. In conformity with the practice which you may perhaps choose to adopt later, given in Liber Thisarb, sub figura CMXIII, paragraphs 27-28, Magick, pp. 420-422, you must find an answer to the question: "How did I come to be in this place at this time, engaged in this particular work?" As you will see from the book, this will start you on the discovery of who you really are, and eventually lead you to your recovering the memory of previous incarnations.

As it is difficult for you to come to Town except at rare and irregular  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

intervals, may I suggest a plan which has previously proved very useful,

and that is a weekly letter. Eliphas L,vi did this with the Baron Spedalieri,

and the correspondence is one of the most interesting of his works. you

ask such questions as you wish to have answered, and  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$  answer them to the

best of my ability. I, of course, add spontaneous remarks which may be

elicited by my observations on your progress and the perusal of your magi-

cal diary. This, of course, should be written on one side of the paper

only, so that the opposite page is free for comments, and an arrangement

should be made for it to be inspected at regular intervals.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

7

666

Letter No. B

April 20, 1943

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law

I was very glad to have your letter, and am very sorry to hear that you

have been in affliction. About the delay, however, I think I ought to tell

you that the original Rule of the Order of A.'. A.'. was that the introducer  $\,$ 

read over a short lection to the applicant, then left him alone for a quar-

ter of an hour, and on coming back received a "yes" or "no." If there was

any hesitation about it the applicant was barred for life.

The reason for the relaxation of the rule was that it was thought better

to help people along in the early stages of the work, even if there was no hope of their turning out first-class. But I should like you to realize that sooner or later, whether in this incarnation or another, it is put up to you to show perfect courage in face of the completely unknown, and the power of rapid and irrevocable decision without without counting the cost. I think that it is altogether wrong to allow yourself to be worried by "psychological, moral, and artistic problems." It is no good your starting anything of any kind unless you can see clearly into the simplicity of truth. All this humming and hawing about things is moral poison. What is the use of being a woman if you have not got an intuition, an instinct enabling you to distinguish between the genuine and the sham? Your state of mind suggests to me that you must have been, in the past, under the influence of people who were always talking about things, and never doing any real work. They kept on arguing all sorts of obscure philosophical points; that is all very well, but when you have succeeded in analyzing your reactions you will understand that all this talk is just an excuse for not doing any serious work. I am confirmed in this judgment by your saying: "I don't know if I want to enter into a great conflict. I need peace." Fortunately you save yourself by adding: "Real peace, that is living and not stagnant." All life is conflict. Every breath that you draw represents a victory in the struggle of the whole Universe. You can't have peace without perfect mastery of circumstance; and I take it that this is what you mean by "living, not stagnant." But it is of the first consequence for you to summon up the resolution to stamp on this sea of swirling thoughts by an act of will; you must say:

"Peace be still." The moment you have understood these

they are, tools of the enemy, invented by him with the idea

thoughts for what

of preventing

you from undertaking the Great Work --- the moment you dismiss all such considerations firmly and decisively, and say: "What must I do?" and having discovered that, set to work to do it, allowing of no interruption, you will find that living peace which (as you seem to see) is a dynamic and not a static condition. (There is quite a lot about this point in Little Essays Toward Truth, and also in The Vision and the Voice.)

Your postscript made me smile. It is not a very good advertisement for the

8

kind of people with whom you have been associated in the past. My own position is a very simple one. I obeyed the injunction to "buy a perfectly black hen, without haggling." I have spent over 100,000

pounds of my in-

herited money on this work: and if I had a thousand times that amount to-  $\,$ 

day it would all go in the same direction. It is only when one is built  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

in this way, to stand entirely aloof from all considerations of two pence  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

halfpenny more or fourpence halfpenny less, that one obtains perfect free-  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

dom on this Plane of Discs.

All the serious Orders of the world, or nearly all, begin by insisting that

the aspirant should take a vow of poverty; a Buddhist Bhikku, for example,

can own only nine objects - his three robes, begging bowl, a fan, tooth-

brush, and so on. The  $\operatorname{\text{\bf Hindu}}$  and  $\operatorname{\text{\bf Mohammedan}}$  Orders have similar regulations;

and so do all the important Orders of monkhood in Christianity.

Our own Order is the only exception of importance; and the reason for this  $\frac{1}{2}$ 

is that it is much more difficult to retain one's purity if one is living

in the world than if one simply cuts oneself off from it. It is far easier

to achieve technical attainments if one is unhampered by any such considera-

tions. These regulations operate as restrictions to one's usefulness in  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,2,3,\ldots \right\}$ 

helping the world. There are terrible dangers, the worst dangers of all,

associated with complete retirement. In my own personal judgment, moreover,

I think that our own ideal of a natural life is much more wholesome.

When you have found out a little about your past incarnations, you should

be able to understand this very clearly and simply.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

Letter No. C

April 30, 1943

Cara Soror,

Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law

Thank you for your long letter of no date, but received two days ago. I am

very sorry you are still feeling exhausted. I am not too good myself, for  $\,$ 

I find this weather very trying. I will answer your various points as best  $\bar{\phantom{a}}$ 

I can.

I am arranging to send you the official papers connected with the 0.T.O., but

the idea that you should meet other members first is quite impossible. Even

after affiliation, you would not meet anyone unless it were necessary for

you to work in cooperation with them. I am afraid you have still got the  $\,$ 

idea that the Great Work is a tea-party. Contact with other students only

means that you criticize their hats, and then their morals; and I am not

going to encourage this. Your work is not anybody else's; and undirected

chatter is the worst poisonous element in human society.

When you talk of the "actual record" of the "Being called Jesus Christ,"  ${\tt I}$ 

don't know what you mean. I am not aware of the existence of any such re-  $\,$ 

cord. I know a great many legends, mostly borrowed from previous legends of a similar character.

9

It would be better for you to get a copy of the Equinox of the Gods and

study it. The Great Work is the uniting of opposites. It may mean the  $\,$ 

uniting of the soul with  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{God}},$  of the microcosm with the macrocosm, of the

female with the male, of the ego with the non-ego  $\operatorname{---}$  or what not.

By "love under will" one refers to the fact that the method in every case  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) ^{2}$ 

is love, by which is meant the uniting of opposites as above stated, such

as hydrogen and chlorine, sodium and oxygen, and so on. Any reaction what-

ever, any phenomenon, is a phenomenon of "love", as you will understand

when I come to explain to you the meaning of the word "point-event". But

love has to be "under will," if it is to be properly directed. You must

find your True Will, and make all your actions subservient to the one great purpose.

Rahoor is the Sun God; Tahuti is the Egyptian Mercury; Kephra is the Sun at midnight.

About your problems; what I have to do is to try to teach you to think

clearly. You will be immensely stimulated by having all the useless  $\operatorname{trim-}$ 

mings stripped from your thinking apparatus. For instance, I don't think

you know the first principles of logic. You apparently take up a more or

less Christian attitude, but at the same time you like very much the idea  $\,$ 

of Karma. You cannot have both.

The question about money does not arise. This old and very good rule (which

I have always kept) was really pertinent to the time when there were  $\operatorname{actual}$ 

secrets. But I have published openly all the secrets. All I can do is to

train you in a perfectly exoteric way. My suggestion about the weekly

letter was intended to exclude this question, as you would be getting  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{full}}$ 

commercial value for anything paid.

Your questions about the Spirit of the Sun, and so on, are to be answered

by experience. Intellectual satisfaction is worthless. I have to bring

you to a state of mind completely superior to the mechanism of the normal  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{mind}}\xspace.$ 

A good deal of your letter is rather difficult to answer. You always seem  $\,$ 

to want to put the cart before the horse. Don't you see that, if I were

trying to get you to do something or other, I should simply return you to

the kind of answer which I thought would satisfy you, and make you happy?

And this would be very easy to do because you have got no clear ideas a-

bout anything. For one thing, you keep on using terms about whose signifi-

cance we are not yet in agreement. When you talk about the "Christian

path," do you believe in vicarious atonement and eternal damnation  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  or

don't you? A great deal of the confusion that arises in all these ques-  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,n\right\}$ 

tions, and grows constantly worse as fellow-students talk them over --- the  $\,$ 

blind leading the blind --- is because they have no idea of the necessity

of defining their terms.

Then again, you ask me questions like "What is purity?" that can be an-

swered in a dozen different ways; and you must understand what is meant  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{w}}$ 

by a "universe of discourse." If you asked me --- "Is this sample of clo-

ride of gold a pure sample?" I can answer you. You must understand the

value of precision in speech. I could go on rambling about purity and

selflessness for years, and no one would be a penny the better.

P.S. --- or rather, I did not want to dictate this bit. --- Your ideas about

the O.T.O. remind me of some women's idea of shopping. You want to  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) ^{2}$ 

10

maul about the stock and then walk out with a proud glad smile: NO. Do you really think that I should muster all the most distinguished people  $\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \int_{$ 

The affiliation clause in our Constitution is a privilege: a

courtesy to a sympathetic body. Were you not a Mason, or Co-Mason, you

would have to be proposed and seconded, and then examined by savage Inquisitors; and

then --- probably --- thrown out on to the garbage heap. Well, no, it's not

as bad as that; but we certainly don't want anybody who chooses to apply.

Would you do it yourself, if you were on the Committee of a Club? The

 $\ensuremath{\text{O.T.O.}}$  is a serious body, engaged on a work of Cosmic scope. You should

question yourself: what can I contribute?

alive for your inspection and approval?

Secrets. There is one exception to what I have said about publishing

everything: that is, the ultimate secret of the O.T.O. This is really

too dangerous to disclose; but the safeguard is that you could not use

it if you knew it, unless you were an advanced Adept; and you would not

be allowed to go so far unless we were satisfied that you were sincerely  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

devoted to the Great Work. (See One Star in Sight). True, the  $\mbox{{\tt Black}}$ 

Brothers could use it; but they would only destroy themselves.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

Letter No. D

June

8, 1943

Cara Soror,

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

Thanks for your letter. I couldn't find the O.T.O. typescript --- and then

it struck me that it would be useful to await your reactions. If I were

expecting some presumably important papers by post, I should get anxious  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

after 24 hours delay (at most) and start enquiries. Anyhow, I can't find

them for the moment; but Mr. Bryant said he would lend you his Blue

Equinox: pages 195-270 give what you require.

But the real point of your affiliating is that it saves me from constantly

being on  $\operatorname{my}$  guard lest I should mention something which I am sworn not to

reveal. As in every serious society, members are pledged not to disclose

what they may have learnt, whom they have met; it is so, even in Co-Mason-

ry: isn't it: But one may mention the names of members who have died. (See

Liber LII, par. 2.) Be happy then; the late X... Y... was one of us.

I hope that he and Rudolph Steiner will (between them) satisfy your doubts.

The A.'.A.'. is totally different. One Star in Sight tells you every-

thing that you need to know. (Perhaps some of these regulations are hard

to grasp: personally, I can never understand all this By-Law stuff. So  $\,$ 

you must ask me what, and why, and so on.)

There is really only one point for your judgment. "By their fruits ye

shall know them." You have read Liber LXV and Liber VII; That shows you

11

what states you can attain by this cirriculum. Now read "A Master of the

Temple" (Blue Equinox, pp. 127-170) for an account of the early stages of training, and their results. (Of course, your path might not coincide with, or even resemble, his path.) But do get it into you head that "If the blind lead the blind, they shall both fall into the ditch." If you had seen 1% of the mischief that I have seen, you would freeze to the marrow of your bones at the mere idea of seeing another member through the telescope! Well, I employ the figure of hyperbole, that I admit; but it really won't do to have a dozen cooks at the broth! If you're working with me, you'll have no time to waste on other people. I fear your "Christianity" is like that of most other folk. You pick out one or two of the figures from which the Alexandrines concocted "Jesus" (too many cooks, again, with a vengeance!) and neglect the others. The Zionist Christ of Matthew can have no value for you; nor can the Asiatic "Dying-God" --- compiled from Melcarth, Mithras, Adonis, Bacchus, Osiris, Attis, Krishna, and others --- who supplied the miraculous and ritualistic elements of the fable. Rightly you ask: "What can I contribute?" Answer: One Book. That is the idea of the weekly letter: 52 of yours and 52 of mine, competently edited, would make a most useful volume. This would be your property: so that you get full material value, perhaps much more, for your outlay. I thought of the plan because one such arrangement has recently come to an end, with amazingly happy results: they should lie open to your admiring gaze in a few months from now. Incidentally, I personally get nothing out of it; secretarial work costs money these days. But there is another great advantage; it keeps both of us up to the mark. Also, in such letters a great deal of odds and ends of knowledge turn up automatically; valuable stuff, frequent enough; yes, but one doesn't want to lose the thread, once one starts. Possibly ten days might be best.

But please understand that this suggestion arose solely from your own

statement of what you thought would help in your present circumstances.

Anyway, as you say, decide! If it is yes, I should like to see you before

groundwork to keep you busy in my absence.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

Letter No. E

Aug.

18, 1943

Cara Soror,

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

Much thought has gone into the construction of your Motto. "I will become"

can be turned neatly enough as "Let there be;" by avoiding the First Pro-  $\,$ 

12

which is exactly what you want.

"The creative Force of the Universe" is quite ready-made. Pyramisl, a

pyramid, is that Force in its geometrical form; in its biological form

it is Phallus2, the Yang or Lingam. Both words have the same numerical  $\,$ 

value, 831. These two words can therefore serve you as the secret object

of your Work. How than can you construct the number 831?

The Letter Kaph3, Jupiter (Jehovah), the Wheel of Fortune in the Tarot ---

the Atu X is a picture of the Universe built up and revolving by virtue of

those Three Principles: Sulphur, Mercury, Salt; or Gunas: Sattvas, Rajas,

Tamas --- has the value 20. So also has the letter Yod4 spelt in full.

One Gnostic secret way of spelling and pronouncing Jehovah is IAO5 and  $\,$ 

this has the value 811. So has "Let there be," Fiat, transliterating into  ${\it Greek}$ .

Resuming all these ideas, it seems that you can express your aspiration  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

very neatly, very fully, by choosing for your motto the words FIAT YOD.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

P.S. Please study this letter, and these explanatory figures (the author,

BAPHOMET X0 O.T.O., in the original spells each word, giving the  $\,$ 

numerical equivalent of each letter in puramis, etc. This is here not

copied.) and meditate upon them until you have fully assimilate not only

the matter under immediate consideration, but the general method of Qabal-  $\,$ 

istic research and construction. Note how new cognate ideas arise to  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

enrich the formula.

666

Letter No. F

Aug.

20, 1943

Cara Soror,

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

Let me begin by referring to my letter about the motto and make clear to  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

you the working of this letter.

In this motto you have really got several ideas combined, and yet they are

really, of course, one idea. Fiat, being 811, is identical with IAO, and therefore FIAT YOD might be read not only as "let there be" (or "Let me become"), the secret source of all creative energy, but as "the secret source of the energy of Jehovah." The two words together, having the value

1\* In the original in Greek

2\* In the original in Greek.

3\* In the original in Hebrew.

4\* In the original in Hebrew.

5\* In the original in Greek.

13

of 831, they contain the secret meanings Pyramis and Phallos, which is the same idea in different forms; thus you have three ways of expressing the creative form, in its geometrical aspect, its human aspect, and its divine aspect. I am making a point of this, because the working out of this motto should give you a very clear idea of the sort of way in which Qabalah should be used. I think it is rather useful to remember what the essence of the Qabalah is in principle; thus, in your correspondence for Malkuth, Yesod, and Hod you are simply writing down some of the ideas which pertain to the numbers 10, 9, and 8 respectively. Naturally, there is a great deal of redundancy and overloading as soon as you get to ideas important enough to be comprehensive; as is mentioned in the article on the Qabalah in Equinox Vol. I, No. 5, it is quite easy to prove 1 = 2 = 3 = 4, etc.

On the other hand, you must be careful to avoid taking the correspondences given in the books of reference without thinking out why they are so given.

Thus, you find a camel in the number which refers to the Moon, but the Tarot card "the Moon" refers not to the letter Gimel which means camel, but to the letter Qoph, and the sign Pisces which means fish, while the letter

itself refers to the back of the head; and you also find fish has the meaning of the letter Nun. You must not go on from this, and say that the back of your head is like a camel - the connection between them is simply

that they all refer to the same thing.

In studying the Qabalah you mention six months; I think after that time you should be able to realize that, after six incarnations of uninterrupted study, you may realize that you can never know it; as Confucius said about the Yi King. "If a few more years were added to my life, I would devote a hundred of them to the study of the Yi."

If, however, you work at the Qabalah in the same way as I did myself, in season and out of season, you ought to get a very fair grasp of it in six months. I will now tell you what this method is: as I walked about, I made a point of attributing everything I saw to its appropriate idea. I would walk out of the door of my house and reflect that door is Daleth. and house Beth; now the word "dob" is Hebrew for bear, and has the number 6, which refers to the Sun. Then you come to the fence of your property and that is Cheth - number 8, number of Tarot Trump 7, which is the Chariot:

so you begin to look about for your car. Then you come to the street and the first house you see is number 86, and that is Elohim, and it is built of red brick which reminds you of Mars and the Blasted

Tower, and so on. As soon as this sort of work, which can be done in a quite lighthearted

spirit, becomes habitual, you will find your mind running naturally in

this direction, and will be surprised at your progress. Never let your  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

mind wander from the fact that your Qabalah is not my Qabalah; a good

many of the things which I have noted may be useful to you, but you must

construct your own system so that it is a living weapon in your hand.

I think I am fair if I say that the first step on the Qabalah which may be called success, is when you make an actual discovery which throws light on

some problem which has been troubling you. A quarter of a century ago I was in New Orleans, and was very puzzled about my immediate course of action; in fact I may say I was very much distressed. There seemed literally nothing that I could do, so I bethought myself that I had better invoke Mercury. As soon as I got into the appropriate frame of mind, it naturally occurred to me, with a sort of joy, "But I am Mercury." I put it into Latin --- Mercurius sum, and suddenly something struck me, a sort of nameless reaction which said: "That's not quite right." Like a flash it came to me to put

14

it into Greek, which gave me "Hermes Eimi", {Keynote: may wish to convert to true Greek} and adding that up rapidly, I got the number 418, with all the marvellous correspondences which had been so abundantly useful to me in the past (See Equ. of the Gods, p. 138). My troubles disappeared like a flash of lightning.

Now to answer your questions seriatum; it is quite all right to put questions to me about The Book of the Law; a very extended commentary has been written, but it is not yet published. I shall probably be able to answer any of your questions from the manuscript, but you cannot go on after that when it would become a discussion; as they say in the law-courts, "You must take the witness' answer."

II. The Qabalah, both Greek and Hebrew, also very likely Arabic, was used by the author of The Book of the Law. I have explained above the proper use of the Qabalah. I cannot tell you how the early Rosicrucians used it, but I think one may assume that their methods were not dissimilar to our own. Incidentally, it is not very safe to talk about Rosicrucians, because

their name has become a signal for letting loose the most devastating floods

of nonsense. What is really known about the original Rosicrucians is prac-

tically confined to the three documents which they issued. The eighteenth

century Rosicrucians may, or may not, have been legitimate successors of  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,n\right\}$ 

the original brotherhood - I don't know. But from them the O.T.O. derived

its authority; The late O.H.O. Theodor Reuss possessed a certain number

of documents which demonstrated the validity of his claim according to  $\mbox{him}$ ;

but I only saw two or three of them, and they were not of very great impor-  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

tance. Unfortunately he died shortly after the last War, and he had got

out of touch with some of the other  $\operatorname{Grand}$   $\operatorname{Masters}.$  The documents  $\operatorname{did}$  not

come to me as they should have done; they were seized by his wife who had

an idea that she could sell them for a fantastic price; and we did not

feel inclined to meet her views. I don't think the matter is of very great

importance, the work being done by members of the Order all over the place  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

is to me quite sufficient.

III. The Ruach contains both the moral and intellectual worlds, which is  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

really all that we mean by the conscious mind; perhaps it even includes

certain portions of the subconscious.

IV. In initiation from the grade of Neophyte to that of Zelator, one

passes by this way. The main work is to obtain admission to, and control of, the astral plane.

Your expressions about "purifying the feelings" and so on

are rather vague to enter into a scientific system like ours. The result

less refer to is attained automatically in the course of your experiments.

Your very soon discover the sort of state of mind which is favourable or

unfavourable to the work, and you also discover what is helpful and harm-

ful to these states in your way of life. For instance, the practice like

the non-receiving of gifts is all right for a  $\mbox{\sc Hindu}$  whose  $\mbox{\sc mind}$  is branded

which you doubt-

for ten thousand incarnations by the shock of accepting a cigarette or a

 $\operatorname{cup}$  of tea. Incidentally, most of the Eastern cults fall down when they

come West, simply because they make no allowance for our different tempera-

ments. Also they set tasks which are completely unsuitable to Europeans  $\ -$ 

an immense amount of disappointment has been caused by failure to recognize these facts.

Your sub-questions a, b, and c are really answered by the above. All the  $\,$ 

terms you use are very indefinite. I hope it will not take too long to

15

get you out of the way of thinking in these terms. For instance, the word "initiation" includes the whole process, and how to distinguish between it and enlightenment I cannot tell you. "Probation," moreover, if it means "proving," continues throughout the entire process. Nothing is worse for the student than to indulge in these mild speculations about ambiguous terms.

V. You can, if you like, try to work out a progress of Osiris through Amennti on the Tree of Life, but I doubt whether you will get any satisfactory result.

It seems to me that you should confine yourself very closely to the actual

work in front of you. At the present moment, of course, this includes a

good deal of general study; but my point is that the terms employed in

that study should always be capable of precise definition. I am not sure  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

whether you have my Little Essays Toward Truth. The first essay in the  $\,$ 

book entitled "Man" gives a full account of the five principles which go

to make up Man according to the Qabalistic system. I have tried to define

these terms as accurately as possible, and I think you will find them,, in any case, clearer than those to which you have become accustomed with the Eastern systems. In India, by the way, no attempt is ever

made to use

these vague terms. They always have a very clear idea of what is meant by

words like "Buddhi," "Manas" and the like. Attempts at translation are

very unsatisfactory. I find that even with such a simple matter as the

"Eight limbs of Yoga," as you will see when you come to read my Eight

Lectures.

I am very pleased with your illustrations; that is excellent practice for

you. Presently you have to make talismans, and a Lamen for yourself, and

even to devise a seal to serve as what you might call a magical coat-of-

arms, and all this sort of thing is very helpful.

It occurs to me that so far we have done nothing about the astral plane

and this path of Tau of which you speak. Have you had any experience of

travelling in the astral? If not, do you think that you can begin by your-

self on the lines laid down in Liber O, sections 5 and 6? (See Magick,

pp. 387-9). If not you had better let me take you through the first gates.

The question of noise instantly arises; I think we should have to do it

not earlier than nine o'clock at night, and I don't know whether you can manage this.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

Letter No. G

September 4.

Cara Soror,

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

"shall be" (instead of "Do what thou wilt is ... ") not "is". See Liber AL,

I, 36, 54, and II, 54. Not "Master Perdurabo": see Magick p. XXIX. "Care

Frater" is enough.

777 is practically unpurchaseable: copies fetch  $\alpha 10$  or so. Nearly all im-

16

portant correspondences are in Magick Table I. The other 2 books are  $\,$ 

being sent at once. "Working out games with numbers." I am sorry you

should see no more than this. When you are better equipped, you will see

that the Qabalah is the best (and almost the only) means by which an in-

telligence can identify himself. And Gematria methods serve to discover

spiritual truths. Numbers are the network of the structure of the Universe,

and their relations the form of expression of our Understanding of it. (He

gives the numerical value of the letters of the Greek alphabet – not copied  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

here. - ed.) In Greek and Hebrew there is no other way of writing numbers;

our 1, 2, 3 etc. comes from the Phoenicians through the Arabs. You need

no more of Greek and Hebrew than these values, some sacred words ---  $\mbox{know-}$ 

ledge grows by use --- and books of reference.

One cannot set a pupil definite tasks beyond the groundwork I am giving

you, and we should find this correspondence taking clear shape of its own

accord. You have really more than you can do already. And I can only tell

you what the right tasks --- out of hundreds --- are by your own reactions to

your own study and practice.

"Osiris in Amennti" - see the Book of the Dead. I meant you might try to

trace a parallelism between his journeyings and the Path of Initiation.

Astral travel - development of the Astral Body is essential to research;

and, above all, to the attainment of "the Knowledge and Conversation of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

the Holy Guardian Angel."

You ought to demonstrate your performance of the Pentagram Ritual to  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{me}}$ ;

you are probably making any number of mistakes. I will, of course, take

you carefully through the 0.T.O. rituals to III $\emptyset$  as soon as you are fairly

familiar with them. The plan of the grades is this: ---

- 0ø Attraction to the Solar System
- Iø Birth
- IIø Life
- IIIø Death
- IVø "Exaltation"
- P.I, "Annihilation"

 $\ensuremath{\text{Vo-IXØ}}$  Progressive comment on IIØ with very special reference to

the central secret of practical Magick.

There is thus no connection with the A.'.A.'. system and the Tree of Life.

Of course, there are certain analogies.

Your suggested method of study: you have got my idea quite well. But no-

body can "take you through" the Grades of A.'.A.'.. The Grades confirm

your attainments as you make them; then, the new tasks appear. See One Star in Sight.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

Letter No. H

17

November 10 - 11. 11

p.m. - 2 a.m.

Cara Soror,

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

Your's of yestere'en came to gladden me just when the whole evening lay blank before me: the one job such a big job that I simply can't get down to it until I get help: How annoying! Still, yours the gain! 1. That verse (AL. I, 44) condenses the whole magical technique. It makes clear --- when you have understood it --- the secret of success in the Great Work. Of course at first it appears a paradox. You must have an aim, and one aim only: yet on no account must you want to achieve it!!! Those chapters of the Book of Lies quoted in my last letter6 do throw some light onto this Abyss of self-contradiction; and there is meaning much deeper than the contrast between the Will with a capital W, and desire, want, or velleity. The main point seems to be that in aspiring to Power one is limited by the True Will. If you use force, violating your own nature either from lack of understanding or from petulant whim, one is merely wasting energy; things go back to normal as soon as the stress is removed. This is one small case of the big Equation "Free Will = Necessity" (Fate, Destiny, or Karma: it's all much the same idea). One is most rigidly bound by the causal chain that has dragged one to where one is; but it is one's own self that has forged the links. Please refrain from the obvious retort: "Then, in the long run, you can't possibly go wrong: so it doesn't matter what you do." Perfectly true, of course! (There is no single grain of dust that shall not attain to Buddhahood: " with some such words did the debauched old reprobate seek to console himself when Time began to take its revenge.) But the answer is simple enough: you happen to be the kind of being that thinks it does matter what course you steer; or, still more haughtily, you enjoy the pleasure of sailing. No, there is this factor in all success: self-confidence.

If we analyze

this, we find that it means that one is aware that all one's mental and physical faculties are working harmoniously. The deadliest and subtlest enemy of that feeling is anxiety about the result; the finest gauze of doubt is enough to dim one's vision, to throw the entire field out of focus. Hence, even to be aware that there is a result in prospect must militate against that serenity of spirit which is the essence of self-confidence. As you will know, all our automatic physiological functions are deranged if one is aware of them. This then, is the difficulty, to enjoy consciously while not disturbing the process involved. The obvious physical case is the sexual act: perhaps its chief importance is just that it is a type of this exceptional spiritual-mental condition. I hope, however, that you will remember what I have said on the subject in paragraphs 15 - 17 of my 3rd Lecture on Yoga for Yellowbellies (pp. 71-72); there is a way of obtaining ecstacy from the most insignificant physiological function. Observe that in transferring the whole consciousness to (say) one's little finger or big toe is not trying to interfere with the normal exercise of sits activities, but only to realize what is going on in the organism, the 6\* A letter dated Oct. 12, '43 constituted No. 48 in Magick Without Tears and the following chapters from the Book of Lies: - "Peaches", "Pilgrim-Talk", "Buttons and Rosettes", "The Gun-Barrel and the Mountaineer".

18

exquisite pleasure of a function in its normal activity. With a little imagination one can conceive the analogical case of the Universe itself; and, still less fettered by even the mildest limitation which material symbols necessarily (however little) suggest, "Remember all ye that exis-

tence is pure joy; ... " (AL, II, 9).

Is it too bold to suggest that the gradual merging of all these Ways into

an interwoven unity may be taken as one mode of presentation of the Accom-

plishment of the Great Work itself?

At least, I feel fairly satisfied the meditation of them severally and

jointly may help you to an answer to your first question.

2. Most people in my experience either cook up a hell-broth of self-induced

obstacles to success in Astral traveling, or else shoot forth on the wings

of romantic imagination and fool themselves for the rest of their lives in

the manner of the Village Idiot. Yours, luckily, is the former trouble.

But --- is it plain obstinacy? --- you do not exercise the sublime Art of Guru-

bullying. You should have made one frenzied leap to my dying bed, thrust

aside the cohorts of Mourning Archimandrites, and wrung my nose until  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

made you do it.

And you repeatedly insist that it is difficult. It isn't. Is there, how-

ever, some deep-seated inhibition - a (Freudian) fear of success? Is there

some connection with that sense of guilt which is born in all but the very few?

But you don't give it a fair chance. There is, I admit, some trick, or

knack, about getting properly across; a faculty which one acquires (as a

rule) quite suddenly and unexpectedly. Rather like mastering some shots at

billiards. Practice has taught me how to communicate this to students; only

in rare cases does one fail. (It's incredible: one man simply could not

be persuaded that intense physical exertion was the wrong way to to it.

There he sat, with the veins on his forehead almost on the point of burst-

ing, and the arms of  $my\ favourite\ chair\ visibly\ trembling\ beneath\ his\ power-$ 

ful grip!) In your case, I notice that you have got this
practice mixed up

with Dharana: you write of "Emptying my mind of everything except the one idea, etc." Then you go on: "The invoking of a supersensible Being is impossible to me as yet." The impudence! The arrogance! How do you know, pray madam? (Dial numbers at random: the results are often surprisingly delightful!) Besides, I didn't ask you to invoke a supersensible (what a word! Meaning?) Being right away, or at any time: that supersensible is getting on my nerves: do you mean "not in normal circumstances to be apprehended by the senses?" I suppose so. In a word: do fix a convenient season for going on the Astral Plane under my eye: half an hour (with a bit of luck) on not more than four evenings would put you in a very different frame of mind. You will soon "feel your feet" and then "get your sea-legs" and then, much sooner than you think "Afloat in the aethyr, O my God! my God!". . . . . "White swan, bear thou ever me up between thy wings!" 3. Now then to your old Pons Asinorum about the names of the Gods! Stand in the corner for half an hour with your face to the wall! Stay in after

school and write Malka be-Tharshishim v-Ruachoth b-Schebralim 999 times!

19

My dear, dear sister, a name is a formula of power. How can you talk of "anachronism" when the Being is eternal? For the type of energy is eternal.

Every name is a number: and "Every number is infinite; there is no difference." (AL I, 4). But one Name, or system of Names, may be more convenient either (a) to you personally or (b) to the work you are at. E.g. I have

very little sympathy with Jewish Theology or ritual; but the Qabalah is so handy and congenial that I use it more than almost any --or all the others together --- for daily use and work. The Egyptian Theogony is the noblest, the most truly magical, the most bound to me (or rather I to it) by some inmost instinct, and by the memory of my incarnation as Ankh-f-n-Khonsu, that I use it (with its Graeco-Phoenician child) for all work of supreme import. Why stamp my vitals, madam! The Abramelin Operation itself turned into this form before I could so much as set to work on it! like the Duchess' baby (excuse this enthusiasm; but you have aroused the British Lion-Serpent.) Note, please, that the equivalents given in 777 are not always exact. Tahuti is not quite Thoth, still less Hermes; Mercury is a very much more comprehensive idea, but not nearly so exalted: Hanuman hardly at all. Nor is Tetragrammaton IAO, though even etymology asserts the identity. In these matters you must be catholic, eclectic, even syncretic. And you must consider the nature of your work. If I wanted to evoke Taphthartharath, there would be little help indeed from any but the Qabalistic system; for that spirit's precise forms and numbers are not to be found in any other. The converse, however, is not so true. The Qabalah, properly understood, properly treated, is so universal that one can vamp up a ritual to suit almost "any name and form." But in such a case one may expect to have to reinforce it by a certain amount of historical, literary, or philosophic study --- and research. 4. Quite right, dear lady, about your incarnation memories acting as a "Guide to the Way Back." Of course, if you "missed an Egyptian Incarnation," you would not be so likely to be a little Martha, worried "about much serving." Don't get surfeited with knowledge, above all things; it is so very

fascinating, so dreadfully easy; and the danger of becoming a pedant --"Deuce take all your pedants! say I." Don't "dry-rot at ease 'till the Judgment Day."

No, I will NOT recommend a book. It should not hurt you too much to browse on condensed hay (or thistles) such as articles in Encyclopedias. Take Roget's Thesaurus or Smith's Smaller Classical Dictionary (and the like) to read yourself to sleep on. But don't stultify yourself by taking up such study too seriously. You only make yourself ridiculous by trying to do at 50 what you ought to have done at 15. As you didn't --- tant pis! You can't possibly get the spirit; if you could, it would mean merely mental indi-

gestion. We have all read how Cato started to learn Greek at 90: but the

story stops there. We have never been told what good it did to himself or anyone else.

5. God-forms. See Magick pp. 378-9. Quite clear: quite adequate: no

use at all without continual practice. No one can join with you  $\operatorname{---}$  off you

go again! No, no, a thousand times no: this is the practice par excellence  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

where you have to do it all yourself. The Vibration of Godnames: that

perhaps, I can at least test you in. But don't you dare come up for a test

2.0

until you've been at it --- and hard --- for at least 100 exercises.

I think this is your trouble about being "left in the air." When I "present many new things" to you, the sting is in the tail --- the

practice that vitalizes it. Doctrinal stuff is fine "Lazily, lazily, drowsily, drowsily,

in the noo-on-dye shaun!" An ounce of your practice is worth a ton of my

teaching. GET THAT. It's all your hatred of hard work:

"Go to the ant thou sluggard!
Consider her ways and be ----."

I am sure that Solomon was too good a poet, and too experienced a Guru, to tail off with the anticlimax "wise."

6. Minerval. What is the matter? All you have to do is understand it:

just a dramatization of the process of incarnation. Better run through it

with me: I'll make it clear, and you can make notes of your troubles and  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{T}}$ 

their solution for the use of future members.

7. The Book of Thoth. Surely all terms not in a good dictionary are

explained in the text. I don't see what I can do about it, in any case;

the same criticism would apply to (say) Bertrand Russell's Introduction

to Mathematical Physics, wouldn't it?

Is x an R-ancestor of y if y has every R-hereditary that x has, provided

 ${\bf x}$  is a term which has the relation R to something or to which something has

the relation R? (Enthusiastic cries of "Yes, it is!") He says "A number

is anything which has the number of some class." Feel better now?

Still, it would be kind of you to go through a page or so with me, and tell  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,2,3,\ldots \right\}$ 

me where the shoe pinches. Of course I have realized the difficulty long

ago; but I don't know the solution --- or if there is a solution. I  $\operatorname{did}$ 

think of calling Magick "Magick Without Tears"; and I did try having my

work cross-examined as I went on by minds of very inferior education or

capacity. In fact, Parts I and II of Book 4 were thus tested.

What about applying the Dedekindian cut to this letter? I am sure you

would not wish it to develop into a Goclenian Sorites, especially as  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

fear that I may already have deviated from the diapantos 7 Hapaxlegomenon.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

Letter No. I

January 27, 1944

Cara Soror,

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

7\* Greek letters in the original

21

It is very good hearing that these letters do good, but rather sad to reflect that it is going to make you so unpopular. Your friends will notice at once that glib vacuities fail to impress, and hate you, and tell lies about you. It's worth it.

Yes, your brain is quite all right; what is wanted is to acquire the habit of pinning things down instantly. (He says 're-incarnation' --- now what exactly does he mean by that? He says "it is natural to suppose . . . ": what is "natural", and what is implied by supposition?) Practice this style of criticism; write down what happens. Within a week or two you will be astounded to discover that you have got what is apparently little less than a new brain! You must make this a habit, not letting anything get by the sentries.

Indeed, I want you to go even further; make sure of what is meant by even the simplest words. Trace the history of the word with the help of Skeat's Etymological Dictionary. E.g. "pretty" means tricky, deceitful; on the other hand, "hussy" is only "housewife". It's amusing, too, this "tabby"

refers to Prince Attab, the grandson of Ommeya --- the silk quarter of

Baghdad where utabi, a rich watered silk was sold. This will soon give

you the power of discerning instantly when words are being used to hide  $\,$ 

meaning or lack of it.

About A.'.A.'., etc.: your resolution is noble, but there is a letter ready

for you which deals with what is really a legitimate enquiry; necessary,

too, with so many hordes of "Hidden Masters" and "Mahatmas" and so on

scurrying all over the floor in the hope of distracting attention from the

inanities of their trusted henchmen.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

P.S. I must write at length about the Higher Self or "God within us," too

easy to get muddled about it, and the subject requires
careful preparation.

CHAPTER I.

WHAT IS MAGICK?

Cara Soror,

 $\,\,$  Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.

What is Magick? Why should anyone study and practice it? Very natural;

the obvious preliminary questions of any subject soever. We must  $\operatorname{cer-}$ 

tainly get all this crystal clear; fear not that I shall fail to set

forth the whole business as concisely as possible yet as fully, as  $\operatorname{cogent}$ -

ly yet as lucidly, as may prove within my power to do.

At least I need not waste any time on telling you what Magick is not; or to

go into the story of how the word came to be misapplied to conjuring tricks,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

and to sham miracles such as are to this day foisted by charlatan swindlers,

either within or without the Roman Communion, upon a gaping crew of pious

37

imbeciles.

22

First let me go all Euclidean, and rub your nose in the Definition, Postulate and Theorems given in my comprehensive (but, alas! too advanced and

too technical) Treatise on the subject. Here we are!

## I. DEFINITION:

Magick is the Science and Art of causing Change to occur in conformity with Will.

(Illustration: It is my Will to inform the World of certain facts  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

within my knowledge. I therefore take "magical
weapons," pen, ink,

and paper; I write "incantations" --- these sentences -- in the "magi-

cal language" i.e. that which is understood by people I wish to  $\,$ 

instruct. I call forth "spirits" such as printers,
publishers,

booksellers, and so forth, and constrain them to convey my message

to those people. The composition and distribution is thus an  ${\tt act}$ 

of --- MAGICK --- by which I cause Changes to take place in conformity with my Will.8)

# II. POSTULATE:

the proper object.

ANY required Change may be effected by application of the proper kind and degree of Force in the proper manner through the proper medium to

(Illustration: I wish to prepare an ounce of Chloride of Gold. I

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

in sufficient quantity and of adequate strength, and place it, in a  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

vessel which will not break, leak or corrode, in such a manner as  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

will not produce undesirable results, with the necessary quantity

of Gold, and so forth. Every Change has its own conditions.

In the present state of our knowledge and power some changes are

not possible in practice; we cannot cause eclipses, for instance,

or transform lead into tin, or create men from mushrooms. But it

is theoretically possible to cause in any object any change of which

that object is capable by nature; and the conditions are covered

by the above postulate.)

#### III. THEOREMS:

1. Every intentional act is a Magical Act.9

(Ilustration: See "Definition" above.)

- 2. Every successful act has conformed to the postulate.
- 3. Every failure proves that one or more requirements of the postu-

late have not been fulfilled

(Illustrations: There may be failure to understand the case; as  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{T}}$ 

when a doctor makes a wrong diagnosis, and his treatment injures  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

his patient. There may be failure to apply the right kind of force,  $% \left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\$^*$  By "intentional" I mean "willed". But even unintentional acts so seem-

ing are not truly so. Thus, breathing is an act of the Will-to-live.

9\* In one sense Magick may be defined as the name given to Science by the vulgar.

23

as when a rustic tries to blow out an electric light. There may be

failure to apply the right degree of force, as when a wrestler has  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{A}}$ 

his hold broken. There may be failure to apply the force in the

right manner, as when one presents a cheque at the wrong window of  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,n\right\}$ 

the Bank. There may be failure to employ the correct medium, as

when Leonardo da Vinci found his masterpiece fade away. The force  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{may}}$  be applied to an unsuitable object, as when one tries to  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{crack}}$ 

a stone, thinking it a nut.)

4. The first requisite for causing any change is thorough qualita-

tive and quantitative understanding of the condition.

(Illustration: The most common cause of failure in life is ignorance

of one's own True Will, or of the means by which to fulfill that Will.

A man may fancy himself a painter, and waste his life trying to become

one; or he may be really a painter, and yet fail to understand and

to measure the difficulties peculiar to that career.)

5. The second requisite of causing any change is the practical

ability to set in right motion the necessary forces.

(Illustration: A banker may have a perfect grasp of a given situa-

tion, yet lack the quality of decision, or the assets, necessary to  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

take advantage of it.)

6. "Every man and every woman is a star." That is to say, every

human being is intrinsically an independent individual with his own

proper character and proper motion.

7. Every man and every woman has a course, depending partly on the  $\,$ 

 $\mbox{\it self}\,,$  and partly on the environment which is natural and necessary

for each. Anyone who is forced from his own course, either through

not understanding himself, or through external opposition, comes in-

to conflict with the order of the Universe, and suffers accordingly.

(Illustration: A man may think it his duty to act in a certain way,

through having made a fancy picture of himself, instead of investi-

gating his actual nature. For example, a woman may make herself

miserable for life by thinking that she prefers love to social con-

sideration, or vice versa. One woman may stay with an unsympathetic

husband when she would really be happy in an attic with a lover,  $\$ 

while another may fool herself into a romantic elopement when her  $\,$ 

only true pleasures are those of presiding at fashionable functions.

Again, a boy's instinct may tell him to go to sea, while his parents

insist on his becoming a doctor. In such a case, he will be both

unsuccessful and unhappy in medicine.

8. A man whose conscious will is at odds with his True Will is  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,2,3,\ldots \right\}$ 

wasting his strength. He cannot hope to influence his environment

efficiently.

(Illustration: When Civil War rages in a nation, it is in no condi-

tion to undertake the invasion of other countries. A  $\mbox{\tt man}$  with cancer

employs his nourishment alike to his own use and to that of the enemy

which is part of himself. He soon fails to resist the pressure of

his environment. In practical life, a man who is doing what his

conscience tells him to be wrong will do it very clumsily. At first!)

24

9. A man who is doing his True Will has the inertia of the Universe  $\,$ 

to assist him.

(Illustration: The first principle of success in evolution is that

the individual should be true to his own nature, and at the same  $% \left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left($ 

time adapt himself to his environment.)

10. Nature is a continuous phenomenon, thought we do not know in all

cases how things are connected.

41

(Illustration: Human consciousness depends on the properties of

 $\ensuremath{\operatorname{protoplasm}}$  , the existence of which depends on innumerable physical

conditions peculiar to this planet; and this planet is determined

by the mechanical balance of the whole universe of matter. We may  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

then say that our consciousness is causally connected with the  $\ensuremath{\text{re-}}$ 

motest galaxies; yet we do not know even how it arises
from --- or

with --- the molecular changes in the brain.)

11. Science enables us to take advantage of the continuity of Nature

by the empirical application of certain principles whose interplay

involves different orders of idea, connected with each other in a  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$ 

way beyond our present comprehension.

(Illustration: We are able to light cities by rule-of-thumb methods.

We do not know what consciousness is, or how it is connected with

muscular action; what electricity is or how it is connected with

the machines that generate it; and our methods depend on calcula-

tions involving mathematical ideas which have no correspondence in

the Universe as we know it.10)

 $12.\ \mathrm{Man}$  is ignorant of the nature of his own being and powers.

Even his idea of his limitations is based on experience of the past.

and every step in his progress extends his empire. There is, there-

fore, no reason to assign theoretical limits 1 to what he may be,

or to what he may do.

(Illustration: Two generations ago it was supposed theoretically

impossible that man should ever know the chemical composition of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

the fixed stars. It is known that our senses are adapted to receive  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

only an infinitesimal fraction of the possible rates of vibration.

Modern instruments have enabled us to detect some of these supra-

sensibles by indirect methods, and even to use their peculiar quali-

ties in the service of man, as in the case of the rays of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Hertz}}$  and

Roentgen. As Tyndall said, man might at any moment learn to per-

ceive and utilize vibrations of all conceivable and inconceivable

kinds. The question of Magick is a question of discovering and  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{em}}\xspace-$ 

ploying hitherto unknown forces in nature. We know that they exist,

and we cannot doubt the possibility of mental or physical instru-  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

ments capable of bringing us in relation with them.)

13. Every man is more or less aware that his individuality comprises

several orders of existence, even when he maintains that his subtler  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

principles are merely symptomatic of the changes in his gross vehicle.

A similar order may be assumed to extend throughout nature.

10\* For instance, "irrational," "unreal," and "infinite" expressions.

11\* i.e. except --- possibly --- in the case of logically absurd questions,

such as the schoolmen discussed in connection with "God."

25

(Illustration: One does not confuse the pain of toothache with the  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$ 

decay which causes it. Inanimate objects are sensitive to certain

physical forces, such as electrical and thermal conductivity; but

neither in us nor in them  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  so far as we know  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  is there any direct

conscious perception of these forces. Imperceptible influences are

therefore associated with all material phenomena; and there is no  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

reason why we should not work upon matter through those subtle ener-  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

gies as we do through their material bases. In fact, we use magnetic  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

force to move iron, and solar radiation to reproduce images.)

14. Man is capable of being, and using, anything which he perceives;

for everything that he perceives is in a certain sense a part of his

being. He may thus subjugate the whole Universe of which he is con-

scious to his individual Will.

(Illustration: Man has used the idea of God to dictate his personal

conduct, to obtain power over his fellows, to excuse his crimes, and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

for innumerable other purposes, including that of realizing himself

as God. He has used the irrational and unreal conceptions of mathe-

 $\mbox{\tt matics}$  to help him in the construction of  $\mbox{\tt mechanical}$  devices. He

has used his moral force to influence the actions even of wild ani-  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

mals. He has employed poetic genius for political purposes.)

15. Every force in the Universe is capable of being transformed

into any other kind of force by using suitable means. There is thus

an inexhaustible supply of any particular kind of force that we may  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

need.

(Illustration: Heat may be transformed into light and power by

using it to drive dynamos. The vibrations of the air may be used

to kill men by so ordering them in speech as to inflame war-like  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

passions. The hallucinations connected with the mysterious energies

of sex result in the perpetuation of the species.)

16. The application of any given force affects all the orders of

being which exist in the object to which it is applied, whichever

of those orders is directly affected.

(Illustration: If I strike a man with a dagger, his consciousness,

such, has no direct relation therewith. Similarly, the power of  $\boldsymbol{m}\boldsymbol{y}$ 

thought may so work on the mind of another person as to produce far-  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$ 

reaching physical changes in him, or in others through him.)

17. A man may learn to use any force so as to serve any purpose,

by taking advantage of the above theorems.

(Illustration: A man may use a razor to make himself vigilant over

his speech, by using it to cut himself whenever he unguardedly utters  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

a chosen word. He may serve the same purpose by resolving that every  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

incident of his life shall remind him of a particular thing, Making

every impression the starting point of a connected series of thoughts  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

ending in that thing. He might also devote his whole energies to

some particular object, by resolving to do nothing at variance

therewith, and to make every act turn to the advantage of that object.)

18. He may attract to himself any force of the Universe by making

himself a fit receptacle for it, establishing a connection with it,

26

and arranging conditions so that its nature compels it to flow to-  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\}$ 

ward him.

(Illustration: If I want pure water to drink, I dig a well in a

place where there is underground water; I prevent it
from leaking

away; and I arrange to take advantage of water's accordance with

the laws of Hydrostatics to fill it.)

19. Man's sense of himself as separate from, and opposed to, the

Universe is a bar to his conducting its currents. It insulates him.

(Illustration: A popular leader is most successful when he forgets  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

himself, and remembers only "The Cause." Self-seeking engenders

jealousies and schism. When the organs of the body assert their  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

they are diseased. The single exception is the organ of reproduc-

tion. Yet even in this case self-assertion bears witness to its.

dissatisfaction with itself, since in cannot fulfill its function  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

until completed by its counterpart in another organism.)

 $20\,.$  Man can only attract and employ the forces for which he is

really fitted.

(Illustration: You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear.

A true man of science learns from every phenomenon. But Nature is  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

dumb to the hypocrite; for in her there is nothing
false12.)

21. There is no limit to the extent of the relations of any man

with the Universe in essence; for as soon as man makes himself one

with any idea, the means of measurement cease to exist. But his  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

power to utilize that force is limited by his mental power and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

capacity, and by the circumstances of his human environment.

(Illustration: When a man falls in love, the whole world becomes,  $% \left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left($ 

to him, nothing but love boundless and immanent; but his mystical

state is not contagious; his fellow-men are either amused or an-

noyed. He can only extend to others the effect which his love has

had upon himself by means of his mental and physical qualities.

Thus, Catullus, Dante, and Swinburne made their love a mighty mover  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

of mankind by virtue of their power to put their thoughts on the  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$ 

subject in musical and eloquent language. Again, Cleopatra and

other people in authority moulded the fortunes of many other people  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

by allowing love to influence their political actions. The Magician,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

however well he succeeds in making contact with the secret sources

of energy in nature, can only use them to the extent permitted by

his intellectual and moral qualities. Mohammed's intercourse with

Gabriel was only effective because of his statesmanship, soldier-

of the rays which we now use for wireless telegraphy was sterile

until reflected through the minds and wills of the people who could

take his truth, and transmit it to the world of action by means of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right$ 

mechanical and economic instruments.)

 $12^{\star}$   $\,$  It is no objection that the hypocrite is himself part of Nature. He

is an "endothermic" product, divided against himself, with a tendency to  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{C}}$ 

break up. He will see his own qualities everywhere, and thus obtain a  $\,$ 

radical misconception of phenomena. Most religions of the past have

failed by expecting Nature to conform with their ideals of proper conduct.

27

22. Every individual is essentially sufficient to himself. But he

is unsatisfactory to himself until he has established himself in his

right relation with the Universe.

(Illustration: A microscope, however perfect, is useless in the

hands of savages. A poet, however sublime, must impose himself upon  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

theoretically should be the case.)

23. Magick is the Science of understanding oneself and one's  $\operatorname{condi-}$ 

tions. It is the  $\mbox{Art}$  of applying that understanding in action.

(Illustration: A golf club is intended to move a special ball in a

special way in special circumstances. A Niblick should rarely be

used on the tee, or a Brassie under the bank of a bunker. But, also,

the use of any club demands skill and experience.).

 $\,$  24. Every man has an indefeasible right to be what he is.

(Illustration: To insist that anyone else shall comply with one's own

standards is to outrage, not only him, but oneself, since both parties  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

are equally born of necessity.)

25. Every man must do Magick each time that he acts or even thinks,

since a thought is an internal act whose influence ultimately affects  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

action, thought it may not do so at the time.

(Illustration: The least gesture causes a change in a man's own body  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,2,\ldots \right\}$ 

and in the air around  $\mbox{him:}$  it disturbs the balance of the entire

universe and its effects continue eternally throughout all space.

Every thought, however swiftly suppressed, has its effect on the

 $\,$  mind. It stands as one of the causes of every subsequent thought,

and tends to influence every subsequent action. A golfer may lose  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,n\right\}$ 

a few yards on his drive, a few more with his second and third, he

may lie on the green six bare inches too far from the hole; but the

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

stroke, and so probably between having and losing the hole.)

26. Every man has a right, the right of self-preservation, to ful-

fill himself to the utmost.13.

(Illustration: A function imperfectly performed injures, not only

itself, but everything associated with it. If the heart is afraid  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

to beat for fear of disturbing the liver, the liver is starved for

blood, and avenges itself on the heart by upsetting digestion, which

disorders respiration, on which cardiac welfare depends.)

 $\,$  27. Every man should make Magick the keynote of his life. He should

learn its laws and live by them.

(Illustration: The Banker should discover the real meaning of his

existence, the real motive which led him to choose that profession.

He should understand banking as a necessary factor in the economic

existence of mankind, instead of as merely a business whose objects  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

13\* Men of "criminal nature" are simply at issue with their true Wills. The

murderer has the Will-to-live; and his will to murder is a false will at

variance with his true Will, since he risks death at the hands of Society by obeying his criminal impulse.

2.8

are independent of the general welfare. He should learn to distin-

guish false values from real, and to act not on accidental fluctua-

tions but on considerations of essential importance. Such a banker  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

will prove himself superior to others; because he will not be an  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

individual limited by transitory things, but a force of Nature, as  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

impersonal, impartial and eternal as gravitation, as patient and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

irresistible as the tides. His system will not be subject to panic,

any more than the law of Inverse Squares is disturbed by Elections.  $\,$ 

 $\mbox{\ensuremath{\mbox{\ensuremath}\ensuremath{\ensuremath{\mbox{\ensuremath}\ens$ 

his; and for that reason he will be able to direct them with the  $\,$ 

calm, clear-headed confidence of an onlooker, with
intelligence un-

clouded by self-interest and power unimpaired by passion.)

 $28.\ \mbox{Every}$  man has a right to fulfill his own will without being

afraid that it may interfere with that of others; for if he is in

his proper path, it is the fault of others if they interfere with him. (Illustration: If a man like Napoleon were actually appointed by destiny to control Europe, he should not be blamed for exercising his rights. To oppose him would be an error. Anyone so doing would have made a mistake as to his own destiny, except in so far as it might be necessary for him to learn the lessons The sun moves in space without interference. The order of Nature provides a orbit for each star. A clash proves that one or the other has strayed from its course. But as to each man that keeps his true course, the more firmly he acts, the less likely are others to get in his way. His example will help them to find their own paths and pursue them. Every man that becomes a Magician helps others to do likewise. The more firmly and surely men move, and the more such action is accepted as the standard of morality, the less will conflict and confusion hamper humanity.) Well, here endeth the First Lesson. That seems to me to cover the ground fairly well; at least, that is what I have to say when serious analysis is on the agenda. But there is a restricted and conventional sense in which the word may be used without straying too far from the above philosophical position. One might say: -"Magick is the study and use of those forms of energy which are (a) subtler than the ordinary physical-mechanical types, (b) accessible only to those who are (in one sense or another) 'Initiates'." I fear that this may sound rather obscurum per obscurius; but this is one of these cases --we are likely to encounter many such in the course of our researches ---

in which we understand, quite well enough for all practical

purposes,

what we mean, but which elude us more and more successfully the more

accurately we struggle to define their import.

We might fare even worse if we tried to clear things up by making lists

of events in history, tradition, or experience and classifying this as

being, and that as not being, true  ${\tt Magick.}$  The borderland cases would

confuse and mislead us.

But --- since I have mentioned history --- I think it might help, if I went straight on to the latter part of your question, and gave

you a brief

29

sketch of Magick past, present and future as it is seen from the inside.

What are the principles of the "Masters"? What are They trying to do?

What have They done in the past? What means do They employ?

As it happens, I have by me a sketch written by M. Gerard Aumont of Tunis  $\,$ 

some twenty years ago, which covers this subject with reasonable adequacy.

I have been at the pains of translating it from his French, I hope not

too much reminiscent of the old traduttore, traditore. I will revise  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

it, divide it (like Gaul) into Three Parts and send it along.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

CHAPTER II

THE NECESSITY OF MAGICK FOR ALL

Cara Soror,

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

Right glad am I to hear that you have been so thoroughly satisfied with my explanation of what Magick is, and on what its theories rest. It is good, too, hearing how much you were interested in the glimpse that you have had of some of its work in the world; more, that you grasped the fact that this apparently recondite and irrelevant information has an immediate bearing on your personal life of today. Still, I was not surprised that you should add: "But why should I make a special study of, and devote my time and energy to acquiring proficiency in, the Science and Art of Magick? Ah, well then, perhaps you have not understood my remarks at one of our earliest interviews as perfectly as you suppose! For the crucial point of my exposition was that Magick is not a matter extraneous to the main current of your life, as music, gardening, or collection jade might be. No, every act of your life is a magical act; whenever from ignorance, carelessness, clumsiness or what not, you come short of perfect artistic success, you inevitably register failure, discomfort, frustration. Luckily for all of us, most of the acts essential to continued life are involuntary; the "unconscious" has become so used to doing its "True Will" that there is no need of interference; when such need arises, we call it disease, and seek to restore the machine to free spontaneous fulfillment of its function. But this is only part of the story. As things are, we have all adventured into an Universe of immeasurable, of incalculable, possibilities, of situations never contemplated by the trend of Evolution. Man is a marine monster; when he decided that it would be better for him somehow to live on land, he had to grow lungs instead of gills. When we want to travel over soft snow, we have to invent ski; when we wish to exchange thoughts, we must arrange a conventional code of sounds, of knots in

string, of

carved or written characters --- in a word --- embark upon the boundless ocean of hieroglyphics or symbols of one sort or another. (Presently I shall have to explain the supreme importance of such systems; in Universe itself is not, and cannot be, anything but an arrangement of 30 symbolic characters!) Here we are, then, caught in a net of circumstances; if we are to do anything at all beyond automatic vegetative living, we must consciously apply ourselves to Magick, "the Science and Art" (let me remind you!) "of causing change to occur in conformity with the Will." Observe that the least slackness or error means that things happen which do not thus conform; when this is so despite our efforts, we are (temporarily) baffled; when it is our own ignorance of what we ought to will, or lack of skill in adapting our means to the right end, then we set up a conflict in our own Nature: our act is suicidal. Such interior struggle is at the base of nearly all neuroses, as Freud recently "discovered" --as if this had not been taught, and taught without his massed errors, by teachers of the past! The Taoist doctrine, in particular, is most precise and most emphatic on this point; indeed, it may seem to some of us to overshoot the mark; for nothing is permissible in that scheme but frictionless adjustment and adaptation to circumstance. "Benevolence and righteousness" are actually deprecated! That any such ideas should ever have existed (says Lao-tse) is merely evidence of the universal disorder. Taoist sectaries appear to assume that Perfection consists in the absence of any disturbance of the Stream of Nescience; and this is

very much like

53

the Buddhist idea of Nibbana.

We who accept the Law of Thelema, even should we concur in this doctrine theoretically, cannot admit that in practice the plan would work out; our aim is that our Nothing, ideally perfect as it is in itself, should enjoy itself through realizing itself in the fulfillment of all possibilities. All such phenomena or "point-events" are equally "illusion"; Nothing is always Nothing; but the projection of Nothing on this screen of the phenomenal does not only explain, but constitutes, the Universe. It is the only system which reconciles all the contradictions inherent in Thought, and in Experience; for in it "Reality" is "Illusion", "Freewill" is "Destiny", the "Self" is the "Not-Self"; and so for every puzzle of Philosophy. Not too bad an analogy is an endless piece of string. Like a driving band, you cannot tie a knot in it; all the complexities you can contrive are "Tom Fool" knots, and unravel at the proper touch. Always either Naught or Two! But every new re-arrangement throws further light on the possible tangles, that is, on the Nature of the String itself. It is always "Nothing" when you pull it out; but becomes "Everything" as you play about with it,14 since there is no limit to the combinations that you can form from it, save only in your imagination (where the whole thing belongs!) and that grows mightily with Experience. It is accordingly well worth while to fulfill oneself in every conceivable manner. It is then (you will say) impossible to "do wrong", since all phenomena are equally "Illusion" and the answer is always "Nothing". In theory one can hardly deny this proposition; but in practice --- how shall I put it? "The state of Illusion which for convenience I call my present consciousness is such that the course of action A is more natural to me that the

course of action B?"

Or: A is a shorter cut to Nothing; A is less likely to create internal conflict.

14\* N ñ N = Two or Naught; one is the Magical, the other the

14\* N ñ N = Two or Naught; one is the Magical, the other the mystical,

process. You will hear a lot about this one day!

31

## Will that serve?

Offer a dog a juicy bone, and a bundle of hay; he will naturally take

the bone, whereas a horse would choose the hay. So, while you happen to

imagine yourself to be a Fair Lady seeking the Hidden Wisdom, you come to

me; if you thought you were a Nigger15 Minstrel, you would play the banjo,

and sing songs calculated to attract current coin of the  $\operatorname{Realm}$  from a

discerning Public! The two actions are ultimately identical - see AL I,

 $22\ \text{-}$  and your perception of that fact would make you an Initiate of very

high standing; but in the work-a-day world, you are "really" the Fair

Lady, and leave the minstrel to grow infirm and old and hire an orphan

boy to carry his banjo!

Now then, what bothers me it this: Have I or have I not explained this  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

matter of "Magick" - "Why should I (who have only just heard of it, at  $\ensuremath{\text{S}}$ 

;east as a serious subject of study) acquire a knowledge of its principles,

and of the powers conferred by its mastery?" Must I bribe you with pro-  $\,$ 

mises of health, wealth, power over others, knowledge, thaumaturgical

I hope there is no such need - and yet, shall I confess it?
- it was only

because all the "good things of life" were suddenly seen of me to be worth-

less, that I took the first steps towards the attainment of that  $\operatorname{Wisdom}$ 

which, while enjoying to the full the "Feast of Life," guarantees me against

surfeit, poison or interruption by the knowledge that it is all a Dream,

and gives me the Power to turn that dream at will into any form that hap-  $\,$ 

pens to appeal to my Inclination.

Let me sum up, very succinctly; as usual, my enthusiasm has lured me into

embroidering my sage discourse with Poets' Imagery!

Why should you study and practice Magick? Because you can't help doing

it, and you had better do it well than badly. You are on the links,

whether you like it or not; why go on topping your drive, and slicing

your brassie, and fluffing your niblick, and pulling your iron, and socket-

ing your mashie and not being up with your putt - that's 6, and you are

not allowed to pick up. It's a far cry to the Nineteenth, and the  ${\rm sky}$ 

threatens storm before the imminent night.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

CHAPTER III

HIEROGLYPHICS: LIFE AND LANGUAGE NECESSARILY SYMBOLIC

Cara Soror,

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

Very natural, the irritation in your last! You write: ---

"But why? Why all this elaborate symbolism? Why not say straight out

15^ WEH NOTE: Expound here a bit to clarify Crowley's attitude toward race. refer to Chapter LXXIII.

32

what you mean? Surely the subject is difficult enough in any case --- must you put on a mask to make it clear? I know you well enough by now to be sure that you will not fob me off with any Holy-Willie nonsense about the ineffable, about human language being inadequate to reveal such Mysteries, about the necessity of constructing a new language to explain a new system of thought; of course I know that this had to be done in the case of chemistry, of higher mathematics, indeed of almost all technical subjects; but I feel that you have some other, deeper explanation in reserve. After all, most of what I am seeking to learn from you has been familiar to many of the great minds of humanity for many centuries. Indeed, the Qabalah is a special language, and that is old enough; there is not much new material to fit into that structure. But why did they, in the first place, resort to this symbolic jargon?" You put it very well; and when I think it over, I feel far from sure that the explanation which I am about to inflict upon you will satisfy you, or even whether it will hold water! In the last resort, I shall have to maintain that we are justified by experience, by the empirical success in communicating thought which has attended, and continues to attend, our endeavors. But to give a complete answer, I shall have to go back to the beginning, and restate the original problem; and I beg that you will not suppose that I am evading the question, or adopting the Irish method of answering it by another, though I know it may sound as if I were. Let me set out by restating our original problem; what we want is Truth; we want an even closer approach to Reality; and we want to discover and discuss the proper means of achieving this object. Very good; let us start by the simplest of all possible enquiries --- and the most difficult --- "What is anything?" "What do we know?" and other questions that spring naturally from these.

```
I see a tree..

I hear it --- rustling or creaking in the wind.

I touch it --- hard.

I smell it --- acrid.

I taste it --- bitter.

Now all the information given by these five senses has to be
```

put together, although no two agree in any sort of way. The logic by which we build up

our complex idea of a tree has more holes than a sponge.

But this is to jump far ahead: we must first analyze the single, simple  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

impression. "I see a tree." This phenomenon is what is called a "point-

event." It is the coming together of the two, the seer and the seen. It

is single and simple; yet we cannot conceive of either of them as any-

thing but complex. And the Point-Event tells us nothing whatever about  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

either; both, as Herbert Spencer and God knows how many others have

shown, unknowable; it stands by itself, alone and aloof. It has happened;

it is undeniably Reality. Yet we cannot confirm it; for it can never

happen again precisely the same. What is even more bewildering is that

since it takes time for the eye to convey an impression to the conscious-

ness (it may alter in 1,000 ways in the process!) all that really exists  $% \left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{$ 

is a memory of the Point-Event. not the Point-Event itself. what then is

this Reality of which we are so sure? Obviously, it has not got a name,

since it never happened before, or can happen again! To discuss it at

33

all we must invent a name, and this name (like all names) cannot possibly be anything more than a symbol.

Even so, as so often pointed out, all we do is to "record the behaviour

of our instruments." Nor are we much better off when we've done it; for

58

our symbol, referring as it does to a phenomenon unique in itself, and

not to be apprehended by another, can mean nothing to one's neighbors.

What happens, of course, is that similar, though not identical, Point-

Events happen to many of us, and so we are able to construct a symbolic

language. My memory of the mysterious Reality resembles yours suffi-

ciently to induce us to agree that both belong to the same class.

But let me furthermore ask you to reflect on the formation of language

itself. Except in the case of onomato-poetic words and a few others,

there is no logical connection between a thing and the sound of our name

for it. "Bow-wow" is a more rational name than " $\log$ ", which is a mere

convention agreed on by the English, while other nations prefer chien,

hund, cane, kalb, kutta and so on. All symbols, you see, my dear child,

and it's no good your kicking!

But it doesn't stop there. When we try to convey thought by writing, we

are bound to sit down solidly, and construct a holy Qabalah out of nothing.

Why would a curve open to the right, sound like the ocean, open at the

top, like you? And all these arbitrary symbolic letters are combined by

just as symbolic and arbitrary devices to take on conventional meanings,

these words again combined into phrases by no less highhanded a procedure.

And then folk wonder how it is that there should be error and misunder-

standing in the transmission of thought from one person to another!  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

Rather regard it as a miraculous intervention of Providence when even  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

one of even the simplest ideas "gets across." Now then, this being so,

it is evidently good sense to construct one's own alphabet, with one's  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

own very precise definitions, in order to handle an abstruse and techni-  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

cal subject like Magick. The "ordinary" words such as God, self, soul,

spirit and the rest have been used so many thousand times in so many

thousand ways, usually by writers who knew not, or cared not for the

necessity of definition that to use them to-day in any scientific essay is almost ludicrous.

That is all, just now, sister; no more of your cavilling, please; sit

down quietly with your 777, and get it by heart!

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

CHAPTER IV

THE QABALAH, THE BEST TRAINING FOR MEMORY

Cara Soror,

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

Now you must learn Qabalah. Learn this Alphabet of Magick.

take it on trust, as a child does his own alphabet. No one has ever

34

found out why the order of the letters is what it is. Probably there isn't any answer.

If you only knew what I am grappling with in the Yi King! the order of

the sixty-four hexagrams. I am convinced that it is extremely signifi-

cant, that it implies a sublime system of philosophy. I've got far enough

to be absolutely sure that there is a necessary  $\operatorname{rhythm}$ ; and it's killing

me by millimetres, finding out why each pair succeeds the last. Forgive these tears!

But our Magical Alphabet is primarily not letters, but figures, not sounds

but mathematical ideas. Sir Humphrey Davyl6, coming out of his famous

illumination (with some help from Nitrous Oxide he got in) exclaimed:

The Universe is composed solely of ideas. We, analyzing this a little,

say: The Universe is a mathematical expression.

Sir James Jeans might have said this, only his banker advised him to cash

in on God. The simplest form of this expression is 0 = 2, elsewhere

expounded at great length. This 2 might itself be expressed in an indefin-

itely great number of ways. Every prime number, including some not in the

series of "natural numbers", is an individual. The other numbers with

perhaps a few exceptions (e.g. 41817) are composed of their primes.

Each of these ideas may be explained, investigated, understood, by means

very various. Firstly, the Hebrew, Greek and Arabic numbers are also

letters. Then, each of these letters is further described by one of the

(arbitrarily composed) "elements of Nature;" the Four (or Five) Elements,

the Seven (or Ten) Planets, and the Twelve Signs of the Zodiac.

All these are arranged in a geometrical design composed of ten "Sephiroth"

(numbers) and twenty-two "paths" joining them; this is called the Tree of Life.

Every idea soever can be, and should be, attributed to one or more of

these primary symbols; thus green, in different shades, is a quality or

function of Venus, the Earth, the Sea, Libra, and others. So also abstract

ideas; dishonesty means "an afflicted Mercury," generosity a good, though

not always strong, Jupiter; and so on.

The Tree of Life has got to be learnt by heart; you must know it back-

wards, forwards, sideways, and upside down; it must become the automatic

background of all your thinking. You must keep on hanging everything

that comes your way upon its proper bough.

61

At first, of course, all this is dreadfully confusing; but persist, and a time will come when all the odd bits fit into the jig-saw, and you behold --- with what adoring wonder! --- the marvellous beauty and symmetry of the Qabalistic system.

And then --- what a weapon you will have forged!

16° WEH NOTE: Option to add a comment of Humphrey Davy and the invention of

modern anesthesia to clarify the reference. On the occasion of a Nitrous

Oxide party, such as he catered, he chanced to note that one of the

participants had taken injury but felt no pain. This led to the practice

of administrating anesthetics to patients in operations, and gave the time  $% \frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}$ 

in surgery to perfect modern procedural medicine.

17^^ WEH NOTE: 418 = give the prime factors.

35

What power to analyze, to order, to manipulate your thinking!

And please remember when people compliment you on your memory or the clarity of your thought, to give credit to the Qabalah!

That's fine, I seem to hear you purr; that looks a lovely machine. The

Design is just elegant; that scarf-pin of yours is perfectly sweet.

There's only one point: how to make the damn thing work?

Ah yes, like the one in the Apocalypse, the sting is in your tail.

Honest, you needn't worry; it works on ball-bearings, and there's always  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,n\right\} =0$ 

those "Thirteen Fountains of Magnificent Oil flowing down the Beard of

 ${\tt Macroprosopus"}$  in case it creaks a little at first. But seriously, all

the mathematics you need is simple Addition and Multiplication.

"Yeah!" you rudely reply. "That's what you think; but you haven't got very far in the Qabalah!" Too true, sister. The Book of the Law itself insists upon the fact that it contains a Qabalah which was beyond me at the time of its dictation, is beyond me now, and always will be beyond me in this incarnation. Let me direct your spiritual attention to AL I, 54; I, 56; II, 54-55; II, 76; III, 47. Now there was enough comprehensible at the time to assure me that the Author of the Book knew at least as much Qabalah as I did: I discovered subsequently more than enough to make it certain without error that he knew a very great deal more, and that of an altogether higher order, than I knew; finally, such glimmerings of light as time and desperate study have thrown on many other obscure passages, to leave no doubt whatever in my mind that he is indeed the supreme Qabalist of all time . . . . "I asked you how to work it." Don't be so peevish, querulous, and impatient; your zeal is laudable, but it's wasting your own time to hurry me. Well, when you've got this Alphabet of Numbers (in its proper shape) absolutely by heart, with as many sets of attributions as you can commit to memory without getting confused, you may try a few easy exercises, beginning with the past. ("How many sets of attributions?" - Well, certainly, the Hebrew and Greek Alphabets with the names and numbers of each letter, and its meaning: a couple of lists of God-names, with a clear idea of the character, qualities, functions, and importance of each; the "Kingscale" of colour, all the Tarot attributions, of course; then animals, plants, drugs, perfumes, a list or two of archangels, angels, intelligences and spirits ---

63

that ought to be enough for a start.)

Now you are armed! Ask yourself: why is the influence of Tiphareth

transmitted to Yesod by the Path of Samekh, a fence, 60, Sagittarius,

the Archer, Art, blue - and so on; but to Hod by the Path of Ayin, an  $\,$ 

eye, 70, Capricornus, the Goat, the Devil, Indigo, K.T.

36

Thirteen is the number of Achad {Hebrew option}, Unity, and Ahebah {Hebrew

option}, Love; then what word

should arise when you expand it by the Creative Dyad, and get 26; what

when you multiply it by 4, and get 52? Then, suppose the Pentagram gets

busy,  $13 \times 5 = 65$ , what then?

Now don't you dare to come round crawling to me for the answers; work

it out yourself what sort of words they ought to be, and then check  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

your result by looking up those numbers in the Sepher Sephiroth:

Equinox Vol. I, No. 8, Supplement.

When you are a real adept at all these well-known calculations "prepare

to enter the Immeasurable Region" and dig out the Unknown.

You must construct your own Qabalah!

Nobody can do it for you. What is your own true Number? You must find

it and prove it to be correct. In the course of a few years, you should

have built yourself a Palace of Ineffable Glory, a Garden of Indescrib-

able Delight. Nor Time nor Fate can tame those tranquil towers, those

Minarets of Music, or fade one blossom in those avenues of Perfume!

Humph! Nasty of me: but it has just stuck me that it might be just as

well if you made a Sepher Sephiroth of your own! What a positively

beastly thing to suggest! However, I do suggest it.

After all, it's simple enough. Every word you come across, add it up,

stick it down against that number in a book kept for the purpose. That

may seem tedious and silly; why should you do all over again the work

that I have already done for you? Reason: simple. Doing it will teach

you Qabalah as nothing else could. Besides, you won't be all cluttered

up with words that mean nothing to you; and if it should happen that you

want a word to explain some particular number, you can look it up in  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$ 

Sepher Sephiroth.

By this method, too, you may strike a rich vein of words of your  $\operatorname{own}$ 

that I have altogether missed.

No doubt, a Really Great Teacher would have said: "Beware! Use my

Dictionary, and mine alone! All others are spurious!" But then I'm not  $\parbox{\footnotement{\foot$ 

a R.G.T. of that kind.

For a start, of course, you should put down the words that are bound to

come in your way in any case: numbers like 11, 13, 31, 37, and their  $\,$ 

multiples; the names of God and the principal angels; the planetary

and geomantic names; and your own private and particular name with its  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

branches. After that, let your work on the Astral Plane guide you.

When investigating the name and other words communicated to you by such

beings as you meet there, or invoke, many more will come up in their

proper connections. Very soon you will have quite a nice little Sepher  $\,$ 

Sephiroth of your very own. Remember to aim, above all things, at coherence.

It is excellent practice, but the way, to do some mental arithmetic on  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

your walks; acquire the habit of adding up any names that you have come

across in your morning's reading. Nietzsche has well observed that the

best thoughts come by walking; and it has happened to  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{me}}\xspace,$  more than

once or twice, that really important correspondences have  $\operatorname{come}$ , as by

37

a flashlight, when I was padding the old hoof.

You will have noticed that in this curt exposition I have confined  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{myself}}$ 

to Gematria, the direct relation of number and work, omitting any refer-

ence to Notariqon, the accursed art of making words out of initials,

like (in profane life) Wren and Gestapo and their horrid brood, or to

Temurah, the art of altering the position of the letters in a word, a

sort of cipher; for these are almost always frivolous. To base any

serious calculations on them would be absurd.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

P.S. You should study the Equinox Vol. I, No. 5, "The Temple of Solomon  $\,$ 

the King" for a more elaborate exposition of the Qabalah.

CHAPTER V

THE UNIVERSE. THE 0 = 2 EQUATION

Cara Soror,

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

Yes, I admit everything! It is all my fault. Looking over my past writ-

ings, I do see that  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  only one-opointed attempt to set forth a sound

ontology was my early fumbling letter brochure Berashith18. Since then,

I seem to have kept assuming that everybody knew all about it; referring  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

to it, quoting it, but never sitting down seriously to demonstrate the

thesis, or even to state it in set terms. Chapter 0 of Magick in Theory  $\ \ \,$ 

and Practice skates gently over it; the "Naples Arrangement" in The

66

Book of Thoth dodges it with really diabolical ingenuity. I ask  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{myself}}$ 

why. It is exceedingly strange, because every time I think of the Equa-

tion, I am thrilled with a keen glow of satisfaction that this sempiternal

Riddle of the Sphinx should have been answered at last.

So then let me now give myself the delight, and you the comfort, of stat-

ing the problem from its beginning, and proving the soundness of the

solution --- of showing that the contradiction of this Equation is unthink-

able. --- Are you ready? Forward! Paddle!

#### A. We are aware.

- B. We cannot doubt the existence (whether "real" or "illusory" makes no difference) of something, because doubt itself is a form of awareness.
- C. We lump together all that of which we are aware under the convenient name of "Existence", or "The Universe". Cosmos is not so

good for this
purpose; that word implies "order", which in the present
stage of our

argument, is a mere assumption.

D. We also tend to think of the Universe as containing things of which we are not aware; but this is altogether unjustifiable, although it is

difficult to think at all without making some such assumption. For

18\* See Crowley, Collected Works.

38

instance, one may come upon a new branch of knowledge --- say, histology

or Hammurabi or the language of the Iroquois or the poems of the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Herma}}\xspace$ 

phrodite of Panormita. It seems to be there all ready waiting for us;

we simply cannot believe that we are making it all up as we go along.

For all that, it is sheer sophistry; we may merely be unfolding the  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

contents of our own minds. Then again, does a thing cease to exist if we

forget it? The answer is that one cannot be sure.

Personally, I feel convinced of the existence of an Universe outside  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{m}} \ensuremath{\mathsf{y}}$ 

own immediate awareness; but it is true, even so, that it does not exist

for me unless and until it takes its place as part of my consciousness.

 ${\tt E.}$  All this paragrpah  ${\tt D}$  is in the nature of a digression, for what you

may think of it does not at all touch the argument of this letter. But

it had to be put in, just to prevent your mind from raising irrelevant

objections. Let me continue, then, from C.

F. Something is 19. This something appears incalculably vast and complex.

How did it come to be?

This, briefly, is the "Riddle of the Universe," which has been always the  $\,$ 

 ${\tt G.}$  The orthodox idiot answer, usually wrapped up in obscure terms in the

hope of concealing from the enquirer the fact that it is not an answer

at all, but an evasion, is: God created it.

Then, obviously, who created God? Sometimes we have a Demiurge, a creative

 $\operatorname{God}$  behind whom is an eternal formless  $\operatorname{Greatness}$  --- anything to  $\operatorname{confuse}$ 

the issue!

Sometimes the Universe is supported by an elephant; he, in turn, stands

on a tortoise . . . by that time it is hoped that the enquirer is too  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

tired and muddled to ask what holds up the tortoise.

Sometimes, a great Father and Mother crystallize out of some huge cloudy

confusion of "Elements" – and so on. But nobody answers the question;  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

at least, none of these God-inventing mules, with their incurably common-place minds.

H. Serious philosophy has always begun by discarding all these pueril-

ities. It has of necessity been divided into these schools: the Nihilist,

the Monist, and the Dualist.

I. The last of these is, on the surface, the most plausible; for almost

the first thing that we notice on inspecting the Universe is what the

Hindu schools call "the Pairs of Opposites."

This too, is very convenient, because it lends itself so readily to ortho-

dox theology; so we have Ormuzd and Ahriman, the Devas and the Asuras,

Osiris and Set, et cetera and da capo, personifications of " $\operatorname{Good}$ " and

"Evil." The foes may be fairly matched; but more often the tale tells

of a revolt in heaven. In this case, "Evil" is temporary; soon, espe-

cially with the financial help of the devout, the "devil" will be "cast

into the Bottomless Pit" and "the Saints will reign with Christ in glory

19\* You must read The Soldier an The Hunchback: ! and ? in the Equinox  $\,$ 

I, 1.

39

for ever and ever, Amen!" Often a "redeemer," a "dying God," is needed to secure victory to Omnipotence; and this is usually what

little vulgar

boys might call a "touching story!"

 ${\tt J.}$  The Monist (or Advaitist) school, is at once subtler and more refined;

it seems to approach the ultimate reality (as opposed to the superficial  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

examination of the Dualists) more closely.

It seems to me that this doctrine is based upon a sorites of  $\mbox{doubtful}$ 

validity. To tell you the hideously shameful truth, I hate this doc-

trine so rabidly that I can hardly trust myself to present it fairly!

But I will try. Meanwhile, you can study it in the Upanishads, in the Bhagavad-Gita, in Ernst Haeckel's The Riddle of the Universe, and dozens of other classics. The dogma appears to excite its dithyrambs. I have to admit the "poetry" of the idea; but there is something in me which vehemently rejects it with excruciating and vindictive violence. Possibly, this is because part of our own system runs parallel with the first equations of theirs. K. The Monists perceive quite clearly and correctly that it is absurd to answer the question "How came these Many things (of which we are aware) to be?" by saying that they came from Many; and "Many" in tion includes Two. The Universe must therefore be a single phenomenon: make it eternal and all the rest of it --- i.e. remove all limit of any kind --- and the Universe explains itself. How then can Opposites exist, as we observe them to do? Is it not the very essence of our original Sorites that the Many must be reducible to the One? They see how awkward this is; so the "devil" of the Dualist is emulsified and evaporated into "illusion;" what they call "Maya" or some equivalent term. "Reality" for them consists solely of Brahman, the supreme Being "without quantity or quality." They are compelled to deny him all attributes, even that of Existence; for to do so would instantly limit them, and so hurl them headlong back in to Dualism. All that of which we are aware must obviously possess limits, or it could have no intelligible meaning for us; if we want "pork," we must specify its qualities and quantities; at the very least, we must be able to distinguish it from "that-whichis-not-pork." But - one moment, please! L. There is in Advaitism a most fascinating danger; that is that, up to a certain point, "Religious Experience" tends to support

this theory.

A word on this. Vulgar minds, such as are happy with a personal God,

Vishnu, Jesus, Melcarth, Mithras, or another, often excite themselves -

call it "Energized Enthusiasm" if you want to be sarcastic!
--- to the

point of experiencing actual Visions of the objects of their devotion.

But these people have not so much as asked themselves the original  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

question of "How come?" which is our present subject. Sweep them into

the discard!

 ${\tt M.}$  Beyond Vishvarupadarshana, the vision of the Form of Vishnu, beyond

that yet loftier vision which corresponds in Hindu classification to our

"Knowledge and Conversation of the Holy Guardian Angel", is that called  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Can}}$ 

Atmadarshana, the vision (or apprehension, a much better word) of the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{W}}$ 

Universe as a single phenomenon, outside all limitations, whether of

time, space, causality, or what not.

40

Very good, then! Here we are with direct realization of the Advaitist

theory of the Universe. Everything fits perfectly. Also, when I say  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,2,\ldots \right\}$ 

"realization," I want you to understand that I mean what I say in a

sense so intense and so absolute that it is impossible to convey my

meaning to anyone who has not undergone that experience20.

How do we judge the "reality" of an ordinary impression upon conscious-

ness? Chiefly by its intensity, but its persistence, by the fact that  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{L}}$ 

nobody can argue us out of our belief in it. As people said of Berkeley's  $\,$ 

'Idealism' - "his arguments are irrefutable but they fail to carry con-

viction." No sceptical, no idealist queries can persuade us that a kick  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

in the pants is not 'real' in any reasonable sense of the word. More-  $\,$ 

over memory reassures us. However vivid a dream may be at the time,

however it may persist throughout the years (though it is rare for any

dream, unless frequently repeated, or linked to waking impressions by

some happy conjunction of circumstances, to remain long in the mind with

any clear-cut vision) it is hardly ever mistaken for an event of  $\operatorname{actual}$ 

life. Good: then, as waking life is to dream, so --- yes, more so! --- is

Religious Experience as above described to that life common to all of

us. It is not merely easy, it is natural, not merely natural, but inevi-

table, for anyone who has experienced "Samadhi" (this word conveniently

groups the higher types of vision21) to regard normal life as "illusion"  $\,$ 

by comparison with this state in which all problems are resolved, all

doubts driven out, all limitations abolished.

But even beyond Atmadarshana comes the experience called Sivadarshana22,

in which this Atman (or Brahman), this limit-destroying Universe, is  $\frac{1}{2}$ 

itself abolished and annihilated.

(And, with its occurrence, smash goes the whole of the Advaitist theory!)

It is a commonplace to say that no words can describe this final destruc-

tion. Such is the fact; and there is nothing one can do about it but

put it down boldly as I have done above. It does not matter to our

present purpose; all that we need to know is that the strongest prop of

the Monist structure has broken off short.

Moreover, is it really adequate to postulate an origin of the Universe,

as they inevitably do? Merely to deny that there ever was a beginning

by saying that this "one" is eternal fails to satisfy me.

What is very much worse, I cannot see that to call Evil "illusion" helps

us at all. When the Christian Scientist hears that his wife has been

savagely mauled by her Peke, he has to smile, and say that "there is a

claim of error." Not good enough.

N. It has taken a long while to clear the ground. That I  $\mbox{\rm did}$  not

expect; the above propositions are so familiar to me, they run so

cleanly through my mind, that, until I came to set them down in order,

I had no idea what a long and difficult business it all was.

Still, it's a long lane, etc. We have seen that "Two" (or "Many") are

20\* I have discussed this and the following points very fully in Book  $4\,$ 

Part I, pp. 63-89

21\* "Vision" is a dreadfully bad word for it; "trance" is better, but

idiots always mix it up with hypnotism.

22\*\* Possibly almost identical with the Buddhist Neroda-Samapatti.

41

unsatisfactory as origin, if only because they can always be reduced to

"One"; and "One" itself is no better, because, among other things, it

finds itself forced to deny the very premises on which it was founded.

Shall we be any better off if we assume that "Ex nihilo nihil fit" is  $\ensuremath{\text{[Therefore]}}$ 

a falsehood, that the origin of All Things is Nothing? Let us see!

O. Shall we first glance at the mathematical aspect of Nothing?

(Including its identical equation in Logic.) This I worked out so long

ago as 1902 e.g. in Berashith, which you will find reprinted in The  $\,$ 

Sword of Song, and in my Collected Works, Vol. I.

The argument may be summarized as follows.

When, in the ordinary way of business, we write  ${\tt 0}$ , we should really

write 0n23. For 0 implies that the subject is not extended in any dimen-

sion under discussion. Thus a line may be two feet in length, but in

breadth and depth the coefficient is Zero. We could describe it as 2f + 0b + 0d, or n2f + 0b + 0d.

What I proposed in considering "What do we mean by Nothing?" was to

consider every possible quality of any object as a dimension.

For instance, one might describe this page as being nf + n'b + n"d + 0

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} redness + \tt) & \tt0 & \ttamiability + \tt0 & velocity + \tt0 & potential & \ttand & \ttso \\ \tt on, & \tt until & \tt you \\ \end{tabular}$ 

had noted and measured all the qualities it possesses, and  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{excluded}}$  all

that it does not. For convenience, we may write this expression as

Xf+b+d+r+a+v+p --- using the initials of the qualities which we call dimensions.

Just one further explanation in pure mathematics. To interpret X1,

X1+1 or X2, and so on, we assume the reference to be to spatial dimen-

sions. Thus suppose  ${\tt X1}$  to be a line a foot long,  ${\tt X2}$  will be a plane a

foot square, and X3 a cube measuring a foot in each dimension. But

what about X4? There are no more spatial dimensions. Modern mathemat-

ics has (unfortunately, I think) agreed to consider this fourth dimen-

sion as time. Well, and X5? To interpret this expression, we may

begin to consider other qualities, such as electric capacity, colour,

moral attributes, and so on. But this remark, although necessary,

leads us rather away from our main thesis instead of toward it.

P. What happens when we put a minus sign before the index (that  $\operatorname{small}$ 

letter up on the right) instead of a plus? Quite simple. 23  $^{\rm MEH}$  NOTE: Add comments to distinguish indices (Abstract Algebra) from

{Keynote: I shouldn't, but as a physicist, I have to say} {that Crowley is giving an erroneous layman's opinion } {and his usage of math notation cannot be considered } {correct. These expressions are ok as text, but not as } {math without redefinition through Abstract Algebra, a } {field Crowley appears not to know by name. The ideas } {are valid, but the expressions are misleading. It might} {be wise to add a footnote about the notation being non-} {traditional. Notably, this line defies Pythagoras!

powers of numbers.

{Crowley's notation with superscripts is the problem. {It looks like powers of numbers instead of indices. {He probably intended indices, but didn't know how to {represent them or flag them in typography.

42

x2 = X1+1 = X1 + X1. With a minus, we divide instead of multiplying.

Thus, X3-2 = X3 ö X2 = X1, just as if you had merely subtracted the 2

from the 3 in the index.

Now, at last, we come to the point of real importance to our thesis:

how shall we interpret XO? We may write it, obviously, as X1-1 or

Xn-n. Good, divide. Then X1  $\ddot{o}$  X1 = 1. This is the same, clearly

enough, whatever X may be.

 ${\tt Q.}$  Ah, but what we started to do was discover the meaning of Nothing.

It is not correct to write it simply as 0; for that 0 implies an index

01, or 02, or 0n. And if our Nothing is to be absolute Nothing, then  $\,$ 

there is not only no figure, but no index either. So we must write it as 00.

What is the value of this expression? We proceed as before; divide.

 $0 = 0n - n = 0n \ \ddot{o} \ 0n = -- \ x \ --. \ Of course \ 0n \ \ddot{o} \ 1$  remains 0;

1 0n

but 1  $\ddot{o}$  On =  $\hat{i}$  {Keynote: this last is an elongated infinity symbol}.

That is, we have a clash of the "infinitely great" with the "infinitely

 ${\tt small;"}$  that knocks out the "infinity" (and Advaitism with it!) and

leaves us with an indeterminate but finite number of utter variety.

That is: 00 can only be interpreted as "The Universe that we know."

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{R}}.$  So much for one demonstration. Some people have found fault with

the algebra; but the logical Equivalent is precisely parallel. Suppose I wish to describe my study in one respect: I can say "No dogs are in my study, " or "Dogs are not in my study." I can make a little diagram: D is the world of dogs; S is my study. Here it is: The squares are quite separate. The whole world outside the square D is the world of no dogs: outside the square S, the world of no-study.24 But suppose now that I want to make the Zero absolute, like our 00, I must say "No dogs are not in my study." Or, "There is no absence-of-dog in my study." That is the same as saying: "Some doge are in my study;" diagram again: 25 In Diagram 1, 26 "the world where no dogs are" included the whole of my study; in Diagram 2 that absence-of-dog is no longer there; so one or more of them must have got in somehow. That's that; I know it may be a little difficult at first; fortunately there is a different way --- the Chinese way --- of stating the theorem in very much simpler terms. S. The Chinese, like ourselves, begin with the idea of "Absolute Nothing." They "make an effort, and call it the Tao;" but that is exactly what 24^ ¿ÄÄÄÙ ¿ÄÄÄÙ { 3 D 3 3 S 3 lute>} ÀÄÄÄÙ ÀÄÄÄÙ 25^{Keynote: Same two labeled squares, but this time the} {square with S overlaps lower right of D square at an angle} {--gratuitious comment: Crowley's language is invalid but diagrams ok} 26^{Keynote: need to label these two figures} 43 the Tao comes to mean, when we examine it. They see quite well, as we

```
have done above, that merely to assert Nothing is not to
explain the
Universe; and they proceed to do so by means of a
mathematical equation
even simpler than ours, involving as it does no operations
beyond simple
addition and subtraction. They say "Nothing obviously means
Nothing;
it has no qualities nor quantities." (The Advaitists27 said
the same, and
then stultified themselves completely by calling it One!)
"But," con-
tinue the sages of the Middle Kingdom, "it is always
possible to reduce
any expression to Nothing by taking any two equal and
opposite terms."
(Thus n = (-n) = 0.) "We ought therefore to be able to get
any expres-
sion that we want from Nothing; we merely have to be careful
terms shall be precisely opposite and equal." (0 = n + (-1)^n)
n). This then
they did, and began to diagrammatize the Universe as the Œ
{S.B. cap "I"} - a
pair of
opposites, the Yang or active male, and the Yin or passive
Female,
principles. They represented the Yang by an unbroken ( ----
--- ), the Yin
by a broken ( --- --- ), line. (The first manifestation in
Nature of these
two is Thfi Yang, the Sun, and the Thfi Yin, the Moon.)
This being a little
large and loose, they doubled these lines, and obtained the
four Hsiang.
They then took them three at a time, and got the eight Kwa.
represent the development from the original @ {S.B. cap "I"}
to the Natural
Order of
the Elements.
I shall call the male principle M, the Female F.
M.1. ----- Khien "Heaven-Father" F.1. -- -- Khwtn
"Earth-Mother"
    -----
                                         -- --
     _____
                                         -- --
M.2. ---- LŒ The Sun
                                   F.2. -- -- Khfn The
Moon
M.3. -- -- K†n Fire
                                   F.3. -- -- Tui Water
    -- --
                                         -----
     ----
                                         _____
```

M.4. ----- Sun Air F.4. ----- K†n Earth

Note how admirably they have preserved the idea of balance. M 1 and

F.1. are perfection. M.2. and F.2. still keep balance in their lines.

The four "elements" show imperfection; yet they are all balanced as

against each other. Note, too, how apt are the ideograms.  $\ensuremath{\text{M.3.}}$  shows

the flames flickering on the hearth, F.3., the wave on the solid bottom  $\,$ 

of the sea; M.4., the mutable air, with impenetrable space above, and

finally F.4., the thin crust of the earth masking the interior energies

of the planet. They go in to double these  $\mathrm{Kw}f$ , thus reaching the sixty-

four Hexagrams of the YC King, which is not only a Map, but a History  $\,$ 

of the Order of Nature.

It is pure enthusiastic delight in the Harmony and Beauty of the  $\operatorname{System}$ 

that has led me thus far afield; my one essential purpose is to show

how the Universe was derived by these Wise Men from Nothing. 27^ WEH NOTE: Do an Arthur Avalon plug here, highlighting his "Garland of Letters"

44

When you have assimilated these two sets of Equations, when you have

understood how 0 = 2 is the unique, the simple, and the necessary solu-  $\,$ 

tion of the Riddle of the Universe, there will be, in a sense, little

more for you to learn about the Theory of Magick.

You should, however, remember most constantly that the equation of the

Universe, however complex it may seem, inevitably reels out to Zero;

for to accomplish this is the formula of your Work as a  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Mystic}}.$  To

remind you, and to amplify certain points of the above, let me quote from Magick pp. 152-3 footnote 2. "All elements must at one time have been separate --- that would be the case with great heat. Now when atoms get to the sun, we get that immense extreme heat, and all the elements are themselves again. Imagine that each atom of each element possesses the memory of all his adventures in combination. By the way, that atom (fortified with that memory) would not be the same atom; yet it is, because it has gained nothing from anywhere except this memory. Therefore, by the lapse of time, and by virtue of memory, a thing could become something more than itself; thus a real development is possible. One can then see a reason for any element deciding to go through this series of incarnations, because so, and only so, can he go; and he suffers the lapse of memory which during these incarnations, because he knows he will come through unchanged. "Therefore you can have an infinite number of gods, individual and equal though diverse, each one supreme and utterly indestructible. This is also the only explanation of how a "Perfect Being" could create a world in which war, evil, etc., exist. God is only an appearance, because (like "good") it cannot affect the substance itself, but only multiply its combinations. This is something the same as mystic monotheism; but all parts of himself, so that their interplay is false. If we presuppose many elements, their interplay is natural. "It is no objection to this theory to ask who made the elements --- the elements are at least there, and God, when you look for him, is not there. Theism is obscurum per obscurius. A male star is built up from the centre outwards; a female from the circumference inwards. This is what is meant when we say that woman has no soul. It explains fully the difference between the sexes."

Every "act of love under will" has the dual result (1) the creation of

a child combining the qualities of its parents, (2) the withdrawal by

ecstasy into Nothingness. Please consult what I have elsewhere written

on "The Formula of Tetagrammaton;" the importance of this at the  $\ensuremath{\text{the}}$ 

moment is to show how 0 and 2 appear constantly in Nature as the  $\operatorname{\texttt{common}}$ 

Order of Events.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

CHAPTER VI

THE THREE SCHOOLS OF MAGICK (I)

45

Cara Soror,

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

Here is the first section of M. Gerard Aumont's promised essay28; it was

originally called "The Three Schools of Magick". (Don't be cross,

please, because it is not in the form of a personal letter!)

There is today much misunderstanding of the meaning of the term "Magick".

Many attempts have been made to define it, but perhaps the best for our

present purpose of historical-ideological exposition will be this  ${\mathord{\text{--}}}$ 

Magick is the Science of the Incommensurables.

This is one of the many restricted uses of the word; one suited to

the present purpose.

It is particularly to be noted that Magick, so often mixed up in the  $\,$ 

popular idea of a religion, has nothing to do with it. It is, in fact,

the exact opposite of religion; it is, even more than Physical Science, its irreconcilable enemy.

80

let us define this difference clearly.

Magick investigates the laws of Nature with the idea of making use of

them. It only differs from "profane" science by always keeping ahead

of it. As Fraser29 has shown, Magick is science in the tentative stage;

but it may be, and often is, more than this. It is science which, for  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

one reason or another, cannot be declared to the profane.

Religion, on the contrary, seeks to ignore the laws of Nature, or to

escape them by appeal to a postulated power which is assumed to have

laid them down. The religious man is, as such, incapable of understand-

ing what the laws of Nature really are. (They are generalizations from  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

the order of observed fact.)

The History of Magick has never been seriously attempted. For one

reason, only initiates pledged to secrecy know much about it; for

another, every historian has been talking about some more or less con-

ventional idea of Magick, not of the thing itself. But Magick has led

the world from before the beginning of history, if only for the reason

that Magick has always been the mother of Science. It is, therefore,

of extreme importance that some effort should be made to  ${\tt understand}$ 

something of the subject; and there is, therefore, no apology necessary

for essaying this brief outline of its historical aspects.

There have always been, at least in nucleus, three main Schools of

Philosophical practice. (We use the word "philosophical" in the old

good broad sense, as in the phrase "Philosophical Transactions of the  $\,$ 

Royal Society for the Advancement of Knowledge.")

It is customary to describe these three Schools as Yellow, Black, and

White. The first thing necessary is to warn the reader that they must

81

by no means be confounded with racial distinctions of colour; and they correspond still less with conventional symbols such as yellow caps, yellow robes, black magick, white witchcraft, and the like. The danger
28\* A few amendments - very few - have been necessitated by the lapse of time.
29^ WEH NOTE: Mention Fraser source, locate it in G.B.

46

is only the greater that these analogies are often as alluring as the prove on examination to be misleading.

These Schools represent three perfectly distinct and contrary theories

of the Universe, and, therefore, practices of spiritual science. The  $\,$ 

magical formula of each is as precise as a theorem of trigonometry.  $\label{eq:precise}$ 

Each assumes as fundamental a certain law of Nature, and the subject is  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

complicated by the fact that each School, in a certain sense, admits the  $\,$ 

formulae of the other two. It merely regards them as in some way incom-

plete, secondary, or illusory. Now, as will be seen later, the Yellow  $\,$ 

School stand aloof from the other two by the nature of its postulates.

But the Black School and the White are always more or less in active

conflict; and it is because just at this moment that
conflict is

approaching a climax that it is necessary to write this essay. The

adepts of the White School consider the present danger to mankind so  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

great that they are prepared to abandon their traditional policy of

silence, in order to enlist in their ranks the profane of every nation.

We are in possession of a certain mystical document 30 which we may

describe briefly, for convenience sake, as an Apocalypse of which we

82

hold the keys, thanks to the intervention of the Master who has appeared

at this grave conjuncture of Fate. This document consists of a series

of visions, in which we hear the various Intelligences whose nature it  $% \frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right$ 

would be hard to define, but who are at the very least endowed with

knowledge and power far beyond anything that we are accustomed to regard  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

as proper to the human race.

We must quote a passage from one of the most important of these documents.

The doctrine is conveyed, as is customary among Initiates, in the form

of a parable. Those who have attained even a mediocre degree of enlight-

enment are aware that the crude belief of the faithful, and the  $\operatorname{crude}$ 

infidelity of the scoffer, with regard to matters of fact, are merely

childish. Every incident in Nature, true or false, possesses a spiritual

significance. It is this significance, and only this significance, that

possesses any philosophical value to the Initiate.

The orthodox need not be shocked, and the enlightened need not be contemp-

tuous, to learn that the passage which we are about to quote, is a parable  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots,n\right\}$ 

based on the least decorous of the Biblical legends which refer to Noah.

It simply captures for its own purposes the convenience of Scripture.

(Here follows the excerpt from the Vision.)

"And a voice cries: Cursed be he that shall uncover the nakedness of

the Most High, for he is drunken upon the wine that is the blood of the

adepts. And BABALON hath lulled him to sleep upon her breast, and she

hath fled away, and left him naked, and she hath called her children  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

together saying: Come up with me, and let us make a mock of the naked-  $\,$ 

ness of the Most High.

"And the first of the adepts covered His shame with a cloth, walking

backwards, and was white. And the second of the adepts covered his

shame with a cloth, walking sideways, and was yellow,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

the adepts made a mock of His nakedness, walking forwards, and was black.

And these are the three great schools of the Magi, who are also the  $\,$ 

three Magi that journeyed unto Bethlehem; and because thou hast not

30\* Liber CDXVIII, The Vision and the Voice, edition with Introduction

and Commentary by 666. Thelema Publishing Co., Barstow, California.

47

wisdom, thou shalt not know which school prevaileth, or if the three schools be not one."

We are now ready to study the philosophical bases of these three Schools.

We must, however, enter a caveat against too literal an interpretation,

even of the parable. It may be suspected, for reasons which should be

apparent after further investigation of the doctrines of the Three

Schools, that this parable was invented by an Intelligence of the  ${\tt Black}$ 

School, who was aware of his iniquity, and thought to transform it into

righteousness by the alchemy of making a boast of it. The intelligent

reader will note the insidious attempt to identify the doctrine of the  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$ 

Black School with the kind of black magic  $\{sic\}$  that is commonly called

 $\ensuremath{\operatorname{Diabolism}}$  . In other words, this parable is itself an example of an

exceedingly subtle black magical operation, and the contemplation of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

such devices carried far enough beings us to an understanding of the  $\,$ 

astoundingly ophidian processes of Magicians. Let not the profane

reader dismiss such subtleties from his mind as negligible nonsense.

It is cunning of this kind that determines the price of potatoes.

The above digression is perhaps not so inexcusable as it may seem on a

first reading. Careful study of it should reveal the nature of the

84

thought-processes which are habitually used by the secret  ${\tt Masters}$  of

the human race to determine its destiny.

When everyone has done laughing, I will ask you to compare the real

effects produced on the course of human affairs by Caesar, Attila, and

Napoleon, on the one hand; of Plato, the Encyclopaedists, and Karl Marx31 on the other.

The Yellow School of Magick considers, with complete scientific and

philosophical detachment, the fact of the Universe as a fact. Being

itself apart of that Universe, it realizes its impotence to alter the

totality in the smallest degree. To put it vulgarly, it does not try to

raise itself from the ground by pulling at its socks. It therefore

opposes to the current of phenomena no reaction either of hatred or of

sympathy. So far as it attempts to influence the course of events at

all, it does so in the only intelligent way conceivable. It seeks to

diminish internal friction.

It remains, therefore, in a contemplative attitude. To use the terms

of Western philosophy, there is in its attitude something of the  ${\tt stoicism}$ 

of Zeno; or of the Pickwickianism, if I may use the term, of Epicurus.

The ideal reaction to phenomena is that of perfect elasticity. It

possesses something of the cold-bloodedness of mathematics; and for

this reason it seems fair to say, for the purposes of elementary study,

that Pythagoras is its most adequate exponent in European philosophy.

Since the discovery of Asiatic thought, however, we have no need to

take our ideas at second-hand. The Yellow School of Magick possesses

one perfect classic. The Tao Teh King32.

31\* It is interesting to note that the three greatest influences in the

world today are those of Teutonic Hebrews: Marx, Hertz, and Freud.

32\* Unfortunately there is no translation at present published which is

the work of an Initiate. All existing translations have been garbled by

people who simply failed to understand the text. An approximately per-

fect rendering is indeed available, but so far it exists only in  ${\tt manu-}$ 

script. One object of this letter is to create sufficient public interest

to make this work, and others of equal value available to the public.

48

It is impossible to find any religion which adequately represents the  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

thought of this masterpiece. Not only is religion as such repugnant to

science and philosophy, but from the very nature of the tenets of the

Yellow School, its adherents are not going to put themselves to any

inconvenience for the enlightenment of a lot of people whom they consider  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right$ 

to be hopeless fools.

At the same time, the theory of religion, as such, being a tissue of

falsehood, the only real strength of any religion is derived from its

pilferings of Magical doctrine; and, religious persons being by defini-

tion entirely unscrupulous, it follows that any given religion is likely

to contain scraps of Magical doctrine, filched more or less haphazard

from one school or the other as occasion serves.

Let the reader, therefore, beware most seriously of trying to get a

grasp of this subject by means of siren analogies. Taoism has as little  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

to do with the Tao Teh King as the Catholic Church with the Gospel.

The Tao Teh King inculcates conscious inaction, or rather unconscious

inaction, with the object of minimizing the disorder of the world.  $\ensuremath{\mathtt{A}}$ 

few quotations from the text should make the essence of the doctrine clear.

 $\ensuremath{\mathtt{X}}$  3 "Here is the Mystery of Virtue. It createth all and nourisheth

all; yet it doth not adhere to them. It operateth all; but

knoweth not of it, nor proclaimeth it; it directeth all, but

without conscious control."

XXII 2 "Therefore the sage concentrateth upon one Will, and it is as  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$ 

a light to the whole world. Hiding himself, he shineth;

 $\label{lem:withdrawing himself, he attracteth notice;} \\ \text{humbling himself,} \\$ 

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

not, no man may contend against him."

XLIII 1 "The softest substance hunteth down the hardest. The Unsub-  $\,$ 

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

Virtue of Inertia."

 $2\,\,$  "Few are they who attain: whose speech is Silence, whose

Work is Inertia."

attract it."

 $\tt XLVIII~3$  "He who attracteth to himself all that is under Heaven doth

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$  so without effort. He who maketh effort is not able to

LVIII 3 "The wise man is foursquare and avoideth aggression; his

corners do not injure others. He moveth in a straight line,

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

not blind with his brightness."

LXIII 2 "Do great things while they are yet small, hard things while  $\$ 

they are yet easy; for all things, how great or hard soever,

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{have}}$  a beginning when they are little and easy. So thus the

wise man accomplisheth the greatest tasks without undertaking

anything important."

{Keynote: This footnote is obsolete. The "Tao Teh King" was published

as "Equinox" III - 8, 1975 e.v. by H.P.S.}

49

LXXVI 2 "So then rigidity and hardness are the stigmata of death; elasticity and adaptability of life."

3 "He then who putteth forth strength is not victorious; even as a strong tree filleth the embrace."

4 "Thus the hard and rigid have the inferior place, the soft and elastic the superior."

Enough, I think, for this part of the essay.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

CHAPTER VII

THE THREE SCHOOLS OF MAGICK (2)

Cara Soror,

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

Hoping that you are now recovered from the devastating revelations in  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

the matter of the Yellow School, I must ask you to brace yourself for

disclosures even more formidable about the Black. Do not confuse with

the Black Lodge, or the Black Brothers. The terminology is unfortunate,

but it wasn't I that did it. Now then, to work!

The Black School of Magick, which must by no means be confused with the  $\,$ 

School of Black Magick or Sorcery, which latter is a perversion of the  $\,$ 

White tradition, is distinguished fundamentally from the Yellow School

in that it considers the Universe not as neutral, but as definitely a  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

curse. Its primary theorem is the "First Noble Truth" of the Buddha  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$ 

"Everything is Sorrow." In the primitive classics of this School the

idea of sorrow is confused with that of sin. (This idea of universal

lamentation is presumably responsible for the choice of black as its

symbolic colour. And yet? Is not white the Chinese hue of mourning?)

The analysis of the philosophers of this School refers every phenomenon

to the category of sorrow. It is quite useless to point out to them

that certain events are accompanied with joy: they continue their ruth-

less calculations, and prove to your satisfaction, or rather dissatis-  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

faction, that the more apparently pleasant an event is, the more

malignantly deceptive is its fascination. There is only one way of

escape even conceivable, and this way is quite simple, annihilation.

(Shallow critics of Buddhism have wasted a great deal of stupid ingenuity

on trying to make out that Nirvana or Nibbana means something different

from what etymology, tradition and the evidence of the  $\operatorname{Classics}$  combine

to define it. The word means, quite simply, cessation: and it stands

to reason that, if everything is sorrow, the only thing which is not

sorrow is nothing, and that therefore to escape from sorrow is the attain-  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

ment of nothingness.)

Western philosophy has on occasion approached this doctrine. It has at

least asserted that no known form of existence is exempt from sorrow.

50

Huxley says, in his Evolution and Ethics, "Suffering is the badge of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

all the tribe of sentient things."

The philosophers of this School, seeking, naturally enough, to amend the evil at the root, inquire into the cause of this existence which is sorrow, and arrive immediately at the 'Second Noble Truth' of the Buddha: "The Cause of Sorrow is Desire". They follow up with the endless concatenation of causes, of which the final root is Ignorance. (I am not concerned to defend the logic of this School: I merely state their doctrine.) The practical issue of all this is that every kind of action is both unavoidable and a crime. I must digress to explain that the confusion of thought in this doctrine is constantly recurrent. That is part of the blackness of the Ignorance which they confess to foundation of their Universe. (And after all, everyone has surely the right to have his own Universe the way he wants it.) This School being debased by nature, is not so far removed from conventional religion as either the White or the Yellow. Most primitive fetishistic religions may, in fact, be considered fairly faithful representatives of this philosophy. Where animism holds sway, the "medicine-man" personifies this universal evil, and seeks to propitiate it by human sacrifice. The early forms of Judaism, and that type of Christianity which we associate with the Salvation Army, Billy Sunday and the Fundamentalists of the back-blocks of America, are sufficiently simple cases of religion whose essence is the propitiation of a maliqnant demon. When the light of intelligence begins to dawn dimly through many fogs upon these savages, we reach a second stage. Bold spirits master courage to assert that the evil which is so obvious, is, in some mysterious way, an illusion. They thus throw back the whole complexity

of sorrow to a single cause; that is, the arising of the illusion aforesaid. The

problem then assumes a final form: How is that illusion to be destroyed.

A fairly pure example of the first stage of this type of thought is to

be found in the Vedas, of the second stage, in the Upanishads. But the

answer to the question, "How is the illusion of evil to be destroyed?",

depends on another point of theory. We may postulate a Parabrahm infi-  $\,$ 

nitely good, etc. etc., in which case we consider the destruction

of the illusion of evil as the reuniting of the consciousness with

Parabrahm. the unfortunate part of this scheme of things is that on

seeking to define Parabrahm for the purpose of returning to Its purity,

it is discovered sooner or later, that It possesses no qualities at all!

In other words, as the farmer said, on being shown the elephant: There

ain't no sich animile. It was Gautama Buddha who perceived the inutility

of dragging in this imaginary pachyderm. Since our Parabrahm, he said to

the Hindu philosophers, is actually nothing, why not stick to or original

perception that everything is sorrow, and admit that the only way to

escape from sorrow is to arrive at nothingness?

We may complete the whole tradition of the Indian peninsula very simply.

To the Vedas, the Upanishads, and the Tripitaka of the Buddhists, we

have only to add the Tantras of what are called the Vamacharya Schools.

Paradoxical as it may sound the Tantrics are in reality the most advanced

of the Hindus. Their theory is, in its philosophical ultimatum, a primi-

tive stage of the White tradition, for the essence of the Tantric cults

is that by the performance of certain rites of Magick, one does not only

escape disaster, but obtains positive benediction. The Tantric is not

51

obsessed by the will-to-die. It is a difficult business, no doubt, to

get any fun out of existence; but at least it is not impossible. In other words, he implicitly denies the fundamental proposition that existence is sorrow, and he formulates the essential postulate of the White School of Magick, that means exist by which the universal sorrow (apparent indeed to all ordinary observation) may be unmasked, even as at the initiatory rite of Isis in the ancient days of Kehm. There, a Neophyte presenting his mouth, under compulsion, to the pouting buttocks of the Goat of Mendez, found himself caressed by the chaste lips of a virginal priestess of that Goddess at the base of whose shrine is written that No man has lifted her veil. The basis of the Black philosophy is not impossibly mere climate, with its resulting etiolation of the native, its languid, bilious, anaemic, fever-prostrated, emasculation of the soul of man. We accordingly find few true equivalents of this School in Europe. In Greek philosophy there is no trace of any such doctrine. The poison in its foulest and most virulent form only entered with Christianity33. But even so, few men of any real eminence were found to take the axioms of pessimism seriously. Huxley, for all of his harping on the minor key, was an eupeptic Tory. The culmination of the Black philosophy is only found in Schopenhauer, and we may regard him as having been obsessed, on the one hand, by the despair born of that false scepticism which he learnt from the bankruptcy of Hume and Kant; on the other, by the direct obsession of the Buddhist documents to which he was one of the earliest Europeans to obtain access. He was, so to speak, driven to suicide by his own vanity, a parallel to Kiriloff in The Possessed of Dostoiewsky. We have, however, examples plentiful enough of religions deriving almost exclusively from the Black tradition in the different stages. We have already mentioned the Evangelical cults with their ferocious

devil-god

who creates mankind for the pleasure of damning it and forcing it to

crawl before him, while he yells with druken glee over the agony of his

only son34. But in the same class, we must place Christian Science, so

grotesquely afraid of pain, suffering and evil of every sort, that its

dupes can think of nothing better than to bleat denials of its actuality,

in the hope of hypnotizing themselves into anaesthesia.

Practically no Westerns have reached the third stage of the Black tradi-

tion, the Buddhist stage. It is only isolated mystics, and those  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{men}}$ 

who rank themselves with a contemptuous compliance under the standard  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

of the nearest religion, the one which will bother them least in their  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

quest of nothingness, who carry the sorites so far.

The documents of the Black School of Magick have already been indicated.

They are, for the most part, tedious to the last degree and repulsive to

every wholesome-minded man; yet it can hardly be denied that such books

as The Dhammapada and Ecclesiastes are masterpieces of literature. They  $\,$ 

represent the agony of human despair at its utmost degree of intensity,

and the melancholy contemplation which is induced by their perusal is

not favourable to the inception of that mood which should lead every  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

truly courageous intelligence to the determination to escape from the  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

33\* Anti-semite writers in Europe --- e.g. Weininger --- call the Black  $\,$ 

theory and practice Judaism, while by a curious confusion, the same ideas

are called Christian among Anglo-Saxons. In 1936 e.v. the "Nazi" School

began to observe this fact.

34\* N.B. Christianity was in its first stage a Jewish Communism, hardly

distinguishable from Marxism.

ferule of the Black Schoolmaster to the outstretched arms of the White

Mistress of Life.

Let us leave the sinister figure of Schopenhauer for the mysteriously

radiant shape of Spinoza! This latter philosopher, in respect at least

of his Pantheism, represents fairly enough the fundamental thesis of the  $\,$ 

White tradition. Almost the first observation that we have to make is

that this White tradition is hardly discoverable outside Europe. It

appears first of all in the legend of Dionysus. (In this connection

read carefully Browning's Apollo and the Fates.)

The Egyptian tradition of Osiris is not dissimilar. The central idea

of the White School is that, admitted that "everything is sorrow" for

the profane, the Initiate has the means of transforming it to "Every-

thing is joy". There is no question of any ostrich-ignoring of fact,

as in Christian Science. There is not even any more or less sophisti-

cated argument about the point of view altering the situation as in

 $\label{eq:contrary} \mbox{ We have, on the contrary, and attitude which was perhaps}$ 

first of all, historically speaking, defined by Zoroaster, "nature

teaches us, and the Oracles also affirm, that even the evil germs of
Matter may alike become useful and good." "Stay not on the

precipice with the dross of Matter; for there is a place for thine Image in a

realm ever splendid." "If thou extend the Fiery Mind to the work of

piety, thou wilt preserve the fluxible body."35

It appears that the Levant, from Byzantium and Athens to Damascus,

Jerusalem, Alexandria and Cairo, was preoccupied with the formulation

of this School in a popular religion, beginning in the days of Augustus

Caesar. For there are elements of this central idea in the works of

the Gnostics, in certain rituals of what Frazer conveniently calls the

Asiatic God, as in the remnants of the Ancient Egyptian cult. The  $\operatorname{doc-}$ 

trine became abominably corrupted in committee, so to speak and the

result was Christianity, which may be regarded as a White ritual over-

laid by a mountainous mass of Black doctrine, like the baby of the

mother that King Solomon non-suited.

We may define the doctrine of the White School in its purity in very simple terms.

Existence is pure joy. Sorrow is caused by failure to perceive this

fact; but this is not a misfortune. We have invented sorrow, which

does not matter so much after all, in order to have the exuberant satis-  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

faction of getting rid of it. Existence is thus a sacrament.

Adepts of the White School regard their brethren of the Black very much

as the aristocratic English Sahib (of the days when England was a nation)

regarded the benighted Hindu. Nietzsche expresses the philosophy of

this School to that extent with considerable accuracy and vigour. The

 $\mbox{\tt man}$  who denounces life merely defines himself as the  $\mbox{\tt man}$  who is unequal

to it. The brave man rejoices in giving and taking hard knocks, and the  $\,$ 

brave man is joyous. The Scandinavian idea of Valhalla may be primitive,

but it is manly. A heaven of popular concert, like the Christian; of

unconscious repose, like the Buddhist; or even of sensual enjoyment, like

the Moslem, excites his nausea and contempt. He understands that the  $\,$ 

only joy worth while is the joy of continual victory, and victory itself

would become as tame as croquet if it were not spiced by equally contin-

 $35\,^{\star}$  This passage appears to be a direct hint at the Formula of the IXØ

O.T.O., and the preparation of the Elixir of Life.

ual defeat.

The purest documents of the White School are found in the Sacred Books

of Thelema. The doctrine is given in excellent perfection both in the

book of the Heart Girt with the Serpent and the book of Lapis Lazuli.

A single passage is adequate to explain the formula.

7. Moreover I beheld a vision of a river. There was a little boat  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

 $\qquad \qquad \text{thereon; and in it under purple sails was a golden} \\ \text{woman, an} \\$ 

image of Asi wrought in finest gold. Also the river was of

blood, and the boat of shining steel. Then I loved her; and,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

loosing my girdle, cast myself into the stream.

8. I gathered myself into the little boat, and for many days and  $\,$ 

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

- 9. Yea! I gave her of the flower of my youth.
- 10. But she stirred not; only by my kisses I defiled her so that  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$

she turned to blackness before me.

- 11. Yet I worshipped her, and gave her of the flower of  $\operatorname{\mathsf{my}}$  youth.

before me. Almost I cast myself into the stream.

13. Then at the end appointed her body was whiter than the milk of

the stars, and her lips red and warm as the sunset, and her

life of a white heat like the heat of the midmost  $\sup$ .

14. Then rose she up from abyss of Ages of Sleep, and her body  $\,$ 

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

15. The river also became the river of Amrit, and the little boat

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$  was the chariot of the flesh, and the sails thereof the blood

of the heart that beareth me, that beareth me.

Liber

LXV, Cap. II.

We find even in profane literature this doctrine of the White School of Magick: -

O Buddha! couldst thou nowhere rest
A pivot for the universe?

Must all things be alike confessed

Mere changes rung upon a curse?

I swear by all the bliss of blue

My Phryne with her powder on
Is just as false - and just as true 
As your disgusting skeleton.

Each to his taste: if you prefer
 This loathly brooding on Decay;
I call it Growth, and lovelier
 Than all the glamours of the day.

You would not dally with Doreen

Because her fairness was to fade,

54

Because you know the things unclean

That go to make a mortal maid.

Aspasia may skin me close,
And Lais load me with disease.
Poor pleasures, bitter bargains, these?
I shall despise Diogenes.

Follow your fancy far enough!

At last you surely come to God.

There is thus in this School no attempt to deny that Nature is, as Zoroaster said, "a fatal and evil force"; but Nature is, so to speak, "the First Matter of the Work", which is to be transmuted into gold.

The joy is a function of our own part in this alchemy. For this reason

we find the boldest and most skillful adepts deliberately seeking out

the most repugnant elements of Nature that their triumph may be the

greater. The formula is evidently one of dauntless courage. It expresses

the idea of vitality and manhood in its most dynamic sense.

The only religion which corresponds to this School at all is that of

ancient Egypt; possibly also that of Chaldea. This is because those

religious component of them is negligible. So far as it exists, it  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{exists}}$ 

exists only for the uninitiate.

There are, however, traces of the beginning of the influence of the

School in Judaism and in Paganism. There are, too, certain documents  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

of the pure Greek spirit which bear traces of this. It is what they  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\}$ 

called Theurgy.

The Christian religion in its simplest essence, by that idea of over-

coming evil through a Magical ceremony, the Crucifixion, seems at first

sight a fair example of the White tradition; but the idea of sin and

of propitiation tainted it abominably with Blackness. There have been,

however, certain Christian thinkers who have taken the bold logical step  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

of regarding evil as a device of God for exercising the joys of combat

and victory. This is, of course, a perfectly White doctrine; but it

is regarded as the most dangerous of heresies. (Romans VI. 1,2, et al.)

For all that, the idea is there. The Mass itself is essentially a

typical White ritual. Its purpose is to transform crude matter directly  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

into Godhead. It is thus a cardinal operation of Talismanic Magick. But

the influence of the Black School has corroded the idea with theological

accretions, metaphysical on the one hand, and superstitious on the other,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right$ 

so completely as to mask the Truth altogether.

At the Reformation, we find a nugatory attempt to remove the Black ele-

ment. The Protestant thinkers did their best to get rid of the idea of

 $\sin$ , but it was soon seen that the effort could only lead to antinomian-

ism; and they recognized that this would infallibly destroy the religious idea as such.

55

 ${\tt Mysticism}\,,$  both Catholic and Protestant, made a further attempt to free

Christianity from the dark cloud of iniquity. They joined hands with

the Sufis and the Vedantists. But this again led to the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{mere}}$  denial of

the reality of evil. Thus drawing away, little by little, from clear

appreciation of the facts of Nature, their doctrine became purely

theoretical, and faded away, while the thundercloud of  $\sin$  settled down

more heavily than ever.

The most important of all the efforts of the White School, from an  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{exo}}\xspace$ 

teric point of view, is Islam. In its doctrine there is some slight

taint, but much less than in Christianity. It is a virile religion.

It looks facts in the face, and admits their horror; but it proposes

to overcome them by sheer dint of manhood. Unfortunately, the  $\operatorname{meta-}$ 

physical conceptions of its quasi-profane Schools are grossly material-

istic. It is only the Pantheism of the Sufis which eliminates the

conception of propitiation; and, in practice, the Sufis are too closely

allied to the Vedantists to retain hold of reality.

That will be all for the present.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

CHAPTER VIII

## THE THREE SCHOOLS OF MAGICK (3)

Cara Soror,

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

It has been a long --- I hope not too tedious --- voyage; but at last the harbour is in sight.

Our Essay approaches its goal; the theory of Life to which initiation tends.

Let us continue!

There is in history only one movement whose object has been to organize

the isolated adepts of the White School of Magick, and this movement

was totally unconnected with religion, except in so far as it lent its

influence to the reformers of the Christian church. Its appeal was not

at all to the people. It merely offered to open up relations with, and

communicate certain practical secrets of wisdom to, isolated  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{men}}$  of

science through Europe. This movement is generally known by the

name of Rosicrucianism.

The word arouses all sorts of regrettable correspondences; but the

adepts of the Society have never worried themselves in the least about

the abuse of their name for the purposes of charlatanism, or about the  $% \frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right$ 

attacks directed against them by envious critics. Indeed, so wisely

have they concealed their activities that some modern scholars of the  $\,$ 

shallower type have declared that no such movement ever existed, that

it was a kind of practical joke played upon the curiosity of the credu-

lous Middle Ages. It is at least certain that, since the original

proclamations, no official publications have been put forward. The  $\,$ 

essential secrets have been maintained inviolate. If, during the last

few years, a considerable number of documents have been published by

them, though not in their name, it is on account of the impending  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{crisis}}$ 

to civilization, of which mention will later be made.

There is no good purpose, even were there license, to discuss the nature

of the basis of scientific attainment which is the core of the doctrines

of the Society. It is only necessary to point out that its correspondence

with alchemy is the one genuine fact on the subject which has been allowed

to transpire; for the Rosicrucian, as indicated by his central symbol,

the barren cross on which he has made a rose to flower, occupies  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{him}}$ -

self primarily with spiritual and physiological alchemy. Taking for

"The First Matter of the Work" a neutral or inert substance (it is con-

stantly described as the commonest and least valued thing on earth, and

may actually connote any substance whatever) he deliberately poisons it,

so to speak, bringing it to a stage of transmutation generally called

the Black Dragon, and he proceeds to work upon this virulent poison until

he obtains the perfection theoretically possible.

Incidentally, we have an almost precise parallel with this operation in

modern bacteriology. The apparently harmless bacilli of a disease are

cultivated until they become a thousand times more virulent than at

first, and it is from this culture that is prepared the vaccine which

is an efficacious remedy for all the possible ravages of that kind of micro-organism.

. . . .

We have been obliged to expose, perhaps at too considerable a length,

the main doctrines of the three Schools. The task, however tedious,

has been necessary in order to explain with reasonable lucidity their

connection with the world which their ideas direct; that is to say,

the nature of their political activities.

The Yellow School, in accordance with its doctrine of perfectly elastic

reaction and non-interference, holds itself, generally speaking, entirely

apart from all such questions. We can hardly imagine it sufficiently

interested in any events soever to react aggressively. It feels strong

enough to deal satisfactorily with anything that may turn  $\ensuremath{\text{up}}\xspace\colon$  and

generally speaking, it feels that any conceivable action on its part

would be likely to increase rather than to diminish the mischief.

It remains somewhat contemptuously aloof from the eternal conflict of

the Black School with the White. At the same time, there is a certain

feeling among the Yellow adepts that should either of these Schools

become annihilated, the result might well be that the victor would

sooner or later turn his released energy against themselves.

In accordance, therefore, with their general plan of non-action, as

expressed in the Tao Teh King, of dealing with mischief before it

has become too strong to be dangerous, they interfere gently from time to  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

time to redress the balance.

During the last two generations the Masters of the Yellow School have

been compelled to take notice of the progressive ruin of the  $\mbox{White}$ 

adepts. Christianity, which possessed at least the semblance of  $\boldsymbol{a}$ 

White formula, is in the agonies of decomposition, even before it is

57

actually dead. Materialistic science has overwhelmed the faith and

102

hope of the Christians (they never possessed any charity to overwhelm)

with a demonstration of the sorrow, transitoriness and cruel futility

of the Universe. A vast wave of pessimism has engulfed the fortress of Mansoul.

It was indeed a deadly blow to the adepts of the White School when

Science, their own familiar friend in whom they trusted, lifted up

his heel against them. It was in this conjuncture that the Yellow

adepts sent forth into the Western world a messenger, Helena Petrowna

Blavatsky, with the distinct mission to destroy, on the one hand, the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

crude schools of Christianity, and, on the other, to eradicate the  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

materialism from Physical Science. She made the necessary connection

with Edward Maitland and Anna Kingsford, who were trying rather

helplessly to put the exoteric formulae of the White School into th

hands of students, and with the secret representatives of the Rosicru-

cian Brotherhood. It is not for us in this place to estimate the

degree of success with which she carried out her embassy; but at

least we see today that Physical Science is at last penetrating to the

spiritual basis of material phenomena. The work of Henry PoincarŠ,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right$ 

Einstein, Whitehead, and Bertrand Russell is sufficient evidence of this fact.

Christianity, too, has fallen into a lower degree of contempt than

ever. Realizing that it was moribund, it made a supreme and  $\operatorname{suicidal}$ 

effort, and plunged into the death-spasm of the first worldwar. It

was too far corrupt to react to the injections of the White formula

which might have saved it. We see today that Christianity is more

bigoted, further divorced from reality, than ever. In some countries

it has again become a persecuting church.

With horrid glee the adepts of the Black School looked on at these

atrocious paroxysms. But it did more. It marshalled its forces quietly, and prepared to clean up the debris of the

battlefields. It

is at present (1924 e.v.) pledged to a supreme attempt to chase the  $\,$ 

manly races from their spiritual halidom. (The spasm still [1945 e.v.]  $\,$ 

continues; note well the pro-German screams of Anglican Bishops, and  $\,$ 

the intrigues of the Vatican.)

The Black School has always worked insidiously, by treachery. We need

then not be surprised by finding that its most notable representative

was the renegade follower of Blavatsky, Annie Besant, and that she was  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

charged by her Black masters with the mission of persuading the world

to accept for its Teacher a negroid36 Messiah. To make the humiliation

more complete, a wretched creature was chosen who, to the most loath-  $\,$ 

some moral qualities, added the most fatuous imbecility. And then blew up!

This, then, is the present state of the war of the Three Schools. We  $\begin{tabular}{ll} \end{tabular} \begin{tabular}{ll} \end{tabular} \b$ 

cannot suppose that humanity is so entirely base as to accept Krishna-

murti; yet that such a scheme could ever have been conceived is a

symptom of the almost hopeless decadence of the White School37. The  $\,$ 

 $36\ensuremath{^{\circ}}$  WEH NOTE: Inject something about Krishnamurti here, and soften the racial

remark made above.

37\* Note. This passage was written in 1924 e.v. The Master Therion arose

and smote him. What seemed a menace is now hardly even a memory.

58

Black adepts boast openly that they have triumphed all along the line.

Their formula has attained the destruction of all positive qualities.

It is only one step to the stage when the annihilation of all life and

thought will appear as a fatal necessity. The materialism and vital  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

scepticism of the present time, its frenzied rush for pleasure in total

disregard of any idea of building for the future, testifies to a condi-

tion of complete moral disorder, of abject spiritual anarchy.

The White School has thus been paralysed. We are reminded of the spider  $\,$ 

described by Fabre, who injects her victims with a poison which paralyzes

them without killing them, so that her own young may find fresh meat.

And this is what is going to happen in Europe and America unless some-

thing is done about it, and done in very short order.

The Yellow School could not remain impassive spectators of the abomina-

tions. Madame Blavatsky was a mere forerunner. They, in conjunction

with the Secret Chiefs of the White School in Europe, Chiefs who had

been compelled to suspend all attempts at exoteric enlightenment by the

general moral debility which had overtaken the races from which they  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

drew their adepts, have prepared a guide for mankind. This man, of an

extreme moral force and elevation, combined with a profound sense of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

worldly realities, has stood forth in an attempt to save the  $\mbox{White School}$ ,

to rehabilitate its formula, and to fling back from the bastions of moral

freedom the howling savages of pessimism. Unless his appeal is heard,

unless there comes a truly virile reaction against the creeping atrophy

which is poisoning them, unless they enlist to the last man under his  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

standard, a great decisive battle will have been lost.

This prophet of the White School, chosen by its Masters and his brethren,

to save the Theory and Practice, is armed with a sword far mightier than  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

Excalibur. He has been entrusted with a new Magical formula, one which

can be accepted by the whole human race. Its adoption will strengthen

the Yellow School by giving a more positive value to their Theory; while

leaving the postulates of the Black School intact, it will transcend them  $\,$ 

and raise their Theory and Practice almost to the level of the Yellow.

As to the White School, it will remove from them all taint of poison of

the Black, and restore vigour to their central formula of spiritual al-

chemy by giving each man an independent ideal. It will put an end to  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

the moral castration involved in the assumption that each  $\operatorname{man}$ , whatever

his nature, should deny himself to follow out a fantastic and impracti-  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

cable ideal of goodness. Incidentally, this formula will save Physical

Science itself by making negligible the despair of futility, the vital

scepticism which has emasculated it in the past. It shows that the joy

of existence is not in a goal, for that indeed is clearly unattainable,

but in the going itself.

This law is called the Law of Thelema. It is summarized in the four  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

words, "Do what thou wilt."

It should not be necessary to explain that a full appreciation of this

message is not to be obtained by a hasty examination. It is essential

to study it from every point of view, to analyse it with the  ${\tt keenest}$ 

philosophical acumen, and finally to apply it as a key for every problem,

internal and external, that exists. This key, applied with skill, will open every lock.

open every lock.

From the deepest point of view, the greatest value of this formula is

that it affords, for the first time in history, a basis of reconciliation

59

between the three great Schools of Magick. It will tend to appease the

eternal conflict by understanding that each type of thought shall go on

106

its own way, develop its own proper qualities without seeking to inter-

fere with other formulae, however (superficially) opposed to its own.

What is true for every School is equally true for every individual.

Success in life, on the basis of the Law of Thelema, implies severe

self-discipline. Each being must progress, as biology teaches, by

strict adaptation to the conditions of the organism. If, as the  ${\sf Black}$ 

School continually asserts, the cause of sorrow is desire, we can still  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{$ 

escape the conclusion by the Law of Thelema. What is necessary is not

to seek after some fantastic ideal, utterly unsuited to our real needs,

but to discover the true nature of those needs, to fulfill them, and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

rejoice therein.

This process is what is really meant by initiation; that is to say, the

going into oneself, and making one's peace, so to speak, with all the  $\,$ 

forces that one finds there.

It is forbidden here to discuss the nature of The Book of the Law, the

Sacred Scripture of Thelema. Even after forty years of close expert

examination, it remains to a great extent mysterious; but the little

we know of it is enough to show that it is a sublime synthesis of all

Science and all ethics. It is by virtue of this Book that  $\mbox{\tt man}\mbox{\tt may}$ 

attain a degree of freedom hitherto never suspected to be possible, a

spiritual development altogether beyond anything hitherto known; and.

what is really more to the point, a control of external nature which

will make the boasted achievements of the last century appear no more  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

than childish preliminaries to an incomparably mighty manhood.

It has been said by some that the Law of Thelema appeals only to the

,lite of humanity. No doubt here is this much in that assertion, that

only the highest can take full advantage of the extraordinary opportuni-

ties which it offers. At the same time, "the Law is for all." Each in

and to develop it in freedom. It is by this means that the  $\mbox{\sc White School}$ 

of Magick can justify its past, redeem its present, and assure its

future, by guaranteeing to every human being a life of Liberty and of Love.

Such, then, are the words of G,rard Aumont. I should not like to endorse

every phrase; but the whole exposition is so masterly in its terse, tense  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right$ 

vigour, and so unrivalled by any other document at  $my\ disposal,\ that\ I$ 

thought it best to let you have it in its own original form, with only

those few alterations which lapse of time has made necessary.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

107

666

P.S. Our own School unites the ruby red of Blood with the gold of the

Sun. It combines the best characteristics of the Yellow and the  $\mbox{White}$ 

Schools. In the light of M. Aumont's exposition, it is easy to under-stand.

To us, every phenomenon is an Act of Love, Every experience is necessary,

60

is a Sacrament, is a means of Growth. Hence, "...existence is pure joy;..."

(AL II, 9) "A feast every day in your hearts in the joy of my rapture!

A feast every night unto Nu, and the pleasure of uttermost delight!  $\mbox{\ensuremath{^{"}}}$ 

(AL II, 42-43).

Let this soak in!

CHAPTER IX

## THE SECRET CHIEFS

Cara Soror,

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

Very glad I am, since at one time I was obliged to be starkly stern

about impertinent curiosity, to note that your wish to be informed about

the Secret Chiefs of the A.'.A.'. is justified; it is most certainly of

the first importance that you and I should be quite clear in our minds  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

about Those under whose jurisdiction and tutelage we both work.

The question is beset with thickets of tough thorn; what is worse, the

path is so slippery that nothing is easier than to tumble head first  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

into the spikiest bush of them all.

You justly remind me that one of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  earliest slogans was "Mystery is the

enemy of Truth;" how then is it what I acquiesce in the policy of con-

cealment in a matter so cardinal?

Perhaps the best plan is for me to set down the facts of the case, so

far as is possible, from them it may appear that no alternative policy is feasible.

The first condition of membership of the A.'.A.'. is that one is sworn

to identify one's own Great Work with that of raising mankind to higher  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

levels, spiritually, and in every other way.

Accordingly, it stands to reason that those charged with the conduct of

the Order should be at least Masters of the Temple, or their judgment  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

would be worthless, and at least Magi (though not that particular kind

of Magus who brings the Word of a New Formula to the world every 2,000

years of so) or they would be unable to influence events on any scale  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

commensurate with the scope of the Work.

Of what nature is this Power, this Authority, this Understanding, this Wisdom --- Will?

(I go up from Geburah to Chokmah.)

Of the passive side it is comparatively easy to form some idea; for the qualities essential are mainly extensions of those that all of us possess in some degree. And whether Understanding - Wisdom is "right" or "wrong" must be largely a matter of opinion; often Time only can decide such points.

But for the active side it is necessary to postulate the existence of a form of Energy at their disposal which is able "to cause change to occur in conformity with the Will" --- one definition of "Magick".

61

Now this, as you know, is an exceedingly complex subject; its theory is tortuous, and its practice encompassed with every kind of difficulty.

Is there no simple method?

Yes: the thaumaturgic engine disposes of a type of energy more adaptable than Electricity itself, and both stronger and subtler than this, its analogy in the world of profane science. One might say, that it is electrical, or at least one of the elements in the "Ringformula" of modern Mathematical Physics.

In the R.R. et A.C., this is indicated to the Adept Minor by the title conferred upon him on his initiation to that grade: Hodos Camelionis:
--- the Path of the Chameleon. (This emphasizes the omnivalence of the force.) In the higher degrees of O.T.O. --- the A.'.A.'. is not fond of

terms like this, which verge on the picturesque --- it is usually called "the Ophidian Vibrations", thus laying special stress upon its serpentine strength, subtlety, its control of life and death, and its power to insinuate itself into any desired set of circumstances. It is of this universally powerful weapon that the Secret Chiefs must be supposed to possess complete control. They can induce a girl to embroider a tapestry, or initiate a political movement to culminate in a world-war; all in pursuit of some plan wholly beyond the purview or the comprehension of the deepest and subtlest thinkers. (It should go without saying that the adroit use of these vibrations enables one to perform all the classical "miracles.") These powers are stupendous: they seem almost beyond imagination to conceive.

"Hic ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono; Imperium sine fine dedi."

as Vergil, that mighty seer and magician of Rome at her perihelion says in his First Book of the Aenead. (Vergil whose every line is also an Oracle, the leaves of his book more sacred, more significant, more sure than those of the Cumaean Sibyl!)

These powers move in dimensions of time and space quite other than those with which we are familiar. Their values are incomprehensible to us.

To a Secret Chief, wielding this weapon, "The nice conduct of a clouded

cane" might be infinitely more important than a war, famine and pesti-

lence such as might exterminate a third part of the race, to promote

whose welfare is the crux of His oath, and the sole reason of His existence!

But who are They?

Since They are "invisible" and "inaccessible," may They not merely be

figments invented by a self-styled "Master," not quite sure of himself, to prop his tottering Authority? Well, the "invisible" and "inaccessible" criticism may equally be 62 leveled at Captain A. and Admiral B. of the Naval Intelligence Department. These "Secret Chiefs" keep in the dark for precisely the same reasons; and these qualities disappear instantaneously the moment They want to get hold of you. It is written, moreover, "Let my servants be few & secret: they shall rule the many & the known." (AL I, 10) But are They then men, in the usual sense of the word? They may be incarnate or discarnate: it is a matter of Their convenience. Have They attained Their position by passing through all the grades of the A.'.A.'.? Yes and no: the system which was given to me to put forward is only one of many. "Above the Abyss" all these technical wrinkles are ironed out. One man whom I suspect of being a Secret Chief has hardly any acquaintance with the technique of our system at all. That he accepts The Book of the Law is almost his only link with my work. That, and his use of the Ophidian Vibrations: I don't know which of us at it, but I am sure that he must be a very long way ahead of me if he is one of Them.

You have already in these pages and elsewhere in my writings examples numerous and varied of the way in which They work. The list is far

from complete. The matters of Ab-ul-Diz and of Amalantrah show one

method of communication; then there is the way of direct
"inspiration,"

as in the case of "Hermes Eimi" in New Orleans38.

Again, They may send an ordinary living man, whether one of Themselves

or no I cannot feel sure, to instruct me in some task, or to set me

right when I have erred. Then there have been messages conveyed by

natural objects, animate or inanimate39. Needless to say, the outstand-

ing example in my life is the whole Plan of Campaign concerning The

Book of the Law. But is Aiwaz a man (presumably a Persian or Assyrian)

and a "Secret Chief," or is He an "angel" in the sense that Gabriel is

an angel? Is Ab-ul-Diz an Adept who can project himself into the aura

of some woman with whom I happen to be living, although she has no pre-

vious experience of the kind, or any interest in such matters at all?

Or is He a being whose existence is altogether beyond this plane, only

adopting human appearance and faculties in order to make  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{\text{Himself}}}$  sensible

and intelligible to that woman?

I have never attempted to pursue any such enquiry. It was not forbidden;

and yet I felt that it was! I always insisted, of course, on the strict-

est proof that He actually possessed the authority claimed by  $\operatorname{Him}\!:\,\,\operatorname{But}$ 

I felt is improper to assume any other initiative. Just a point of good manners, perhaps?

You ask whether, contact once made,  $\ \mbox{I}$  am able to renew it should  $\mbox{I}$  so

wish. Again, yes and no. But the real answer is that no such gesture  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

on my part can ever be necessary. For one thing, the "Chief" is so far

38\* I will remember to give you details of these incidents when the  $\,$ 

occasion arises.

 $39\,^{\star}\,$  One thing I regard from my own experience as certain: when you call,

They come. The circumstances usually show that the call had been fore-

seen, and preparations made to answer it, long before it was made. But

I suppose in some way the call has to justify the making.

63

above me that I can rely on  $\mathop{\mbox{\rm Him}}$  to take the necessary steps, whenever

contact would be useful; for another, there is one path always open

which is perfectly sufficient for all possible contingencies.

Elsewhere I will explain why they picked out so woebegone a ragamuffin  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

as myself to proclaim the Word of the Aeon, and do all the chores appur-

tenant to that particular Work.

The Burden is heavier as the years go by; but --- Perdurabo.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

P.S. Reading this typescript over for "literals," it struck me that you

would ask, very reasonably: "But if the Secret Masters have these bound-

less powers, why do They allow you to be plagued by printers, held up

for lack of secretaries, worried by all sorts of practical problems?

. . . Why, in a word, does anything ever go wrong?"

There are several lines of reply; coalescing, they suffice:

- 1. What is "wrong?" Since four wars is Their idea of "right," you may
- well ask by what standard you may judge events.
- 2. Their Work is creative; They operate on the dull mass of  $\operatorname{unrealized}$

possibilities. Thus they meet, firstly, the opposition of  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{Inertia}};$ 

secondly, the recoil, the reaction, the rebound.

3. Things theoretically feasible are practically impossible when (a)

desirable though their accomplishment may be, it is not the one feat

essential to the particular Work in hand and the moment; (b) the sum total of available energy being used up by that special task, there is none available for side-issues; (c) the opposition, passive or active.

is too strong, temporarily, to overcome.

More largely, one cannot judge how a plan is progressing when one has no precise idea what it is. A soldier is told to "attack;" he may be intended to win through, to cover a general retreat, or to gain time by deliberate sacrifice. Only the Commander in Chief knows what the order means, or why he issues it; and even he does not know the

issue, or whether it will display and justify his military skill and

judgment.

Our business is solely to obey orders: our responsibility ends when we have satisfied ourselves that they emanate from a source which has the

P.P.S. A visitor's story has just reminded me of the possibility that I am a Secret Chief myself without knowing it: for I have sometimes been recognized by other people as having acted as such,

though I was

not aware of the fact at the time.

CHAPTER X

right to command.

THE SCOLEX SCHOOL

64

Cara Soror,

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

You actually want to know how to distinguish gold from copper pyrites40 ---"fool's gold" they called it in '49 California --- no! I wasn't there ---

or "absolute" alcohol and --- Liqueur Whisky from "alki" (commercial alcohol see Jack London's The Princess, a magnificent story --don't miss it!) and Wartime Scotch as sold in most British pubs in 1944, era vulgari. One pretty good plan is to take a masterpiece, pick out a page at random, translate it into French or German or whatever language you like best, walk around your chair three times (so as to forget the English) and then translate it back again. You will gather a useful impression of the value of the masterpiece by noticing the kind of difficulty that arises in the work of translation; more, by observing the effect produced on you by reading over the result; and finally, by estimating the re-translation; has the effect of the original been enhanced by the work done on it? Has it become more lucid? Has it actually given you the information which it purported to do? (I am giving you credit for very unusual ability; this test is not easy to make; and, obviously, you may have spoilt the whole composition, especially where its value depends on its form rather than on its substance. But we are not considering poetry, or poetic prose; all we want is intelligible meaning.) It does not follow that a passage is nonsensical because you fail to understand it; it may simply be too hard for you. When Bertrand Russell writes "We say that a function R is 'ultimately Q-convergent à' if there is a member y of the converse domain of R and the field of Q such that the value of the function for the argument y and for any argument to which y has the relation Q is a member of à." Do we? But you do not doubt that if you were to learn the meaning of all these unfamiliar terms, you would be able to follow his thought. Now take a paragraph from an "occult teacher."

What's more, I'll give you wheat, not tares; it seems terrifyingly easy for sound instruction to degenerate in to a "pi-jaw." Here

goes!

"To don Nirmanakaya's humble robe is to forego eternal bliss for

self, to help on man's salvation. To reach Nirvana's bliss but to

renounce it, is the supreme, the final step --- the highest on  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Renun}}\xspace$ 

ciation's Path."

Follows a common-sense comment by Frater O.M.

"All this about Gautama Buddha having renounced Nirvana is apparently

all a pure invention of Mme. Blavatsky, and has no authority in the  $\,$ 

Buddhist canon. The Buddha is referred to, again and again, as having

'passed away by that kind of passing away which leaves nothing what-

 $40^{\circ}$  WEH NOTE: If Homer can nod, so can Crowley. The mineral called fool's

gold is actually iron pyrites, not copper. It has a brassy look, and that  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

might account for this error.

65

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

 ${\tt Mahaparinibbana\ Sutta;}\ {\tt and\ it\ was\ the\ contention\ of\ the\ Toshophists}$ 

that this 'great, sublime Nibbana story' was something peculiar to

Gautama Buddha. They began to talk about Parinibbana, super-Nibbana,

as if there were some way of subtracting one from one which would  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

leave a higher, superior kind of a nothing, or as if there were some  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

way of blowing out a candle which would leave Moses in a much more  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

Egyptian darkness than we ever supposed when we were children.

"This is not science. This is not business. This is  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{American}}$  Sun-

day journalism. The Hindu and the American are very much alike in  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

this innocence, this 'naivet,' which demands fairy stories with ever

bigger giants. They cannot bear the idea of anything being complete

and done with. So, they are always talking in superlatives, and are

hard put to it when the facts catch up with them, and they have to

invent new superlatives. Instead of saying that there are bricks of

various sizes, and specifying those sizes, they have a brick and a  $\!\!\!$ 

super-brick, and 'one' brick, and 'some' brick; and
when they have

got to the end they chase through the dictionary for some other  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

epithet to brick, which shall excite the sense of wonder at the  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$ 

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

public with this word --- which is supposed to have been made. Probably

the whole thing is a bluff without a single fact behind it. Almost

the whole of the Hindu psychology is an example of this  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{kind}}$  of

journalism. They are not content with the supreme  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{\textsc{God}}}.$  The other

 $\mbox{\sc man}$  wishes to show off by having a supremer  $\mbox{\sc God}$  than that, and when

a third man comes along and finds them disputing, it is up to him to

invent a supremest super-God.

"It is simply ridiculous to try to add to the definition of Nibbana

by this invention of Parinibbana, and only talkers busy themselves

with these fantastic speculations. The serious student minds his  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

own business, which is the business in hand. The President of a  $\ensuremath{\,}^{}$ 

Corporation does not pay his bookkeeper to make a statement of the  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

countless billions of profit to be made in some future year. It

requires no great ability to string a row of zeros after a signifi-

cant figure until the ink runs out. What is wanted is the actual  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

balance of the week.

"The reader is most strongly urged not to permit himself to indulge

in fantastic flights of thought, which are the poison of the  $\mbox{\ensuremath{\text{mind}}}\,,$ 

because they represent an attempt to run away from reality, a dis-

 $\,$  persion of energy and a corruption of moral strength. His business

is, firstly, to know himself; secondly, to order and control  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{him}}\xspace-$ 

self; thirdly, to develop himself on sound organic lines little by

little. The rest is only leather and prunella.

"There is, however, a sense in which the service of humanity is  $% \left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac$ 

necessary to the completeness of the Adept. He is not to fly away  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

too far.

"Some remarks on this course are given in the note to the next verse.

"The student is also advised to take note of the conditions of member-

ship of the A.'.A.'.". (Equinox III, Supplement pp. 57 - 59).

So much for the green tree; now for the dry!

66

We come down to the average popular "teacher," the mere humbug. Read this: ---

"One day quite soon an entirely different kind of electricity will  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

be discovered which will bring as many profound changes into human

living as the first type did. This new electricity will move in a  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

finer ether than does our familiar kind, and thus w

CHAPTER XVI

## ON CONCENTRATION

Cara Soror,

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

You wisely ask me for a special letter on Concentration; you point out

that I have implied it constantly, but never given plain instruction.

It hope I have not been so vague as to allow you to suppose that Concen-

tration Camps are evidence that benevolent and enlightened governments

are at last seriously concerned to educate the world to Yoga; but I do

agree that it cannot do great harm if I take a dose of my own medicine,

and gather into one golden sheaf all the ripe corn of my wisdom on this subject.

For concentration does indeed unlock all doors; it lies at the heart of

every practice as it is of the essence of all theory; and almost all  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$ 

the various rules and regulations are aimed at securing adeptship in

this matter. All the subsidiary work --- awareness, one-pointedness, mind-

fullness and the rest --- is intended to train you to this.

All the greetings, salutations, "Saying Will," periodical adorations, even

saying "apo pantos kakodaimonos" with a downward and outward sweep of the  $\,$ 

arm, the eyes averted, when one sees a person dressed in a religious

(Christian) uniform: all these come under "Don't stroke the cat the wrong  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

way!" or, in the modern pseudo-scientific journalese jargon
"streamlining
life."

Let us see if Frater Perdurabo has anything to the point! Of course,

Part I of Book 4 is devoted to it; but there is too much, and not enough,

to be useful to us just now.

What your really need is the official Instruction in The Equinox, and the

very fullest and deepest understanding of Eight Lectures on Yoga; but

these lectures are so infernally interesting that when I look into the

book for something to quote, it carries me away with it. I can't put it

down, I forget all about this letter. Rather a back-handed advertisement

for Concentration!

The best way is the hardest; to forget all this and start from the begin-

ning as if there had never been anything on the subject written before.

I must keep always in mind that you are assumed to know nothing whatever

about Yoga and Magick, or anything else beyond what the average educated  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

person may be assumed to have been taught.

What is the problem? There are two.

Beta: To train the mind to move with the maximum speed and energy,

 $\label{eq:with the utmost possible accuracy in the chosen} % \[ \begin{array}{c} \text{direction, and} \end{array} \]$ 

 $\qquad \qquad \text{with the } \text{minimum of disturbance or friction.} \\ \text{That is Magick.}$ 

1

Alpha: To stop the mind altogether. That is Yoga.

The rules, strangely enough, are identical in both cases; at least, until

your "Magick" is perfect; Yoga merely goes on a step further. In Beta

you have reduced all movements from many to One; in Alpha you reduce that One to Zero.

Now then, with a sigh of relief, know you this: that every possible inci-

dent in the Beta training is mutatis mutandis, perfectly familiar to the engineer.

The material must be chosen and prepared in the kind and in the manner,

best suited to the design of the intended machine; the various parts

must be put together with the utmost precision; every obstacle to the

function must be removed, and every source of error eliminated. Now cheer

up, child! In the case of a machine that he has devised and constructed

himself with every condition in his favour, he thinks he is doing not too

badly if he gets some fifteen or twenty per cent of the calculated effi-

ciency out of the instrument; and even Nature, with millions of years

to adjust and improve, very often cannot boast of having done much better.

So you have no reason to be discouraged if success does not smile upon you

in the first week or so of your Work, starting as you do with material of

whose properties you are miserably ignorant, with means pitifully limited,

with Laws of Nature which you do not understand; in fact, with almost

everything against you but indomitable Will and unconquerable courage.

(I know I'm a poor contemptible Lowbrow; but I refuse to be a shamed for  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) =\left$ 

finding Kipling's If and Henley's Don't remember-the title; they may not

be poetry --- but they are honest food and damned good beer for the plebeian

wayfarer. It was such manhood, not the left-wing high-brow Bloomsbury

sissies, that kept London through the blitz. Pray forgive the digression!)

There is only one method to adopt in such circumstances as those of the  $\,$ 

Aspirant to Magick and Yoga: the method of Science. Trial and error.

You must observe. That implies, first of all, that you must learn to ob-

serve. And you must record your observations. No circumstance of life

is, or can be irrelevant. "He that is not with me is against me." In

all these letters you will find only two things: either I tell you what

is bad for you, or what is good for you. But I am not you; I don't know

every detail of your life, every trick of your thought. You must do ninety

percent of the work for yourself. Whether it is love, or your daily avo-

cation, or diet, or friends, or amusement, or anything else, you must

find out what helps you to your True Will and what hinders; cherish the  $\,$ 

one and eschew the other.

I want to insist most earnestly that concentration is not, as we nearly

all of us think, a matter of getting things right in the practices; you

must make every breath you draw subservient to the True Will, to fertilize

the soil for the practices. When you sit down in your Asana to quiet your

 $\mbox{\ensuremath{\text{mind}}}, \mbox{\ensuremath{\text{it}}}$  is much easier for you if your whole life has tended to relative

quietude; when you knock with your Wand to announce the opening of an

Invocation, it is better if the purpose of that ceremony has been simmer-

ing in the background of your thought since childhood!

Yes indeed: background!

Deep down, on the very brink of the subconscious, are all those facts  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

which have determined you to choose this your Great Work.

2

Then, the ambition, conscious, which arranges the general order and disposition of your life.

Lastly, the practices themselves. And my belief is that the immense

official works mentioned in the early part of this letter; I shall be

happy if you will take to heart what I am now so violently thrusting at  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) ^{2}$ 

you, this Middle Work of Concentration.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

CHAPTER XVII

ASTRAL JOURNEY, EXAMPLE. HOW TO DO IT:

HOW TO VERIFY YOUR EXPERIENCES

Cara Soror,

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

There is no better way of training the memory than the practice of the Holy Qabalah.

The whole mechanism of memory depends on joining up independent data.

You must go on adding a little to little, always joining the simple impres-

sions by referring them to others which are more general; and so on

until the whole of your universe is arranged like the brain and the  $\,$ 

nervous system. This system in fact, becomes the Universe. When you  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,2,\ldots \right\}$ 

have got everything properly correlated, your central consciousness

understands and controls every tiniest detail. But you must begin at

the beginning --- you go out for a walk, and the first thing you see is

a car; that represents the Atu VII, the Chariot, referred to Cancer.

Then you come to a fishmonger, and notice certain crustacea, very  $\mbox{mala}$ 

chostomous. This comes under the same sign of Cancer. The next thing  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

you notice is an amber-coloured dress in Swan and Edgar's; amber also

is the colour of Cancer in the King's Scale. Now then you have a set

of three impressions which is joined together by the fact that they all  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{$ 

belong to the Cancer class; experience will soon teach that you can

 $\ensuremath{\operatorname{remember}}$  all three very much more clearly and accurately than you could

any one of the three singly.

You have not increased the burden on your memory, but diminished it.

What you say about tension and eagerness and haste is very true. See

The Book of the Law, Chapter I, 44.

"For pure will, unassuaged of purpose, delivered from the lust of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

result, is every way perfect."

This, from a practical point of view, is one of the most important verses

3

in the book.

The unusual word "unassuaged" is very interesting. People generally

suppose that "will" is the slave of purpose, that you cannot will a thing

properly unless you are aiming at a definite goal. But this is not the

case. Thinking of the goal actually serves to distract the  $\min d. \quad \mbox{In}$ 

these few words is included the whole method without all the  $\operatorname{bombastic}$ 

piety of the servile doctrine of mysticism about the surrender of the

Will. Nor is this idea of surrender actually correct; the will must be  $% \frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right$ 

identified with the Divine Will, so-called. One wants to become like a  $\,$ 

mighty flowing river, which is not consciously aiming at the sea, and is

certainly not yielding to any external influence. It is acting in

conformity with the law of its own nature, with the Tao. One can describe

it, if necessary, as "passive love"; but it is love (in effect) raised

to its highest potential. We come back to the same thing: when passion  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

is purged of any "lust of result" it is irresistible; it has become "Law."

I can never understand why it is that mystics fail to see that their  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

smarmy doctrine of surrender actually insists upon the duality which they  $\,$ 

have set out to abolish!

I certainly have no intention of "holding you down" to "a narrow path of  $\mbox{\ }$ 

work" or any path. All I can do is to help you to understand clearly the

laws of your own nature, so that you may go ahead without extraneous  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

influence. It does not follow that a plan that I have found successful

in my own case will be any use to you. That is another cardinal mistake

of most teachers. One must have become a Master of the Temple to annihi-  $\,$ 

125

late one's ego. Most teachers, consciously or unconsciously, try to get others to follow in their steps. I might as well dress you up in my castoff clothing! (In the steps of the Master. At the feet of the Master. Steward!) Please observe that the further you get on, the higher your potential, the greater is the tendency to leak, or even to break the containing vessel. I can help you by warning you against setting up obstacles, real or imaginary, in your own path; which is what most people do. It is almost laughable to think that the Great Work consists merely in "letting her rip;" but Karma bumps you from one side of the toboggan slide to the other, until you "come into the straight." (There's a chapter or two in

the Book of Lies about this, but I haven't got a copy. I must find one,

and put them in here. Yes: p. 22)

O thou that settest out upon the Path, false is the Phantom that thou

seekest. When thou hast it thou shalt know all bitterness, thy teeth

fixed in the Sodom-Apple.

Thus hast thou been lured along that Path, whose terror else had

driven thee far away.

O thou that stridest upon the middle of the Path, no phantoms mock

thee. For the stride's sake thou stridest.

Thus art thou lured along that Path, whose fascination

driven thee far away.

O thou that drawest toward the End of The Path, effort is no more.

Faster and faster dost thou fall; thy weariness is changed into

Ineffable Rest.

For there is no Thou upon that Path: thou hast become The Way.

As in the Yi King, the 3rd hexagram has departed from the original perfec-

tion, and it takes all the rest of the hexagrams to put things right again.

The result, it is true, is superior; the perfection of the original has

been enhanced and enriched by its experience.

There is another way of defining the Great Work. That explains to us the  $\,$ 

whole object of manifestation, of departing from the perfection of "Nothing"

tage, that it is quite impossible to go wrong. Every experience, whatever

may be its nature, is just another necessary bump.

Naturally one cannot realize this until one becomes a Master of the Temple;

consequently one is perpetually plunged in sorrow and despair. There is,

you see, a good deal more to it than merely learning one's mistakes. One

can never be sure what is right and what is wrong, until one appreciates

that "wrong" is equally "right." Now then one gets rid of the idea of

"effort" which is associated with "lust of result."  $\,\,$  All that one does is

to exercise pleasantly and healthfully one's energies.

It will not do to regard "man" as the "final cause" of manifestation.

Please do not quote myself against me.

"Man is so infinitely small, In all these stars, determinate. Maker and master of them all, Man is so infinitely great."

The human apparatus is the best instrument of which we are, at present,

aware in our normal consciousness; but when you come to experience the

Conversation of the higher intelligences, you will understand how imper-

fect are your faculties. It is true that you can project these intelli-

gences as parts of yourself, or you can suppose that certain  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{human}}$  vehicles

may be temporally employed by them for various purposes; but these specu-

127

lations tend to be idle. The important thing is to make contact with

beings, whatever their nature, who are superior to yourself, not merely

in degree but it kind. That is to say, not merely different as a Great

Dane differs from a Chihuahua, but as a buffalo differs from either.

Of course you are perfectly right about the senses, though  ${\tt I}$  would not

agree to confine the meaning to the five which are common to most people.

There must, one might suspect, be ways of apprehending directly such

phenomena as magnetism, electrical resistance, chemical affinity and the  $\,$ 

like. Let me direct you once more to The Book of the Law, Chapter II,  $\ensuremath{\text{vs}}\xspace.$ 

70 - 72.

"There is help & hope in other spells. Wisdom says: be strong!

Then canst thou bear more joy. Be not animal; refine thy rapture!

If thou drink, drink by the eight and ninety rules of  $\operatorname{art}$ : if thou

love, exceed by delicacy; and if thou do aught joyous, let there be subtlety therein!

"But exceed! exceed!

"Strive ever to more! and if thou art truly mine  $\operatorname{---}$  and doubt it not,

an if thou art ever joyous! --- death is the crown of all."

5

The mystic's idea of deliberately stupefying and stultifying himself is

an "abomination unto the Lord." This, by the way, does not conflict with

the rules of Yoga. That kind of suppression is comparable to the restric-

tions in athletic training, or diet in sickness.

Now we get back to the Qabalah --- how to make use of it.

Let us suppose that you have been making an invocation, or shall we call

it an investigation, and suppose you want to interpret a passage of Bach.

To play this is the principal weapon of your ceremony. In the course of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

your operation, you assume your astral body and rise far above the terres-

trial atmosphere, while the music continues softly in the background.

You open your eyes, and find that it is night. Dark clouds are on the

horizon; but in the zenith is a crown of constellations. This light

helps you, especially as your eyes become accustomed to the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{gloom}}$ , to

take in your surroundings. It is a bleak and barren landscape. Terrific

mountains rim the world. In the midst looms a cluster of blue-black crags.

Now there appears from their recesses a gigantic being. His strength,

especially in his hands and in his loins, it terrifying. he suggests a

combination of lion, mountain goat and serpent; and you instantly jump

to the idea that this is one of the rare beings which the Greeks called

Chimaera. So formidable is his appearance that you consider it prudent

to assume an appropriate god-form. But who is the appropriate god? You

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{may}}$  perhaps consider it best, in view of your complete ignorance as to

who he is and where you are, to assume the  $\operatorname{god-form}$  of Harpocrates, as

being good defence in any case; but of course this will not take you very

far. If you are sufficiently curious and bold, you will make up your mind

rapidly on this point. This is where your daily practice of the Qabalah

will come in useful. You run through in your mind the seven sacred planets.

The very first of them seems quite consonant with what you have so far

seen. Everything suits Saturn well enough. To be on the safe side, you

go through the others; but this is a very obvious case --- Saturn is the

only planet that agrees with everything. The only other possibility will

be the Moon; but there is no trace noticeable of any of her more amiable

characteristics. You will therefore make up your mind that it is a

Saturnian god-form that you need. Fortunate indeed for you that you have

practiced daily the assumption of such forms! Very firmly, very steadily,

very slowly, very quietly, you transform your normal astral appearance

into that of Sebek. The Chimaera, recognizing your divine authority,

becomes less formidable and menacing in appearance. He may, in some way,

indicate his willingness to serve you. Very good, so far; but it is of

course the first essential to make sure of his integrity. Accordingly

you begin by asking his name. This is vital; because if he tells you the

truth, it gives you power over him. But if, on the other hand, he tells

you a lie, he abandons for good and all his fortress. He becomes rather  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

like a submarine whose base has been destroyed. He may do you a lot of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

mischief in the meantime, of course, so look out!

Well then, he tells you that his name is Ottillia. Shall we try to spell

it in Greek or in Hebrew. By the sound of the name and perhaps to some

extent by his appearance one might plump for the former; but after all

the Greek Qabalah is so unsatisfactory. We give Hebrew the first chance  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$ 

we start with Ayin Teth Yod Lamed Yod Aleph Hay {render in Hebrew}. Let us

try this lettering for a start. It adds

up to 135. I daresay that you don't remember what the Sepher Sephiroth

tells you about the number; but as luck will have it, there is no need

to inquire; for  $135 = 3 \times 45$ . Three is the number, is the first number

of Saturn, and 45 the last. (The sum of the numbers in the magic  $\{\text{sic}\}$  square

6

of Saturn is 45.) That corresponds beautifully with everything you have

got so far; but then of course you must know if he is "one of the beliv-

ing Jinn." Briefly, is he a friend or an enemy? You accordingly say to

him "The word of the Law is Thelema {spell it in Greek}" It turns out that he

doesn't under-

stand Greek at all, so you were certainly right in choosing  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Hebrew}}\xspace.$  You

put it to him, "What is the word of the Law?" and he replies darkly.

"The word of the Law is Thora." That means nothing to you; any one might

know as much as that, Thora being the ordinary word for the Sacred Law of

Israel, and you accordingly ask him to spell it to make sure you have

heard aright; and he gives you the letters, perhaps by speaking them,

perhaps by showing them: Teth, Resh, Ayin. You add these up and get

279. This again is divisible by the Saturnian 3, and the result is 93;

in other words, he has been precisely right. On the plane of Saturn one

may multiply by three and therefore he has given you the correct word

"Thelema" in a form unfamiliar to you. You man now consider yourself

satisfied of his good faith, and may proceed to inspect him more closely.

The stars above his head suggest the influence of Binah, whose number also

is three, while the most striking thing about him is the core of his being:

the letter Yod. (One does not count the termination "AH": being a divine

suffix it represents the inmost light and the outermost light.) This Yod,

this spark of intense brilliance, is of the pale greenish  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{gold}}$  which one

sees (in this world) in the fine gold leaf of Tibet. It glows with ever

greater intensity as you concentrate upon observing him, which you could

not do while you were preoccupied with investigating his credentials.

Confidence being thus established, you inquire why he as appeared to you

at this time and at this place; and the answer to this question is of

course your original idea, that is to say, he is presenting to you in

other terms that "mountainous Fugue" which invoked him. You listen to

him with attention, make such enquiries as seem good to you, and record the proceedings.

The above example is, of course, pure imagination, and represents a very

favourable case. You are only too likely, and that not only at the begin-

ning, to meet all sorts of difficulties and dangers.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

CHAPTER XVIII

THE IMPORTANCE OF OUR CONVENTIONAL GREETINGS, ETC.

Cara Soror,

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

From time to time I have exhorted you with mine accustomed matchless  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

eloquence never to neglect the prescribed Greetings: but I think it just

as well to collect the various considerations connected with their use  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{---}}$ 

and in "Greetings" I include "saying Will" before set meals, the four

daily adorations of the Sun (Liber CC, vel Resh) and the salutation of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

Our Lady the Moon. I propose to deal with the general object of the  $\,$ 

combined rituals, not with the special virtues of each separately.

7

The practice of Liber III vel Jugoruml is the complement of these grouped  $\,$ 

customs. By sharp physical self-chastisement when you think, say, or do

whatever it is that you have set yourself to avoid doing, you set a sentry

at the gate of your mind ready to challenge all comers, and so you acquire

the habit of being on the alert. Keep this in mind, and you will have no

difficulty in following the argument of this letter.

When you are practicing Dharana2 concentration, you allow yourself so

many minutes. It is a steady, sustained effort. The mind constantly

struggles to escape control. (I hope you remember the sequence of "breaks."

In case you don't, I summarize them.

- (1) Immediate physical interruptions: Asana should stop these.
  - (2) Things that are "on you mind."
  - (3) Reverie, and "Wouldn't it help if I were to --- ?"
- (4) Atmospherics --- e.g. voices apparently from some alien source.
- (5) Aberrations of the control itself; and the result itself.

(Remember the practice of some  $\mbox{\sc Hindu}$  schools: "Not that, not

that!" to whatever it is the presents itself as Tat Sat ---

reality, truth).

Need I remind you how urgent the wish to escape will assuredly become,

how fantastic are the mind's devices and excuses, amounting often to  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{T}}$ 

deliberate revolt? In Kandy I broke away in a fury, and dashed down to

Colombo with the intention of painting the very air as red as the betel-  $\,$ 

spittle on the pavements! But after three days of futile search for  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

satisfying debauchery I came back to my horses, and, sure enough, it was

merely that I had gone stale; the relaxation soothed and steadied me;  $\mbox{I}$ 

resumed the discipline with redoubled energy, and Dhyana dawned before  $\boldsymbol{a}$ 

week had elapsed.

I mention this because it is the normal habit of the mind to organize

these counter-attacks that makes their task so easy. What you need is a

mind that will help rather than hinder your Work by its normal function.

This is where these Greetings, and Will-sayings, and Adorations come in.

It is not a concentration-practice proper; I haven't a good word for it. "Background-concentration" or "long-distance-concentration" are clumsy, and not too accurate. It is really rather like a public school education. One is not constantly "doing a better thing that one has ever done; one is not dropping one's eye-glass every two minutes, or being a little gentleman in the act of brushing one's hair. The point is that one trains oneself to react properly at any moment of surprise. It must become "second nature" for "Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law." to spring to the forefront of the mind when one is introduced to a stranger, or comes down to breakfast, or hears the telephone bell, or observes the hour of the adoration, (these are to be the superficial reactions, like instinctively rising when a lady enters the room), or, at the other end, in moments of immediate peril, or of sudden apprehension, or when in one's meditation, one approaches the deepest strata.

1\* See Magick in Theory and Practice, pp. 427 - 429.
2\*\* Book 4, Part I.

8

One need not be dogmatic about the use of these special words. One might choose a formula to represent one's own particular True Will. It is a little like Cato, (or Scipio, was it?) who concluded every speech, whether about the Regulations of the Roman Bath or the proposal to reclaim a marsh of the Maremma, with the words: "And moreover, in my opinion, Carthage ought to be destroyed."

Got it?

You teach the mind to push your thought automatically to the very thing from which it was trying to wander. "Yes, I get you Stephen! . . . But,

Uncle Dudley, come clean, do you always do all this yourself? Don't you sometimes feel embarrassed, or fear that you may destroy the effect of your letter, or "create a scene" in the public street when you suddenly stop and perform these incomprehensible antics, or simply forget about the whole thing?" Yes, I do. Peccavi. Mea culpa, mea macima culpa. I am not your old and valued friend, Adam Qadmon, the Perfect Man. I am a pretty poor specimen. I am nothing to cable about to Lung Peng Choung, or Himi, or Monsalvat. I do forget now and again; though, I am glad to say, not nearly as often as I used to do. (As the habit is acquired, it tends to strengthen itself). But often I deliberately omit to do my duty. I do funk it. I do resent it. I do feel that it's too much bother. As I said above, Adam Qadman is not my middle name. Well now, have I any shadow of an excuse? Yes, I have, after a fashion; I don't think it good manners to force my idiosyncrasies down people's throats, and I don't want to appear more of an eccentric than I need. It might detract from my personal influence, and so actually Work that I am trying to perform. . . "Yes, that's all very well, Alibi Ike; you are exceedingly well know as a Scripture-quoting Satan, as a Past-Master in selfjustification. Trained from infancy by the Plymouth Brethern, who for casuistry leave the Jesuits at the post!" "Yes, yes, but --- ---." "You needn't but me no buts, you old he-goat! Wasn't there once a Jonas Hanway, the first man to sport an umbrella? Wouldn't your practice be

natural, and right, and the cream of the cream of good manners as soon  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$ 

as a few hundred people of position took to doing it? And wouldn't

Thomas, Richard, and Henry, three months later, make a point of doing the  $\,$ 

same as their betters?" (That was Conscience speaking.)

All right, you win.

Love is the law, love under will.

9

Yours Fraternally,

CHAPTER XIX

THE ACT OF TRUTH

Cara Soror,

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

It seems that last Wednesday I so far forgot myself as to refer to the  $\,$ 

"Act of Truth" in conversation, and never mentioned what it is when it's  $\ensuremath{\text{S}}$ 

at home, or why anyone should perform it, or what happens when one does perform it!

All right, I will remedy that; luckily, it is a very simple matter;

very important, perfectly paradoxical and devastatingly effective.

Analysed, it is to make the assumption that something which seems very

wrong is actually all right, that an eager wish is an accomplished fact.

a reasonable anxiety, entirely unfounded --- and to act accordingly.

For instance, I'm in some desolate place, dependent for my food supply

on a weekly messenger. If he is a day late, it is awkward; if two, it

means hardship; if three, serious risk. One is naturally anxious as the

day approaches; perhaps the weather, or some similar snag, makes it  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

likely that he will be late. From one cause or another, I have rather  $\,$ 

exceeded my ration. There is nothing I can do about it, materially.

The sensible course of action is to draw in  ${\tt my}$  horns, live on the  ${\tt mini-}$ 

mun, necessary to life, which involves cutting the day's work down to

almost noting, and hope for the best, expecting the worst.

But there is a Magical mode of procedure. You say to yourself: I am  $\,$ 

here to do this Work in accordance with my true Will. The Gods have got

to see to it that I'm not baulked by any blinking messenger. (But take  $\,$ 

care They don't overhear you; They might mistake it for Hybris, or pre-

sumption. Do it all in the Sign of Silence, under the aegis of Harpocrates,

the "Lord of Defence and Protection"; be careful to assume his God-form,

as standing on two crocodiles. Then you increase your consumption, and

at the same time put in a whole lot of extra Work. If you perform this  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

"Act of Truth" properly, with genuine conviction that nothing can go

wrong, your messenger will arrive a day early, and bring an extra large supply.

This, let me say at once, is very difficult, especially at first, until  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Lin}}$ 

one has gained confidence in the efficacy of the Formula; and it is very

futile here than in most cases, and the results of messing it up are  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

commonly disastrous.3

You must invent your act to suit your case, every time; suppose you

expect a cable next Friday week, transferring cash to your account. You

need \$500 to make up an important payment, and you don't know whether

and save your expenses, and make yourself miserable and incapable of  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right$ 

3\* Do not be misled by any apparent superficial resemblance to "Christian

137

Science" and "Coueism" and their cackling kin. They miss every essential feature of the formula.

10

vigorous thought or action? You may succeed in saving enough to swing the deal; but you won't get a penny beyond the amount actually needed ---

and look at the cost in moral grandeur!

No, go and stand yourself a champagne luncheon, and stroll up  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Bond}}$  Street

with an 8 1/2 "Hoyo de Monterey," and squander \$30 on some utterly useless

bauble. Then the \$500 will swell to \$1000, and arrive two days early at that!

There are one or two points to consider very carefully indeed before you start: ---

1. The proposed Act must be absurd; it won't do at all if by some  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Some}}$ 

 $\label{eq:fluke} \mbox{fluke, however unlikely, it might accomplish your aim. For }$ 

instance, it's no use backing an outsider. there must be no  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

causal link.

2. The Act must be one which makes the situation definitely worse.

 $\quad \text{E.g.:}$  suppose you are counting on a new dress to make a hit at

a Reception, and doubt whether it is so much better than your  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

 $$\operatorname{present}$$  best, or whether it will be finished in time. Then,

 $\mbox{ wear that present best to-night (wet, of course),} \\ \mbox{knowing you}$ 

are sure to soil it.

3. Obviously, all the usual conditions of a Magical Operation apply

in this as in all cases; your aim must conform with your True

 $\label{eq:will_self_wild} \text{Will, and all that; but there is one curious point} \ about \ an$ 

Act of Truth: this, that one should resort to it only when there

is no other method possible. In the explorer's case, above, it

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$  won't do if he has any means of hurrying up the messenger.

It seems to me that the above brief sketch should suffice an intelligent

and imaginative student like yourself; but if any point remains darkling,

let me know, and I will follow up with a postscript.

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours fraternally,

666

P.S. --- I thought it might help you if I were to make a few experiments.

I have done so. Result: this is much more difficult and delicate an

affair than I had thought when I wrote this letter. For instance, one

single thought of a "second string" --- e.g. "if it fails, I had better do

so and so"  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  is enough to kill the while operation stone dead. Of course,

I am totally out of practice; but, even so . . . . .

CHAPTER XX

TALISMANS: THE LAMEN: THE PANTACLE

Cara Soror,

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

Really you comfort me when you turn from those abstruse and exalted themes  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

with which you have belaboured me so often of late to dear cuddlesome

11

little questions like this in our letter received this morning: "Do

please, dear Master, give me some hints about how to make Talismans (that's  $% \left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right)$ 

the same as Telesmata, isn't it? Yes, 666) and the Pantacle. The official instructions are quite clear, of course; but somehow I find them just a little frightening."

Well, I think I know pretty well what you mean; so I will try to imitate the style of Aunt Tabitha in "The Flapper's Fireside."

For one thing, you forgot to mention the Lamen. Now what are these things when they are at home? That's easy enough.

The Lamen is a sort of Coat of Arms. It expresses the character and powers of the wearer.

A talisman is a storehouse of some particular kind of energy, the kind that is needed to accomplish the task for which you have constructed it.

The Pantacle is often confused with both the others; accurately, it is a

"Minutum Mundum", "the Universe in Little"; it is a map of all that

exists, arranged in the Order of Nature. There is a chapter in Book 4,

Part II, devoted to it (pp. 117 - 129); I cannot make up my mind whether

I like it. At the best it is very far from being practical instruction.

(The chapter on the Lamen, pp. 159 - 161, is even worse.)

An analogy, not too silly, for these three; the Chessplayer, the Openings, and the Game itself.

But --- you will object --- why be silly at all? Why not say simply that the

Lamen, stating as it does the Character and Powers of he wearer, is a

dynamic portrait of the individual, while the Pantacle, his Universe, is

a static portrait of him? And that, you pursue flattering, is why you

preferred to call the Weapon of Earth (in the Tarot) the Disk, emphasizing

its continual whirling movement rather than the Pantacle of Coin, as is

more usual. Once again, exquisite child of our Father the  $\mbox{Archer}$  of Light

and of seaborn Aphrodite, your well-known acumen has "nicked the ninety and

nine and one over" as Browning says when he (he too!) alludes to the Tarot.

As you will have gathered from the above, a Talisman is a much more  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

restricted idea; it is no more than one of the objects in his Pantacle,

one of the arrows in the quiver of his Lamen. As, then, you would expect,

it is very little trouble to design. All that you need is to "make consi-

derations' about your proposed operation, decide which planet, sign,

element or sub-element or what not you need to accomplish your miracle.

As you know, a very great many desirable objects can be attained by the

use of the talismans in the Greater and Lesser Keys of Solomon the King;

also in Pietro di Abano and the dubious Fourth Book of Cornelius Agrippa.

You must on no account attempt to use the squares given in the Book of the

Sacred Magic of Abramelin the Mage until you have succeeded in the Opera-

tion. More, unless you mean to perform it, and are prepared to go to any

length to do so, you are a fool to have the book in your possession at

all. Those squares are liable to get loose and do things on their  $\operatorname{own}$ 

initiative; and you won't like it.

The late Philip Haseltine, a young composer of genius, used one of these

squares to get his wife to return to him. He engraved it neatly on his

12

arm. I don't know how he proceeded to set to work; but his wife came

back all right, and a very short time afterwards he killed himself.

Then there are the Elemental Tablets of Sir Edward Kelly and Dr. John Dee.

From these you can extract a square to perform almost any conceivable

operation, if you understand the virtue of the various symbols which they

manifest. They are actually an expansion of the Tarot. (Obviously, the

Tarot itself as a whole is a universal Pantacle --- forgive the pleonasm!

Each card, especially is this true of the Trumps, is a talisman; and the

whole may also be considered as the Lamen of Mercury. It is evidently an

Idea far too vast for any human mind to comprehend in its entirety. For

it is "the Wisdom whereby He created the worlds.")

The decisive advantage of this system is not that its variety makes it so

adaptable to our needs, but that we already posses the Invocations

necessary to call forth the Energies required. What is perhaps still more

to the point, they work without putting the Magician to such severe toil

and exertion as is needed when he has to write them out from  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{his}}$  own

ingenium. Yes! This is weakness on my part, and I am very naughty to

encourage you to shirk the hardest path.

I used often to make the background of my Talismans of four concentric

circles, painting then, the first (inmost) in the King (or Knight) scale,

the second in the Queen, the third in the Prince, and the outermost in  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

the Princess scale, of the Sign, Planet, or Element to which I was devoting

it. On this, preferably in the "flashing" colours, I would paint the  $\,$ 

appropriate Names and Figures.

Lastly, the Talisman may be surrounded with a band inscribed with a suit-

able "versicle" chosen from some Holy book, or devised by the Magician to suit the case.

In the British Museum (and I suppose elsewhere) you may see the  $\operatorname{medal}$ 

struck to commemorate the victory over the Armada. This is a reproduction,

perhaps modified, of the Talisman used by  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Dee}}$  to raise the storm which

scattered the enemy fleet.

You must lay most closely to your heart the theory of the Magical Link

(see Magick pp . 107 - 122) and see well to it that it rings true; for  $\,$ 

without this your talisman is worse than useless. It is dangerous; for  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

all that Energy is bound to expend itself somehow; it will make its own

links with anything handy that takes its fancy; and you can get into any  $\ensuremath{\text{get}}$ 

sort of the most serious kind of trouble.

There is a great deal of useful stuff in Magick; pp. 92 - 100, and pp.

179 - 189. I could go on all night doing nothing but indicating sources of information.

Then comes the question of how to "charge" the Talisman, of how to evoke

or to invoke the Beings concerned, and of --- oh! of so much that you need  $\,$ 

a lifetime merely to master the theory.

Remember, too, please, what I have pointed out elsewhere, that the greatest

Masters have quite often not been Magicians at all, technically; they

have used such devices as Secret Societies, Slogans and Books. If you

are so frivolous as to try to exclude these from our discourse, it is

merely evidence that you have not understood a single word of what I have

been trying to tell you these last few hundred years!

13

May I close with a stray example or so? Equinox III, 1, has the Neophyte's

Pantacle of Frater O.I.V.V.I.O. The Fontispiece of the original (4 vol-  $\,$ 

ume) edition of Magick, the colors vilely reproduced, is a Lamen of  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$ 

own Magick, or a Pantacle of the Science, I'm sure I'm not sure which!

Most of my Talismans, like my Invocations, have been poems. This letter  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

must be like the Iliad in at least one respect: it does not end; it stops.

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours fraternally,

666

CHAPTER XXI

## MY THEORY OF ASTROLOGY

Cara Soror,

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

A few well-chosen words about Astrology? Madam, I am only too happy to

oblige: our aim is to serve. The customer is usually wrong; but statis-

tics indicate that it doesn't pay to tell him so.

It seems a long while since I set up your Nativity, and read it, but it

is very clear in  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  mind that you were astonished, as so  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{many}}$  others

have been, by the simplicity and correctness of my reading. It began,

you remember, by your giving me the usual data when we dropped in for

tea at the Anglers' Rest,. I calculated the Ascendant on the spot, and

remarked "Rubbish!" I looked at you again very carefully;
and, after

many grunts, observed, "More likely half-past ten --- within an hour one  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

way or the other." You insisted; I insisted. Unwilling to make a Fracas

in the Inn, we decided to put you to the trouble of writing to your mother to settle the dispute. Back came the answer: "within

minutes of eleven. I remember because your father had hung on as long

as he could --- he had to take the morning service."

This occurrence is very common in my experience; I have contradicted

what sounded like ascertained fact and proved on enquiry to have been

right; so, considering that the statistics I made many years ago showed

me to have been right 109 times out of 120, I think two things are fairly

near probation; firstly, I am not guessing --- that doesn't
matter much;

but, secondly, which is of supreme importance, there is a definite con-

nection between the personal appearance and manner of the native, and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

the Sign of the Zodiac which was rising when he first drew air into his lungs.

Let me add, to strengthen the argument, that on the few occasions where

I have erred there has been a good astrological reason for it. E.g.  $\ensuremath{\text{\textbf{I}}}$ 

might plump for Pisces rising when it was actually Capricornus; but in

that case Saturn would have been afflicted by being in Cancer, with

bad aspects from Venus and the Moon, thus taking away all his rugged,

male, laborious qualities, and in the Ascendant might have been Jupiter,

suggesting many of the qualities of Pisces: and so forth.

14

Now let me start! You want me to explain the system --- or no-system! ---

which I use. I do not "move in a mysterious way My wonders to perform;"

for nothing could be simpler. For its origin I have to thank Abramelin

the Mage, who empties the vials of his scorn upon the astrologers of his  $\,$ 

time with their meticulous calculations of "the hours of the planets"  $% \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( \frac$ 

and so on. I think he goes too far when he says that a planet can have

no influence at all, or very little, unless it is above the horizon;

but he meant well, bless him! And, though he does not say so, I believe

that I do my stuff in very much the same way as he did.

Modern astrologers multiply their charts until their desks remind me of  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{$ 

a Bargain Basement in the rush hour! They compare and contrast until

they are in bat-eyed bewilderment bemused; and when the answer turns

out absolutely false, exclaim, what a shout: "By Ptolemy, I forgot to  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

look at the last Luniation for Buda-Pesth!" But then they can always

find something or other which will explain how they came to go wrong:

understanding.

naturally, when you have several hundred factors, helplessly bound and gagged, it would be just too bad if you couldn't pick out one to serve your turn --- after the event! No, dear girl, it should be obvious to an unweaned brat: (a) they can't see the wood for the trees, (b) they are using Ruach on a proposition which demands Neschamah. Intellect is quite inadequate; the problem requires mother-wit, intuition,

Here is my system in a Number 000 Ampoule.

Put up the figure at birth: study it, make notes of the aspects and dignities, concentrate --- and turn on the Magical Tap!

Occasionally, when I began, I set up the "progressed figure" to see how

the patient was doing this week, but it never seemed to help enough to

compensate for the distraction caused by the complication. What I do  $\,$ 

observe to examine the situation of to-day is Transits. These I have

found very reliable; but even with these I usually ignore aspects of

minor importance. Truth to tell, conjunctions mean very much more than  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

the rest put together.

Talking of aspects, I think it ridiculous to allow vast "orbs" like  $15 \, \text{\o}$ 

for Luna, and  $12\emptyset$  for Sol. Astrologers go to extreme lengths to calculate

the "solar revolution" figure not to a degree, not to a minute, but to a  $\$ 

second: and that when they don't know the exact time of birth within

half an hour or more! Talk about straining at a gnat and swallowing a

camel! Then what does an hour or so matter anyhow, if you are going to

allow an aspect, whether it is  $2 \ensuremath{\text{\varpi}}$  or  $10 \ensuremath{\text{\varpi}}$  off? This even with delicate

aspects like the quintile or semi-sextile. What would you think of  $\boldsymbol{a}$ 

doctor who had a special thermometer made to register -1/100 of a degree,

and never took notice of the fact that the patient had just swallowed

a cupful of scalding hot tea?

In my own work, I disallow a deviation of  $5 \sigma$  or  $6 \sigma$  from the exact aspect,

unless there is some alien reason for thinking that it is actually opera-

tive. With the minor aspects, I dislike reckoning with them if they are even  $3\emptyset$  away.

Nor do I see any sense in marking the odd minutes in the Ascendant, when one is not sure even of the decan.

That seems to be about all that is necessary for my "morning hate;"

suppose we go on to the question of interpretation.

15

Thousands of books have been written on Astrology; nobody could possible

read them all thoroughly, and he would be a great fool to try. But he

may do little harm by going into them far enough to observe that hardly

any half-dozen are agreed even on the foundations of their  $\operatorname{system}$ ,

hardly any two upon the meaning of any given aspect, dignity, or posi-

tion; there is not always agreement even upon what questions pertain

to which houses.

There are a few completely quack systems, such as those which  $\min$  up

the science with Toshosophical4 hypotheses; naturally you discard these.

But even of generally acceptable forms of Astrology, such as Mundane

and Horary, I tend to be distrustful. I ask, for instance, why, if  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right$ 

Taurus rules Poland and Ireland, as is no doubt the case, the  $\operatorname{crash}$ 

and massacres of 1939 e.v. and later in the one did not take place in  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

the other. All the seaports of the world naturally come under one of

the three watery signs; but we do not find that an affliction of Pisces,

which hits Tunis, should do harm to all the other harbours similarly ruled.

This brings us to the first Big Jump in the steeplechase of the whole

science. We hear of thousands of people being killed at the same time  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Line}}$ 

(within an hour or two, perhaps a minute or two) by earthquake, ship-

wreck, explosion, battle or other form of violence. Was the horoscope  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

of every one of the victims marked with the probability of some such

end? I have known very strange cases of coincidence, but
not to that
extent!

The answer, I believe, is manifold. It might be, for example, that

Poland and Ireland are ruled by different degrees of Taurus; that there

are major and minor figures, the former overruling the latter, so that  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

the figure of the launching of the "Titanic" swallowed up the nativities  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

of the victims of her wreck.

Something of this sort is really an obvious truth. Flood in China,

famine in India, pestilence anywhere, evidently depend on maps of  $\boldsymbol{a}$ 

scale far more enormous than the personal.

Then --- on this point I feel reasonably sure --- there may be one or more

factors of which we know nothing at all, by which the basic possibilities

of a figure are set to work. (Just as a car with engine running will not start until the clutch is put in.)

I will conclude by announcing a rather remarkable position.

1. I see no objection at all to postulating that certain "rays,'

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

energy, may reach us from the other parts of the solar system;  $\$ 

 $\qquad \qquad \text{for we can in fact point to perfectly analogous} \\ \text{phenomena in} \\$ 

the discoveries of the last hundred years or so.

But that is no more than a postulate.

 $4\ensuremath{^{\circ}}$  WEH NOTE: By now this term has appeared several times, and it will be

going by more than a few times ahead. Crowley disdained to apply

"Theosophical"

to the movement of Anne Besant, preferring to reserve the word for older systems. He coined the word "TOSHosophical" to replace "Theosophical" in these references.

16

2. The objections to Astrology as such, indicated by what I have  $\,$ 

already pointed out, and several others, would suffice to place  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$  me among the most arrogant disbelievers in the whole study, were

it not for what follows.

3. The facts with regard to the Ascendant are so patent, so undeni-  $\,$ 

able, and so inexplicable without the postulate in (1), that  ${\tt I}$ 

 $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$  am utterly convinced of the fundamental truth of the basic

principles of the science.

I said, "I will conclude"; and I meant it. For now that (or so I hope)

you respect sufficiently  ${\tt my}$  conviction that Astrology is a genuine science

and not a messy mass of Old Wives' Tales, you will obviously demand  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

instruction as to how to learn it, that you may verify my opinion in the  $\,$ 

light of your own experiments.

This will look much better if I put it in a separate letter.

'Till then ---

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

CHAPTER XXII

HOW TO LEARN THE PRACTICE OF ASTROLOGY

Cara Soror,

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

149

"Up guards, and at 'em!" First, you must know your correspondences by heart backwards and upside down (air connu.) They are practically all in The Book of Thoth; but "if anyone anything lacks," look for it in 777.

Then, get a book on Astrology, the older the better. Raphael's Shilling
Handbook is probably enough for the present purpose. Get well into your
head what the menu says about the natures of the planets, the influence
of the aspects, what is meant by dignities, the scope of the houses, and so on.

Dovetail all this with your classical knowledge; the character and qualities, the powers and the exploits, of the several deities concerned.

Next, learn how to set up a figure of the heavens. This need not take an average intelligent person more than an hour at the most. You can learn it from a book. Lastly, get Barley's 1001 Notable nativities and More Nativites. Also any other collections available. Practice setting up the horoscopes. Use the Chaldean square system; it shows at the first glance what is happening in the angular houses, which are the keys of

compare and contrast what you know of the natives, from history, with what is said of the aspects (and the rest) in the books you have read.

Put together similar horoscopes; e.g. a dozen which have Sagittarius

17

rising, another lot with Jupiter in the hid-heaven, and so on; see if you can find a similarity in their lives with what the books will have

the whole figure.

150

led you to expect.

Don't be afraid to criticise; on the contrary, do some research work on

your own, and find cases which seem to contradict tradition.

Instance: Saturn in the M.C. is said to cause a spectacular rise in a  $\$ 

man's career, ending in an equally notable crash. Examples: Napoleon I

and III, Oscar Wilde, Woodrow Wilson, Lord Northcliffe, Hitler. Look for

figures with Saturn thus placed, whose natives have jogged along equably

and died in the odour of sanctity. Find out why what worked in some

cases failed in the others.

By the time you have studied (say) 500 nativities you will be already a

fairly competent judge. Work your bloody guns! as Kipling says; get a

friend --- just this once I allow you human intercourse --- to set up for you

figures of historical importance, or with some outstanding characteristic

(e.g. murderers, champions of sport, statesmen, monsters, philanthropists,  $% \left( \frac{1}{2}\right) =\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +\frac{1}{2}\left( \frac{1}{2}\right) +$ 

heresiarchs) without telling you to whom it refers.

Build up the character, profession, story from the nativity. It sounds

incredible; but more than a score of times I have been
actually able to
name him!

By the time you have got good at this game --- and a most amusing game it

is --- you may call yourself a very competent astrologer.

Sometimes, even now, you may assign the figure of the  $Archbishop\ of\ York$ 

to Jabez Balfour or Catherine de Medici; or mix up Moody and Sankey with

Brown and Kennedy; don't be discouraged; perhaps there may be something

to be said for you after all!

I believe, as I hope, that you will be surprised at the speed with which you acquire proficiency.

All this time, moreover, you have not been wholly idle. You will have

been running about like a demented rabbit, and trying to spot the rising  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

sign of everybody you know. Look at them full-face, then profile; and note salient characteristics, pendulous lips, receding chins, bulbous noses, narrow foreheads, stuck-out ears, pimples, squints, warts, shape of face (three main types; thin, jutting, for cardinal signs; square, steadfast for cherubic; weak, nondescript, for the rest); then the stature, whether lithe, well-knit, sturdy, muscular, fat or what not; in short every bodily feature in turn; make up your mind what sign was rising at birth, and stick to it! Now to verify your suspicions. The conversation may run thus: You: "Can you answer a question without answering another which you were not asked?" It, surprised: "Why, yes, of course I can."

It: "1815."

18

You probably have to explain! In any case you begin all over again, when he has contented himself with "Yes" or "No" you say "Do you know the hour of your birth?" If he says "No," you ask if he can find out, and so on. It he says "Yes;" "Then tell me either the hour or the day and month; but not both." If he gives you the hour, you calculate a bit, and say: "Then you were born on the nth of Xember, within a fortnight either way."

If he tells you his birthday, work it out as before and then: "You were born at P in the morning within an hour either way." (This

makes it

about 11 to 1 against your being right, in either case, on pure chance.)

152

Again, you can practise this in caf,s, when you visit civilized countries,

and it is often possible to scrape acquaintance with people who look

specially interesting, and do not, as in England, instantly suspect you  $\,$ 

of dishonourable advances, and get them to play up. This is sometimes

easier when you are already with that friend which I was so lax as to

allow you; and it is, I own, very helpful to discuss strange faces if

only to make it quite clear to your own mind why you decide on one as  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

Virgo, another as Taurus.

A strange thing happened once; I had explained all this to the girl

that I happened to be living with: that is, I taught her the names of

the signs; she knew no Astrology, net even the simple correspondences.

After about a month, she was better at it than I was! ("Why strange?"

you mutter rudely. "Quite right, my dear! I have always been a wretched

reader of character. Bless my soul! there was a time when I had hopes

of you," I savagely retort.) She had picked up the knack, the trick

of it; she could select, eliminate, re-compose, compare with past

experience, and form a judgment, without knowing the names of its materials.

When you have got your sea-legs at both these parts of your astrological

education, you may (I think) put out to sea with some confidence. Perhaps

a fair test of your fitness would be when you got three people right out

of four, in a total of a score or so. Well, allow for  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$  being in a

"mood" to-night; call it two out of three. If it were guesswork, after

all, that means you are bringing it off at seven to one. Obviously, when

you do go wrong, set up the figure, study it more carefully than ever,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

and find out what misled you.

Remember constantly that the Statistical Method is your one and only

safeguard against self-deception.

Within the limits of a letter I could hardly hope to go into matters much

more fully or deeply than I have done; but 'pon my soul! I think that

what I have said should be enough for an intelligent and assiduous student.

Let me insist that all that is worth while comes by experience. Learning  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

one thing will give you the clue to another.

Well do I know to my sorrow how hard it is, as a rule, to learn how to

do a thing solely from written instruction; so perhaps you had better

arrange to see me one day about the actual setting-up of a figure.

Probably, too, there will be a few points that you would like to discuss.

I will end by betting you six clothing coupons to a pound of sugar that

in two years' concentrated work on these lines you will become a better

astrologer than ever I was. (This is very cunning of  $\operatorname{me}$ ; in two years

we shall all be getting clothes without coupons.)

19

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours fraternally,

CHAPTER XXIII

## IMPROVISING A TEMPLE

Cara Soror,

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

(This letter has been provoked by points discussed in your recent visit.)

As some of your daily practices are ceremonial, it should not come amiss

to vouch safe a few hints of practical service. For in ritual Magick, it will of course be the first care to get everything balanced and tidy. If you propose to erect a regular Temple, the most precise instructions in every detail are given in Book 4, Part II. (But I haven't so much as seen a copy for years!) There is a good deal scattered about in Part III (Magick, which you have) especially about the four elemental weapons. But if circumstances deny you for the moment the means of carrying out this Aedification as the Ideal would have it, you can certainly do your best to create a fairly satisfactory --- above all, workable --- substitute. (By the way, note the moral aspect of a house, as displayed in our language. "Edification" -- "house-making": from Latin Aedes, "house". "Economy" ---"houseruling": from the Greek "OIKOC", "House" and "NOMOC", I was often reduced to such expedients when wandering in strange lands, camping on glaciers, and so on. I fixed it workably well. In Mexico, D.F. for instance, I took my bedroom itself for the Circle, table for the Altar, my candle for the Lamp; and I made the Weapons compact. I had a Wand eight inches long, all precious stones and enamel, to represent the Tree of Life; within, an iron tube containing quicksilver --- very correct, lordly, and damsilly. What a club! Also, bought, a silver-gilt Cup; for Air and Earth I made one sachet of rose-petals in yellow silk, and another in green silk packed with salt. In the wilds it was easy, agreeable and most efficacious to make a Circle, and build an altar, of stones; my Alpine Lantern served admirably for the Lamp. It did double duty when required: e.g. in partaking of the Sacrament of the Four Elements, it served for Fire. But your conditions are not so restricted as this.

Let us consider what one can do with an ordinary house, such as you are

happy enough to possess.

First of all, it is of immense advantage to have a room specially conse-

crated to the Work, never used for any other purpose, and never entered  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

by any other person than yourself, unless it were another Initiate,

either for inspection or in case you were working together.

The aura accumulates with the regularity and frequency of  ${\tt Use.}$ 

20

The first point is the Banishing: Everything is to be removed from the room which is not absolutely necessary to the Work.

in this country, one must attend to the heating. An electric stove in  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

the East or the South, is best: it must not need attention. One can

usually buy stoves with excellent appropriate symbolism. (Last time  ${\tt I}$ 

did this --- 13 e.v. --- I got a perfect Ferranti at Harrods. The circular  $\,$ 

copper bowl, with the central Disk as the source of heat, is unsurpas-

sable.) The walls should be "self-coloured," a neutral tint
--- green,

grey or blue-grey? and entirely bare, unless you put up, in the proper

quarters, the proper designs, such as the "Watch Towers" --- see The  $\,$ 

Equinox I, 7.

Remember that your "East," your Kiblah, is Boleskine House, which is as

near as possible due North from Plymouth. Find North by the shadow of

a vertical rod and noon, or by the Pole-Star. Work out the angle as usual.

The St,1, of Revealing may be just on the N. Wall to make your "East."

Next, your Circle. The floor ought to be "Earth" green; but white will serve, or black. (A Masonic carpet is not at all bad.) The

Circle it-

self should be as shown in Book 4, Part II; but as this volume is

probably unavailable, ask me to show you the large painted diagram in  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

my portfolio when next you visit me, and we can arrange for it to be copied.

This should then be painted in the correct colours on the floor: the

Kether Square to the North, your "East."

The Altar must fit exactly the square of Tiphareth; it is best made as

a cupboard; of oak or acacia, by preference. It can then be used to hold

reserves of incense and other requisites.

Note that the height of the Altar has to suit your convenience. It is

consequently in direct relation with your own stature; in proportion,

it is a double cube. This then determines the size of your circle; in

fact the entire apparatus and furniture is a geometrical function of

yourself. Consider it all as a projection of yourself in terms of these  $\,$ 

conventional formulae. (A convention does really mean "that which is  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{L}}$ 

convenient." How abject, then to obey a self-styled convention which

is actually as inconvenient as possible!)

Next, the Lamp. This may be of silver, or silver-gilt, (to represent

the Path of Gimel) and is to be hung from the ceiling exactly above the

centre of the altar. There are plenty of old church lamps which serve  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

very well. The light is to be from a wick in a floating cork in a glass

of olive oil. (I hope you can get it!) It is really desirable to make

this as near the "Ever-burning Lamp of the Rosicrucians" as possible;

it is not a drawback that this implies frequent attention.

Now for the Weapons!

The Wand. Let this be simple, straight and slim! Have you an Almond or

Witch Hazel in your garden --- or do I call it park? If so, cut (with the magick knife --- I would lend you mine) a bough, as nearly straight as possible, about two feet long. Peel it, rub it constantly with Oil of Abramelin (this, and his incense, from Wallis and Co., 26 New Cavendish

21

Street, W.1) and keep wrapped in scarlet silk, constantly, I wrote, and meant it; rub it, when saying your mantra, to the rhythm of that same.

(Remember, "A ka dua" is the best; ask me to intone it to

(Remember, "A ka dua" is the best; ask me to intone it to you when you next visit me.)

The Cup. There are plenty of chalices to be bought. It should be of silver. If ornamented, the best form is that of the apple. I have seen

suitable cups in many shops.

The Sword. The ideal form is shown in the Ace of Swords in the Tarot.

At all events, let the blade be straight, and the hilt a simple cross.

(The  $32\emptyset$  Masonic Sword is not too bad; Kenning or Spencer in Great Queen

Street, W.C.2 stock them --- or used to do.)

The Disk. This ought to be of pure gold, with your own Pantacle, designed

by yourself after prolonged study, graved thereupon. While getting ready

flat, of course. If you want a good simple design to go on interim,  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{try}}$ 

the Rosy Cross or the Unicursal Hexagram.

So much for the Weapons! Now, as to your personal accoutrements, Robe,

Lamen, Sandals and the like, The Book of the Law has most thoughtfully

simplified matters for us.  $\mbox{"I charge you earnestly to come before me in}$ 

a single robe, and covered with a rich headdress." (AL I, 61) The Robe

158

may well be in the form of the Tau Cross; i.e. expanding from axilla to  $\ \ \,$ 

ankle, and from shoulder to  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  whatever you call the place where your hands

come out. (Shape well shown in the illustration Magick face p. 360).

You being a Probationer, plain black is correct; and the Unicursal Hexa-

gram might be embroidered, or "applique" (is it? I mean
"stuck on"), upon

the breast. The best head-dress is the Nemyss: I cannot trust myself to

describe how to make one, but there are any number of models in the British

Museum, on in any Illustrated Hieroglyphic text. The Sphinx wears one,

and there is a photograph, showing the shape and structure very clearly,

in the Equinox I, 1, frontispiece to Supplement. You can easily make one

yourself out of silk; broad black-and-white stripes is a pleasing design.

Avoid "artistic" complexities.

Well, that ought to be enough to keep you out of mischief for a little

while; but I feel moved to add a line of caution and encouragement.

Listen!
Faites attention!
Achtung!
Khabardar karo!

Just as soon as you start seriously to prepare a place for magical Work,

the world goes more cockeyed than it is already. Don't be surprised if

you find that six weeks' intense shopping all over London fails to provide

you with some simple requisite that normally you could buy in ten minutes.

Perhaps your fires simply refuse to burn, even when liberally dosed with

petrol and phosphorus, with a handful of Chlorate of Potash thrown in just

to show there is no ill feeling! When you have almost decided that you

had better make up your mind to do without something that seems really

quite unobtainable --- say, a sixty-carat diamond which would look so well

on the head-dress --- a perfect stranger comes along and makes you a present  $\,$ 

of one. Or, a long series of quite unreasonable obstacles or silly acci-

dents interfere with your plans: or, the worst difficulty in your way is incomprehensibly removed by some extraordinary "freak of chance." Or, . . .

22

In a word, you seem to have strolled into a world where --- well, it might

be going too far to say that the Law of Cause and Effect is suspended;

but at least the Law of Probability seems to be playing practical jokes on you.

This means that your manoeuvres have somehow attracted the notice of the

Astral Plane: your new neighbours (May I call them?) are taking an  $\ensuremath{\mbox{}}$ 

interest in the latest Tenderfoot, some to welcome, to do all they can

to help you to settle down, others indignant or apprehensive at this  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

disturbance of routine. This is where your Banishings and Invocations

come to the rescue. Of course, I am not here referring to the approach  $\,$ 

to Sanctuaries which of necessity are closely guarded, but merely to the  $\,$ 

recognition of a new-comer to that part of the world in general.

Of course all these miracles are very naughty of you; they mean that your  $\,$ 

magical power has sprung a few small leaks; at least, the water is oozing

between some planks not sealed as Hermetically as they should be. But oh

and this is naughtier still  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  it is a blessed, blessed comfort that they

happen, that chance, coincidence and all the rest will simply not explain  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

it all away, that your new vision of life is not a dream, but part and

parcel of Experience for evermore, a real as any other manifestation of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

Reality through sense such as is common to all men.

And this brings us  $\operatorname{---}$  it has been a long way round  $\operatorname{---}$  from the suggestion of

your visit to the question (hitherto unanswered) in your letter.

You raise so vast and razor-edged a question when you write of the supposed

antinomy of "soul" and "sense" that it seemed better to withhold comment

until this later letter; much meditation was most needful to compress

the answer within reasonable limits; even to give it form at all is no

easy matter. For this is probably the symptom of the earliest stirring of

the mind of the cave-man to reflection, thereunto moved by other symptoms  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$ 

those of the morning after following upon the night before. It is  $\operatorname{---}$  have

we not already dealt with that matter after a fashion? --- evidence of disease

when an organ become aware of its own modes of motion. Certainly the mere

fact of questioning Life bears witness to some interruption of its flow,

just as a ripple on an even stream tells of a rock submerged. The fiercer

the torrent and the bigger the obstacle, the greater the disturbance to  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

the surface --- have I not seen them in the Bralduh eight feet high?

Lethargic folk with no wild impulse of Will may get through Life in bovine

apathy; we may well note that (in a sense) the rage of the water seems to

our perturbed imagining actually to increase and multiply the obstructions;

there is a critical point beyond which the ripples fight each other!

That, in short, is a picture of you!

You have mistaken the flurry of passing over some actual snag for a snag

in itself! You put the blame on to your own quite rational attempts to

overcome difficulties. The secret of the trick of getting past the rocks  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

is elasticity; yet it is that very quality with which you reproach yourself!

We even, at the worst, reach the state for which  ${\tt Buddhism},$  in the  ${\tt East}$ 

presents most ably the case: as in the West, does James Thomson (B.V.) in

The City of Dreadful Night; we come to wish for --- or, more truly to

think that we wish for "blest Nirvana's sinless stainless Peace" (or some

23

such twaddle --- thank God I can't recall Arnold's mawkish and unmanly

phrase!) and B.V.'s "Dateless oblivion and divine repose."

I insist on the "think that you wish," because, if the real You did really

wish the real That, you could never have come to exist at all! ("But  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

don't exist." --- "I know --- let's get on!")

Note, please, how sophistically unconvincing are the Buddhist theories of

how we ever got into this mess. First cause: Ignorance. Way out, then,

knowledge. O.K., that implies a knower, a thing known --- and so on and so

forth, thought all the Three Waste Paper Baskets of the Law; analysed, it

turns out to be nonsense all dolled up to look like thinking. And there

is no genuine explanation of the origin of the Will to be.

How different, how simple, how self-evident, is the doctrine of The Book of the Law!

There are any number of passages dealing with this matter in my writings:

let's forget them, and keep to the Text!

Cap. I, v. 26 ". . my ecstasy, the consciousness of the
continuity of
existence, the omnipresence of my body."

V.~30~ "This is the creation of the world, that the pain of division is

as nothing, and the joy of dissolution all." (There is a Qabalistic inner

meaning in this text; "the pain," for instance, {Greek caps:
OmicronAlphaLambdaGammaOmicronSigma}, may be read

 $\mbox{\ensuremath{\mathtt{XVII}}}$  x 22 "the expression of Star-love," and so on: all too complicated

for this time and place!)

V.~32. "Then the joys of my love" (i.e. the fulfillment of all possible

experiences) "will redeem ye from all pain." V. 58. "I give unimaginable joys on earth: certainty, not faith, while in life, upon death; peace5 unutterable, rest, ecstasy; . . . " Cap. II, v. 9 "Remember all ye that existence is pure joy; that all the sorrows are but as shadows; they pass & are done; but there is that which remains." (The continuation is amusing! vv. 10 and 11 read: "O prophet! thou hast ill will to learn this writing. I see thee hate the hand & the pen; but I am stronger." At that time I was a hard-shell Buddhist, sent out a New Year's Card "wishing you a speedy termination of existence!" And this as a young man, with the world at my feet. It only goes to show . . . . .) Vv. 19, 20. "Is a God to live in a dog? No! but the highest are of us. . . . Beauty and strength, leaping laughter and delicious languor, force and fire, are of us." This chapter returns over and over again to this theme in one form or 5\* "Peace": the glow of satisfaction at achievement. It is not "eternal," rather, it whets the appetite for another adventure. (Peace, {GK: H. EIPHNH}  $189 = 7 \times 9 \times 13$  'the Venusian plus Lunar form of Unity.) 24 another. What is really more significant is the hidden, the unexpressed, soul of the Book; the way in which it leaps into wild spate of rhapsody on any excuse or no excuse.

This is surely more convincing than some dreary thesis plodding along doggedly with the "proof" (!) that "God is good," every sentence creaking with your chalk-stones and squeaking with the twinges of your toe! Yet just because I proclaim a doctrine of joy in the language of joy, people -- dull camels --- say I am not "serious." Yet I have found pleasure in harnessing the winged horses of the Sun to the ploughshare of Reason, in showing the validity of this doctrine in detail. It satisfies my sense of rhythm and of symmetry to explain that every experience, no matter what, must of necessity be a gain of grandeur, of grip, of comprehension and enjoyment ever growing as complexity and simplicity succeed each other in sublime systole and diastole, in strophe and antistrope chanting against each other to the stars of the Night and of the Morning! Of course it is easy as pie to knock all this to pieces by "lunatic logic," saying: "Then toothache is really as pleasant as strawberry shortcake:" You are hereby referred to Eight Lectures of Yoga. None of the terms I am using have been, or can be defined. All my propositions amount to no more than tautology: A. is A. You may even quote The Book of the Law itself: "Now a curse upon Because and his kin! . . . . Enough of Because! Be he damned for a dog!" (AL II, 28-33). These things Ignoratio Elenchi, or something painfully like it: as sort of slipping up a cog, of "confusing the planes" of willfully misunderstanding the gist of an argument. (All magicians, by the way, ought to be grounded solidly in Formal Logic.) Never forget, at the least, how simple it is to make a maniac's hell-broth of any proposition, however plain to common sense. All the above, now: --- Buddhism refuted. Yet it is a possibility and therefore one facet of Truth. "Rest" is an idea: so immobility is one

of the moving states. A certain state of mind is (almost by definition)
"eternal," yet it most assuredly begins and ends.

And so on for ever --- I fear it would be nugatory, pleonastic (and oh!

several other lovely long adjectives!) to try to guard you from these  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) ^{2}$ 

hydra-headed and protean booby-traps; you must tackle them yourself as

they arise, and deal with them as best you can: always remembering that

often enough you cannot tell which is you and which is the Monkey  $\mbox{Puzzle}$ ,

or who has won. ("Everybody's won; so everybody must have a prize"  $\,$ 

applies beautifully). And none of it all matters a row of haricots verts  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left$ 

saut,s; for the conclusion must always be Doubt (see that beastly Book of

Lies again  $\operatorname{---}$  there's a gorgeous chapter about it) and the practical moral

is this: these contradictions don't occur (or don't matter) in Neschamah.

Also, it might help you quite a lot (by encouraging you when depressed, or

amusing you when you want to relax) to read Sir Palamede the Saracen;

Supplement to The Equinox, Vol. I, No. 4. I expect quite a few of his

tragi-comic misadventures will be already familiar to you in one disguise or another.

25

And if the above remarks should embolden you to exclaim: "Perhaps a little drink would do me no great harm" I shall feel that I have deserved well of my country!

For --- see Liber Aleph, after Rabelais --- the Word of the Last Oracle is TRINC.

. . . .

## VISIT...



This plaint of yours tails off --- and perks up in so doing --- with

confession

of Ambition, and considerations of what you must leave over to your next

life. Very right! but all that is covered by your general programme. It

is proper to assimilate these ideas with the fundamental structure of your  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

mind: "Perhaps I had better leave 'The Life and opinion of Battling Bill,

the Ballarat Bruiser' till, shall we say, six incarnations ahead" --- But

perhaps you have acquired that already.

No, better still, concentrate on the Next Step! After all, it is the only  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,n\right\} =\left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,n\right\} =\left\{$ 

one you can take, isn't it! Without lust of result, please!

And I shall leave anything else to the next letter.

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours fraternally,

666

P.S. "Next letter," yes, they are running into one another more than some-

what; it is better so, for life is like that. And we have the bold bad editor to sort them out.

CHAPTER XXIV

NECROMANCY AND SPIRITISM

Cara Soror,

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

Really, you make me ashamed of You! To write to ignorant me to wise you

up about necromancy, when you have at your elbow the one supreme classic ---

L, vi's Chapter XIII in the Dogme et Rituel!6"

What sublimity of approach! What ingenuity of "considerations!" With

what fatally sure steps marches his preparation! With what superb tech-

nique does he carry out his energized enthusiasm! And, finally, with

what exact judicial righteousness does he sum the results of his great  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

Evocation of Apollonius of Tyana!

Contrast with this elaborate care, rightness of every detail, earnestness and intentness upon the goal --- contrast, I say, the modern Spiritist in the dingy squalor of her foul back street in her suburban slum, the room

musty, smelling of stale food, the hideous prints, the cheap and rickety  $\,$ 

166

furniture, calling up any one required from Jesus Christ to Queen Victoria,

6\* Dogme et Rituel de la Haute Magie, by Eliphas L, vi.

26

all at a bob-a-nob!

Faugh! Let us return to clean air, and analyse L,vi's experiment; I

believe that by the application of the principles set forth in my other

letters on Death and Reincarnation, it will be simple to explain his par-

tial failure to evoke Apollonius. You had better read them over again,

to have the matter clear and fresh in your mind.

Now then, let me call you attention to the extreme care which  $\mathbf{L}$ ,  $\mathbf{v}\mathbf{i}$  took

to construct a proper Magical Link between himself and the  $\mbox{\tt Ancient Master.}$ 

Alas! It was rather a case of building with bricks made without straw;

he had not at his command any fresh and vital object pertaining intimately

to Apollonius. A "relic" would have been immensely helpful, especially if

it had been consecrated and re-consecrated through the centuries by devout  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

veneration. This, incidentally, is the great advantage that one may often  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

obtain when invoking Gods; their images, constantly revered, nourished by

continual sacrifice, serve as a receptacle for the  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Prana}}$  driven into them

by thousands or millions of worshippers. In fact, such idols are often

already consecrated talismans; and their possession and daily use is at

least two-thirds of the battle.

Apollonius was indeed as refractory a subject as L, vi could possibly have

chosen. All the cards were against him.

Why? Let me remind you of the sublimity of the man's genius, and the

extent of his attainment. Apollonius must certainly have made the closest

links between his Ruach and his Supernal Triad, and this would have gone

seeking a new incarnation elsewhere. All the available Ruach left float-

ing around in the Akasha must have been comparatively worthless odds and

ends, true Qlippoth or "Shells of the Dead" --- just those
parts of him, in

a word, which Apollonius would have deliberately discarded at his death.

So what use would they be to L,vi? Even if there were among them a few

such elements as would serve his purpose, they would have been devitalized  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

and frittered away by the mere lapse of the centuries, since they had lost

connection with the reality of the Sage. Alternatively, they might have

been caught up and adopted by some wandering Entity, quite probably some malignant demon.

Qlipoth --- Shells of the Dead --- Obsessing Spirits! Here we are back in

the pestilent purlieus of Walham Green, and the frowsty atmosphere of the

frowsy "medium" and the squalid s,ance. "Look! but do not speak to them!" as Virgil warned Dante.

So let us look.

No! Let us first congratulate ourselves that this subject of Necromancy is

so admirably documented. As to the real Art, we have not only Eliphas

 ${\tt L}, {\tt vi},$  but the sublimely simple account in the Old Testament of the Witch

of Endor, her conjuring up of the apparition of Samuel to King Saul. A

third classic must not be neglected: I have heard or read the story else-

where  $\operatorname{---}$  for the moment I cannot place it. But it is so brilliantly told

in I Write as I Please by Walter Duranty that nothing could be happier  $\,$ 

than to quote him verbatim.

revolutionary work in

"It was the story of a Bolshevik who conversed with a corpse. He told it to me himself, and undoubtedly believed it, although he was an average tough Bolshevik who naturally disbelieved in Heaven and Hell and a Life beyond the Grave. This man was doing 'underground'

27

St. Petersburg when the War broke out; but he was caught by the police  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

and exiled to the far north of Siberia. In the second winter of the  $\mbox{\it War}$ 

he escaped from his prison camp and reached an Eskimo village where they

gave him shelter until the spring. They lived, he said, in beastly condi-

tions, and the only one whom he could talk to was the Shaman, or medicine

 $\mbox{\sc man}\,,$  who knew a little Russian. The Shaman once boasted that he could

foretell the future, which my Bolshevik friend ridiculed.

The next day

the Shaman took him to a cave in the side of a hill in which there was a

big transparent block of ice enclosing the naked body of a man  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{---}}$  a white

man, not a native --- apparently about thirty years of age
with no sign of

a wound anywhere. The man's head, which was clean-shaven, was outside

the block of ice; the eyes were closed and the features were European.

The shaman then lit a fire and burnt some leaves, threw powder on them

muttering incantations, and there was a heavy aromatic smoke. He said  $\,$ 

in Russian to the bolshevik, 'Ask what you want to know.' The Bolshevik  $\,$ 

spoke in German; he was sure that the Shaman knew no German, but he was

equally sure he saw the lips move and heard it answer, clearly, in German.

He asked what would happen to Russia, and what would happen to  $\mathop{\text{\rm him}}\nolimits.$  From

the moving lips of the corpse came the reply that Russia would be defeated

in war and that there would be a revolution; the Tzar would be captured

by his enemies and killed on the eve of rescue; he, the Bolshevik, would

fight in the Revolution but would suffer no harm; later, he would be

wounded fighting a foreign enemy, but would recover and live long."

"The Bolshevik did not really believe what he had seen although he was

certain that he had seen it. I mean that he explained it by  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{hypnotism}}$ 

or auto-suggestion or something of the kind; but it was true, he said,

that he passed unscathed through the Revolution and the Civil War and  $\,$ 

was wounded in the Polish War when the Red Army recovered Kiev."

So also we are most fortunate in possessing the account almost beyond

Heart's desire of Spiritism, in Robert Browning's Mr. Sludge the Medium.

You see that I write "Spiritism" not "Spiritualism." To use the latter

word in this connection is vulgar ignorance; it denotes a system of

philosophy which flourished (more or less) is the Middle Ages --- read

your Erdmann if you want the gruesome details. But why should you?

The model for Mr. Sludge was David Dunbar (? Douglas) Home, who was really

quite a distinguished person in his way, and succeeded in pulling some

remarkably instructed and blue-blooded legs. Personally, I believe him

to have been genuine, getting real results through pacts with elementals,

demons or what not; for when he was in Paris, arrangements were made

for him to meet Eliphas L,vi; forthwith "he abandoned the unequal

contest, and fled in terror from the accursed spot."

What annoyed Browning was that he had added to his collection of "Femora

I have pulled", those appendages of Elizabeth Barrett; and where  ${\tt R.B.}$ 

was there was no room for anyone else --- as in the case of Allah!

R.B. was accordingly as spiteful as he could be, and that was not a little.

It is not fair to tar all mediums with the Sludge brush; there are many

everything to conscious fraud.

who could advance quite sincerely some of the apologia of Sludge. Why should a medium be immune to self-deception spurred by the Wish-Fiend? While there are people walking about outside the Bug-house who can find Mrs. Simpson and Generals de Gaulle, Franco, Allenby, Montgomery and who else in the "Centuries" of Nostradamus, we should be stupid to assign

28

In that case what about poor Tiny Aleister? Do please allow me the happy young Eagles of the Old Testament; what clearer prophecy of psychoanalysis, it's only the English for Freud and Jung and Adler!

No, by no means always fraud. Yet at any s,ance the "investigators" take no magical precautions soever --- against, say, the impersonation of Iophiel by Hismael, or the Doves of Venus by the A'arab Zareq. All they attempt especially at "demonstrations" and "materializations," is to guard with great elaboration and (as a rule) complete futility against the deceptions of the common conjuror. They are not expecting any genuine manifestation of the "Spirit World;" and this fact makes clear their true subconscious attitude.

As for those mediums who possess magical ability, they almost always come from the most ignorant classes --- Celts are an exception to this rule --- and have no knowledge whatever of the technique of the business. Worse, they are usually of the type that delights in the secret dirty affinities, and so naturally and gladly attract entities of the Qliphothic world to their magical circle. Hence tricksters, of the lowest elemental orders, at the

best, come and vitalize odds and ends of the Ruach of people recently  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

deceased, and perform astonishing impersonations. The hollow shells  $\operatorname{glow}$ 

with infernal fire. Also, of course, they soak up vitality from the  $\,$ 

sitters, and from the medium herself.

Altogether, a most poisonous performance. And what do they get out of

it? Even when the "Spirits" are really spirits, they only stuff the party up with a lot of trashy lies.

To this summary the Laws of Probability insist that there shall be occasional exceptions.

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours fraternally,

666

CHAPTER XXV

FASCINATIONS, INVISIBILITY, LEVITATION, TRANSMUTATIONS, KINKS IN TIME

Cara Soror,

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

Dear me! dear me! The world's indeed gone topsy-turvy if you have to ask

me for the secrets of Fascination! Altogether tohu-bohu and the Temurah Thash rag!

So much for a display of Old-World Courtly Manners; actually rubbish,

for you might very well be fascinating without knowing how you worked the

trick. In fact, I think that is the case ninety-nine times in a hundred.

Besides, I read your letter carelessly; I overlooked the phrase in which

you mention that you use the word as L, vi did; i.e. to cover all those

types of "miracle" which depend on distracting the attention of, or other-

wise composing, the miraclee --- I invent a rather useful word, yes?

So let us see what sort of miracles those are.

29

To start with, I doubt if we can. Many of such thaumaturgic phenomena contain elements of illusion in greater or less degree; if the maraclee's mind is 100% responsible, I think the business becomes a mere conjuring trick. My dictionary defines the verb: "to charm, to enchant; to act on by some irresistible influence; to captivate; to excite and allure irresistibly or powerfully." For the noun it gets even deeper into technical Magic {sic}: "the act or power of fascinating or spell binding, often to one's harm; a mysterious, irresistible, alluring influence." (Personally, I have always used, or heard, it much less seriously: "attractive" hardly more). Skeat, surprisingly, is almost dumb: p. part. of "to enchant" and "from L. fascinum, a spell." Yes, surprisingly; for the word is one of the many that means the Phallus. The implication is that there is some sexual element in the exciting and alluring quality, which lifts it altogether above mere "pleasing." To my mind the implication is that there is some quality inherent which is cognate to that too totally irrational quasimagnetic force which has been responsible not only for innumerable personal tragedies --- and comedies --- but for the fall of dynasties and even the wreck of Empires. "Christ" is reported as having said: "If I be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all men unto me." Interpret this in the light of the Cross as a Phallic emblem, and --- how lurid a flash!

Compare AL II, 26. "I am the secret Serpent coiled about to spring: in

my coiling there is joy. If I lift up my head, I and my Nuit are one.

If I droop down mine head, and shoot forth venom, then is rapture of the  $\,$ 

earth, and I and the earth are one."

This versicle is deep, devilish deep; and it is chock-a-block with the

mysteries of Fascination. Dig into this, dear sister! dig with your  $\,$ 

Qabalistic trowel; don't blame me if you don't get a Mandrake with the very first thrust!

But most certainly I shall say nothing here. Yes, indeed, nothing was

ever more sternly forbidden than prattle on subjects like this! Look!

It goes right on: "There is great danger in me; for who doth not understand

these runes shall make a great miss. He shall fall down into the

pit called Because, and there he shall perish with the dogs of Reason."  $\,$ 

(v. 27) The pit is of course the Abyss: see The Vision and the Voice,

Xth Aethyr. A very sticky --- or rather, unstuck! finish; so 'ware Hawk!

To business! Fascination No! Invisibility, is obviously penny plain S.A.

This is notably an affair of the subconscious; it often masters open

dislike and distaste; it never yields to reason. It destroys all sense

of values. Its origin is usually obscure. The least irrational base of

it is the sense of smell. It was, if I remember rightly, the Comte de

St. Germain who advised Loise de la ValliŠre to fix her exquisitely

broidered kerchief in such wise that it protected her from contact with

her saddle, and then, after a morning's hard gallop, to find an excuse

for using it to wipe the brows of the perspiring king. It took  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{him}}$  years

to recover! The story is well known, and the plan widely adopted with

30

remarkably unvarying success. But be careful not to overdo it; for if

the source of the perfume is recognized the consciousness takes charge,

and the result is antipathy.

Many years ago I composed a scent based on similar principles, which  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

intended to market under the title "Potted Sex Appeal." We tried it out

with the assistance of a certain noble Marquess, whose consequent mis-

adventures --- won't he laugh when he reads this!

But there are other senses: "l'amour de l'oreille" may refer not only to

Othello's way of snaring Desdemona, but subtleties of timbre in the voice...

Yes, yes, you say impatiently, but there isn't any miracle about all this

in the ordinary sense of the word.

True, but why the devil do you want me, so long as you're getting what you

need? Just being childlike, I suppose! No? Merely that you can explain

such matters to yourself well enough. All right; on to No. 2. Shall we

look at levitation for a change?

This power  $\operatorname{---}$  if it be one  $\operatorname{---}$  is very curious indeed. It connects more

directly with magnetism than almost any other. The first thing we think  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

of when someone says "magnet" is picking up iron filings as a child.

Age before honesty! Let Father Poulain S.J. speak first! He is obliged

to admit the phenomenon, because the Church has done so. But precisely

similar accounts of the levitation of pagans and heretics must be accord-

ing to him, lies, or Works of the Devil. As for the method,  $"God\ employs"$ 

the angels to raise the saint, so as to avoid the necessity of intervening

Himself." Lazy old parishioner!

Now for a douche of common sense. Hatha-Yoga is quite clear and simple,

even logical, about it. The method is plain Pranayama. Didn't I tell

you onetime of the Four Stages of Success? 1. Perspiration  $\operatorname{\mathsf{---}}$  of a very

special kind. 2. Sukshma-Khumbakam: automatic rigidity. One stiffens

like a dog in a bell-jar when you pump in Carbon Dioxide (is it?) 3. The

Bhuchari-Siddhi, "jumping about like a frog." One is wafted, without one's

Asana being disturbed, about the floor, rather as fragments of paper, or

dry leaves, might be in a slight draught under the door. 4. If one is

quite perfectly balanced one cannot be moved sideways; so one rises.

And there you are!

Personally, I reached the Bhuchari-Siddhi quite a number of times; but I  $\,$ 

never observed No. 4. On several occasions other people have seen me levi-  $\,$ 

tated, though never to a height of more than a foot or so. Here is the  $\,$ 

best account of such an incident, of those at my immediate disposal.

"Nearly midnight. At this moment we stopped dictating, and began to con-

verse. Then Fra. P. said: "Oh, if I could only dictate a book like the

Tao Teh King!" Then he close his eyes as if meditating. Just before  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

had noticed a change in his face, most extraordinary, as if he were no

longer the same person; in fact, in the ten minutes we were talking he

seemed to be any number of different people. I especially noticed the

pupils of his eyes were so enlarged that the entire eye seemed black.

(I tremble so and have such a quaking feeling inside, simply in thinking

of last night, that I can't form letters). Then quite slowly the entire

room filled with a thick yellow light (deep golden, but not brilliant.

I mean not dazzling, but soft.) Fra. P. Looked like a person I had never

seen but seemed to know quite well --- his face, clothes and all were of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

the same yellow. I was so disturbed that I looked up to the ceiling to

see what caused the light, but could only see the candles. Then the chair

on which he sat seemed to rise; it was like a throne, and he seemed to

rise; it was like a throne, and he seemed to be either dead or sleeping;

but it was certainly no longer  $\operatorname{Fra}.$  P. This frightened  $\operatorname{me},$  and  $\operatorname{I}$  tried

to understand by looking round the room; when I looked back the chair

was raised, and he was still the same. I realized I was alone; and  $\[$ 

thinking he was dead or gone --- or some other terrible thing --- I lost consciousness."

This discourse has been thus left unfinished: but it is only necessary

to add that the capacity to extract such spiritual honey from these un-

promising flowers is the mark of an adept who has perfected his Magick

Cup. This method of Qabalistic exegesis is one of he best ways of

exalting the reason to the higher consciousness. Evidently it started  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

Fra. P. so that in a moment he become completely concentrated and entranced.

Note that this has nothing at all to do with any Pranayama. It seems a

matter of ecstatic concentration, which chose this mode of expression

instead of bringing on Samadhi --- though that, too, occurred in some of the cases.

By the way, there is a fairly full account of the whole business; I have

just remembered --- it is in my Autohagiography.

"Pranayama produced, firstly, a peculiar kind of perspiration; secondly,

an automatic rigidity of the muscles; and thirdly, the very curious

phenomenon of causing the body, while still absolutely rigid, to take

little hops in various directions. It seems as if one were somehow raised,

possibly an inch from the ground, and deposited very gently a short distance away.

I saw a very striking case of this at Kandy. When Allan was meditating,

it was my duty to bring his food very quietly (from time to time) into

the room adjoining that where he was working. One day he missed two

successive meals, and I thought I ought to look into his room to see if

all was well. I must explain that I have known only two European women

and three European men who could sit in the attitude called Padmasana,

which is that usually seen in seated images of the Buddha. Of these men,

Allan was one. He could knot his legs so well that, putting his hands

on the ground, he could swing his body to and fro in the air between them.

When I looked into his room I found him not seated on his meditation mat,

which was in the centre of the room at the end farthest from the window,

but in a distant corner ten or twelve feet off, still in his knotted

position, resting on his head and right shoulder, exactly like an image

overturned. I set him right way up, and he came out of his trance. He

was quite unconscious that anything unusual had happened. But he had

evidently been thrown there by the mysterious forces generated by Pranayama.

"There is no doubt whatever about this phenomenon; it is quite common.

But the Yogis claim that the lateral motion is due to lack of balance, and  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

that if one were in perfect spiritual equilibrium one would rise directly  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{c}}$ 

in the air. I have never seen any case of levitation, and hesitate to say  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

that it has happened to me, thought I have actually been seen by others, on

several occasions, apparently poised in the air. For the first three

phenomena I have found no difficulty in devising quite simple physiologi-

cal explanations. But I can form no theory as to how the practice could counteract the force of gravitation, and I am unregenerate enough to allow this to make me sceptical about the occurrence of levitation. Yet, after all, the stars are suspended in space. There is no ... priori reason why the forces which prevent them rushing together should not come into operation in respect of the earth and the body." The Allan part of this is the best evidence at my disposal. He couldn't have got where he did by hopping, and he couldn't have got into that position intentionally; he must have been levitated, lost balance, and dropped upside down. In any case, there is no trace of fascination about it, as there may have been in Soror Virakam's observation. About invisibility, now? Of this I have so much experience that the merest outline could take us far beyond the limits of a letter. In Mexico D.F., I worked at acquiring the power by means of ritual. I worked desperately hard. I got to the point where my image in a pierglass flickered, rather like the very earliest films did. Possibly more work, after more skill had come to me, might have done the whole trick. But persist when I found out how to do it by fascination. (Here we are at last!) Roughly, this is how to do it. If one is concentrated to the point when what you are thinking of is the only reality in the

Universe, when you

lose all awareness of who and where you are and what you are doing, it

seems as though that unconsciousness were in some way contagious. The

people around you just can't see anybody.

At one time, in Sicily, this happened nearly every day. Our party, strolling

down to our bathing bay --- the loveliest spot of its kind that I have ever

seen --- over a hillside where there wasn't cover for a rabbit, would lose

sight of me, look, and fail to find me, though I was walking in their midst.

At first, astonishment, bewilderment; at last, so normal had it become:

"He's invisible again."

One incident I remember very vividly indeed; an old friend and I were  $\,$ 

sitting opposite each other in armchairs in front of a large fire, smoking

our pipes. Suddenly he lost sight of me, and actually cried out in alarm.

I said: "What's wrong?" That broke the spell; there I was, all present and correct.

Did I hear you mutter "Transmutations? Werwolves? Golden Hawks?" Likely

enough; it's time we touched on that.

In certain types of animal there appears, if tradition have any weight, to

be a curious quality of --- sympathy? I doubt if that be the word, but can

think of none better --- which enables them to assume at times the human

body of literature about this. Then come wolves, hyaenas, large dogs of

the hunting type; occasionally leopards. Tales of cats and serpents are  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

usually the other way round; it is the human (nearly always female) that

assumes these shapes by witchcraft. But in ancient Egypt they literally

doted on this sort of thing. The papyri are full of formulas for operating

such transmutations. But I think that this was mostly to afford some relaxa-  $\,$ 

tion for the spirit of the dead man; he nipped out of his sarcophagus,

and painted the town all the colours of the rainbow in one animal shape or another.

33

The only experience I have of anything of this sort was when I was in Pacific

waters, mostly at Honolulu or in Nippon. I was practising Astral projection.

A sister of the Order who lived in Hong Kong helped me. I was to visit her, and the token of perfect success was to be that I should knock a vase off the mantel-piece. We appointed certain days and hours --with some awkwardness, as my time-distance from her was constantly growing shorter --- for me to pay my visit. We got some remarkable results; our records of the interview used to tally with surprising accuracy; but the vase remained intact! This is not one of my notorious digressions; and this is how transmutation comes into it. I found that by first taking the shape of a golden hawk, and resuming my own form after landing in her "temple" --- a room she had fitted ad hoc --- the whole operation became incomparably easier. I shall not indulge in hypotheses of why this should have been the case. A little over four years later --- in the meantime we had met and worked at Magick together --- we resumed these experiments in a somewhat different form. The success was much greater; but though I could move her, and even any objects which she was touching, I could make no impression on inanimate objects at a distance from her. The behaviour of her dogs, and of her cat, was very curious and interesting. Strangest of all, there appeared those "kinks in Time" which profane science is just beginning to discuss. Example: on one occasion our records of an "interview" agreed with quite extraordinary precision; but, on comparing notes, it was found that owing to some stupid miscalculation of mine, it was all over in Hong Kong some hours before I had started from Honolulu! Again,

Talking of kinks in Time, I shall now maintain my aforesaid evil notor-

iety  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  the story is totally asynartete from fascinations of whatever

variety --- by recounting what is by far the most inexplicable set of facts that ever came my way.

don't ask me why, or how, or anything!

In the summer of 1910 e.v. I was living at 125 Victoria Street, in a studio converted into a Temple by means of a Circle, an Altar and the rest. West of the Altar was a big fireplace with a fender settee; the East wall was covered with bookshelves. Enter the late Theodor Reuss, O.H.O. and Frater Superior of the O.T.O. He wanted me to join that Order. I recommended him, in politer language to repeat the Novocastrian Experiment. Undeterred, he insisted: "But you must." (Now we go back, or forward, I know not which, to a night when I found myself stranded in London. I asked hospitality of a stranger; it was readily afforded. Some hours later my hostess fell asleep; I could not do so; something was nagging me. I suddenly took my notebook, and wrote a certain passage in a certain book, since published.) "Must, my foot!" He persisted: "You have published the secret of the nth degree of O.T.O., and you must take the corresponding oaths." "I have done nothing of the sort. I don't know the secret. I don't want to know it. I don't . . . " He interrupted me; he strode across the room; he plucked a book from the shelves; he opened it; he thrust it under my nose; he pointed out a passage with a minatory index. I began to stammer. "Yes, I wrote that. I don't know what it means; I don't like it; I only put it in because it was written in rather curious circumstances, and I was too lazy --- or perhaps a little afraid --- to reject it and write what I wanted." He fastened on one point: "You don't know what it means?" I repeated that I did not, even now that he had claimed

34

it as important. He explained it to me, as to a child. I was merely

surprised; it didn't sound possible. (Sister, all this
while I've been

lying to you like an Archbishop; it is connected wit fascinations;

indeed, it has very little to do with anything else!)

Finally, he won me over, I went down to his G.H.Q., took the Oaths, was

installed in the Throne of the  $\text{X} \varnothing$  of O.T.O. as National Sovereign Grand

Master General, and began to establish the Order as a going concern.

Well, you say, that is a very simple story, nothing specially hard to believe in it.

True, but consider the dates.

That scene in Victoria Street, is as clear and vivid in  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{my}}$   $\ensuremath{\mathsf{mind}},$  in every

detail, as if it were yesterday. That secret is published only in that

passage of that book. And  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  the book was not published until three

years later, and from an address of which in 1910 I had not so much as  $\,$ 

thought of. The date of my adhesion to the O.T.O. (which, by the way,

upset every principle and plan that I had ever held) is equally certain  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

by virtue of subsequent published writings.

Now go away and explain that!

Well I've given you a fair account of some of the principal fascinations;

as to the rest, bewitchments, sorceries, inhibitions and all that lot, it

is enough if I say that they follow the regular Laws of Magick; in some,

fascination proper plays a prominent part; in others, it is barely more

than walking on to say "My lord, the carriage waits!" But --- even that

can be done well or ill, and a small mistake may work a mighty mischief.  $\,$ 

Love is the law, love under will.

Yours fraternally,

666

CHAPTER XXVI

MENTAL PROCESSES --- TWO ONLY ARE POSSIBLE

Cara Soror,

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

"Occult" science is the most difficult of them all. For one thing, its

 $\verb|subject-matter|$  includes the whole of philosophy, from ontology and

metaphysics down to natural history. More, the most rarefied and recon-

dite of these has a direct bearing upon the conduct of life in its most

material details, and the simplest study of such apparently earthbound

matters as botany and mineralogy leads to the most abstruse calculations  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

of the imponderables.

With what weapons, then, are we to attack so formidable a fortress?

The first essential is clear thinking.

In a previous letter I have dealt to some extent with this subject;

but it is so important that you must forgive me if I return to it, and

35

that at length, from the outset, and in detail.

Let us begin but having our own minds clear of all ambiguities, ignoring

for the purpose of this argument all metaphysical subtleties.7  $\,\,\textsc{I}$  want

to confine it to the outlook of the "plain man."

What do we do when we "think?"

There are two operations, and only two, possible to thought. However

complex a statement may appear, it can always be reduced to a series of  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

one or other of these. If not, it is a sham statement; nonsense mas-

querading as sense in the cloak of verbiage and verbosity.

Analysis, and Synthesis; or,

Subtraction, and Addition.

1. You can examine A, and find that it is composed of B and C. A = B + C.

2. You can find out what happens to B when you add C to it. B + C = A.

As you notice, the two are identical, after all; but the process is different.

Example: Raise Copper Oxide to a very high temperature; you obtain metallic copper and oxygen gas. Heat copper in a stream of

oxygen; you
obtain copper oxide.

You can complicate such experiments indefinitely, as when one analyzes

coal-tar, or synthesizes complex products like quinine from
its elements;

but one can always describe what happens as a series of simple operations,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

either of the analytical or the synthetic type.

(I wonder if you remember a delightful passage in  $\mbox{\tt Anatole}$  France where

he interprets an "exalted" mystical statement, first by giving the words

their meaning as concrete images, when he gets a magnificent  $\mbox{hymn}$ , like

a passage from the Rig-Veda; secondly, by digging down to the original  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

meaning, with an effect comical and even a little ribald. I fear I have  $\begin{tabular}{ll} \hline \end{tabular}$ 

no idea where to find it; in one of the "odds and ends" compilations

This has been put in a sort of text, because the first stumbling-block

to study is the one never has any certainty as to what the author means,  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

or thinks he means, or is trying to persuade one that he means.

Try something simple: "The soul is part of God." Now then, when he

writes "soul" does he mean Atma, or Buddhi, or the Higher Manas, or

Purusha, or Yechidah, or Neschamah, or Nepheshch, or Nous, or Psyche, or

Phren, or Ba, or Khu, or Ka, or Animus, or Anima, or Seele, or what?

As everybody will he nill he, creates "God" in his own image, it is perfectly useless to inquire what he may happen to mean by that. But even this very plain word "part". Does he mean to imply a quantitative assertion, as when one says sixpence is part of a pound, or a factor 7\* I mean criticisms such as "Definition is impossible;" "All arguments are circular; " "All propositions are tautological." These are true, but one is obliged to ignore them in all practical discussions. 36 indispensable, as when one says "A wheel is part of a motorcar", or . . . (Part actually means "a share, that which is provided," according to Skeat; and I am closer to the place where Moses was when the candle went out than I was before!) The fact is that very few of us know what words mean; fewer still take the trouble to enquire. We calmly, we carelessly assume that our minds are identical with that of the writer, at least on that point; and then we wonder that there should be misunderstandings! The fact is (again!) that usually we don't really want to know; it is so very much easier to drift down the river of discourse, "lazily, lazily, drowsily, drowsily, In the noonday sun". Why is this so satisfactory? Because although we may not know what a word means, most words have a pleasant or unpleasant connotation, each for himself, either because of the ideas or images thus begotten, of hopes or memories stirred up, or merely for the sound of the word itself. (I have gone a month's journey out of my way to visit a town, just because

I liked the sound of the name!)

Then there are devices: style --- rhythm, cadence, rime, ornamentation of a thousand kinds. I think one may take it that the good writer makes use of such artifice to make his meaning clear; the bad writer to obscure it, or to conceal the fact that he has none. One of the best items of the education system at the Abbey in Cefal- was the weekly Essay. Everyone, including children of five or six, had to write on "The Housing Problem," "Why Athens Decayed," "The System," "Buddhist Ethics" and the like; the subject didn't matter much; the point was that one had to discover, arrange and condense one's ideas about it, so as to present it in a given number of words, 93 or 156, or 418 as like as not, that number, neither more nor less. A superb discipline for any writer. I had a marvellous lesson myself some years earlier. I had cut down a certain ritual of initiation to what I thought were the very barest bones, chiefly to make it easy to commit to memory. Then came a candidate who was deaf --- not merely "a little hard of hearing;" his tympana were ruptured --- and the question was How? All right for most of it; one could show him the words typed on slips. But during part of the ceremony he was hoodwinked; one was reduced to the deaf-and-dumb alphabet devised for such occasions. I am as clumsy and stupid at that as I am at most things, and lazy, infernally lazy, on top of that. Well, when it came to the point, the communication of the words became abominably, intolerably tedious. And then! Then I found that about two-thirds of my "absolutely essential" ritual was not necesasary at all! That larned 'im.

Love is the law, love under will.

Fraternally,

666

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  $\ensuremath{\operatorname{animal}}$ 

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  $\operatorname{God}$  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:  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

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  $\,$ 

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$ 

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

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{may}}$  clear our minds, as has so often happened, if we examine it through

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

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

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  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

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  $\begin{tabular}{ll} \hline \end{tabular}$ 

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 him,

in circumstances which jeopardised his own progress, and offered his  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

Deciding to perform a critical Magical Operation, and being warned that

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  $\operatorname{End}$ ,  $\operatorname{They}$ 

also will the means. I shall do all that is possible to me by buying  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right$ 

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

no means of judging what is written in Their ledger; so "...reason is a  $\mbox{\footnote{A}}$ 

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 ---

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.
"It

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

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  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{C}}$ 

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

essential Part of the Will of any Child to grow to  $\mbox{\tt Manhood}$  or to

 $\label{thm:condition} \mbox{Womanhood in Health, and his Guardians may therefore} \\ \mbox{prevent him}$ 

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

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  $\mbox{child's own}$ 

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;

and it is these monkish and monkeyish recluses, with their hideous  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{N}}$ 

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  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  it is a true tale  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  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  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ 

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

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

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?

1. A "Word" consists of four or more letters.

Apply to me.

2. It must be printed in big black type in the Dictionary chosen for  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

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  $\operatorname{common}$ :

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 "R"ntgen-

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  $\ensuremath{\text{may}}$  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.

14

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  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{q}}$ 

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 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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

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 --- at least enough  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

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

264

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$ 

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,

666

CHAPTER LXXIV.

OBSTACLES ON THE PATH.

Cara Soror,

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 guilty, and appeal for clemency.

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 Theognis."

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
overshadowing the firmament, yet with strong Starlight constant overbead. And then I let you down!

You did expect at least something of the atmosphere of the  $\operatorname{Arabian}$ 

267

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  $\ensuremath{\text{I}}$  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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

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-

269

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!

20

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

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right$ 

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($ 

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 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,

 $\mbox{\sc Hitler},$   $\mbox{\sc Mussolini},$  the  $\mbox{\sc Mikado},$  et hoc genus omne, are loyal emissaries

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

"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

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  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{$ 

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

 $\$^{\mbox{\ }}$  WEH 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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right)$ 

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-  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

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  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\} =$ 

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

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  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{a}}$ 

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"  $\ensuremath{\text{---}}$  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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right$ 

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,  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{measured}}$ 

(rather clumsily) and used, but in no case has he understood, still  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1$ 

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  $\sin$  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

33

Intelligence do exist somehow apart from any nervous and cerebral system 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 evidence that we are all becoming wiser and nobler every minute, as

people did seventy years ago. (I was brought up in the

faith that

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

"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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right$ 

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

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 "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.  $\,$ 

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  $% \left\{ 1,2,\ldots ,2,\ldots ,2,\ldots \right\}$ 

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  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right$ 

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

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right)$ 

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.

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

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 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  $\mbox{him.}$  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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

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

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

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

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left$ 

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  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\} =\left$ 

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  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +\left($ 

that many of the mental states necessary to the development of the

Magician are identical with those attained in the course of the strictly

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 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  $\,$ 

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
                                                  M
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

Ζ

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