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Abstract

The Culling Texts is a small corpus of essays written by members of the Sinister Tradition Satanic group The Order of the Nine Angles (or, ONA) on the philosophical and practical aspects of human sacrifice, which they allegedly practice. It is an artifact that professes the claim to a radical and polemic position: of possessing the right, via their moral authority as “noble” persons, and “genuine Satanists” to “cull” (or murder) humans whose point of view or perceived social and moral behavior offends that of the ONA’s group sensibility, and subjective standards. National Socialism, Fascism, Social Darwinism and a romantic hearkening back to an imagined time of “aristocratic” humans all combine in this manifesto to provide a larger story of why the ONA thinks culling is justified. These professed beliefs beg scrutiny and analysis by virtue of their extreme, antisocial, and illegal nature. This paper (while providing context for the ONA) will evaluate and analyze ONA rhetoric in The Culling Texts for how the rhetor creates and substantiates ONA claims of superiority, authority and origin, and how this rhetoric as a whole constitutes an attempt at the construction of a mythology of this small, radical group.

For us, Satan – as did some other Dark Ones – came into our causal continuum in the past to guide, and to offer guidance to we human beings... this advice from Satan was how we might become the elite of this world, and liberate ourselves from the oppression of mundanes and from everything mundane and worthless.

The Order of the Nine Angles (est. late 1960s) is a Sinister Tradition satanic group, which is purported to have originated in England, and developed in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The group is thought to be quite small and is

headquartered in England with presences in a few other European countries, Australia, and the United States. The organization considers itself fascist, admires Adolf Hitler (1889-1945), and embraces National Socialism and Social Darwinism.  

There is a sense of the magically mysterious related in the ONA’s founding story, and it is worth noting here for its romantic and naturalistic elements. These combine to provide a solid mythic basis for the further development of the ONA’s origin-story as observed in the rhetorical analysis in this paper. It has been noted by scholars that the secrecy around the ONA makes verification of information difficult, and certainly the origin story of the ONA is no exception to this issue. Whether true or not, the story unfolds thus: in 1968 one Anton Long (b. 1950) came into contact with several magical groups, eventually moving to London and joining some of these groups. Five years later, in 1973, he met a woman who headed “a small satanist-wicca group” named the Order of the Nine Angles (an amalgam of three small temples of neopagan nature). This un-named woman initiated Long into her group and progressively gave him the legacy of her teachings, eventually turning the leadership of the tiny order over to him. Long codified these teachings and organized the structure of the group into what it is today. According to Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke:

The ONA claimed descent from a cult surrounding a dark, violent goddess who prevailed in Albion (England) as early as 4000 B.C. As a pagan nature religion, its rites were related to the flow and ebb of cosmic energies, the rising of certain stars in the spring and autumn, and certain ceremonies were performed at henges and stone circles. From these supposed Neolithic origins, the cult had declined with the advent of Christianity into a clandestine folk way practiced and handed down by a handful of individuals since medieval times, especially on the Welsh Marches, the place of its supposed prehistoric origin.

Anton Long is thought by many to be the same person as David Myatt, a well-known British National Socialist, who may also be Stephen Brown, their recently published *The Invention of Satanism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2016) that in a 2011 communication with the ONA’s Anton Long, he mentioned that membership was on the rise. 33n1.

5 Order of the Nine Angles, “Concerning Culling as Art”, 8.


6 Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke, Jacob Senholt, and George Sieg have all acknowledged the secrecy around the ONA. Goodrick-Clarke and Senholt have both noted that ONA secrecy is difficult for information gathering and confirmation.

7 Goodrick-Clarke, *Black Sun*, 217.

another pseudonym attributed to him. 9 10 11 Also of interest to consider is that Anton LaVey (1930-1997) very publicly establishes his Church of Satan in 1966, effectively heralding the birth of modern Satanism and attracting much notoriety. Then, in 1973, we are told, another “Anton L.”, Anton Long, becomes the inheritor of the Order of the Nine Angles, a small sinister pagan-fusion magical group who describe themselves throughout “The Culling Texts” as the authoritative heirs of an ancient (undocumented, yet genuine and superior-to-all-others) tradition of Satanism. Perhaps the names of these leaders, and the few years between the establishment of these two – very different – satanic groups, are simply a coincidence. If not coincidence, then the name similarity might be a tongue-in-cheek deceit by Anton Long / David Myatt/ Stephen Brown (the ONA has publicly referred to itself as being mischievous, sly, and misleading).12 Because the Church of Satan heralds the beginning of modern Satanism, the timing of the ONA’s origin story in the context of Modern Satanism could be seen as a subtle challenge to the authority of Anton LaVey. For, as we later see, the ONA claims authority as “genuine Satanists”, relegating all other Satanists (who do not adhere to the ONA’s Sinister Path approach) to the category of “pseudo Satanists”.13

Modern Satanism originated in 1966 with the establishment of Anton Szandor LaVey’s Church of Satan (CoS) in San Francisco California.14 The Church of Satan was at once a carnivalesque indulgence, a carefree sensual adventure, and a disestablishmentarian action and political response to a (Christian) religious hegemony.15 The CoS’s rationalist philosophy encouraged the liberation of the

---

11 Order of the Nine Angles, “The Satanic Letters of Stephen Brown, Vol. 2”. http://www.O9a/ WP-content/uploads/Satanicletters-2.pdf, accessed 3/6/15. In a letter from David Austen, a senior representative the Temple of Set to Kerry Bolton, (a National Socialist Satanist) dated 8/5/1992, Austen writes: “ The ONA whilst representing itself as a viable, functioning organization, appears to be only a fictional device used by a single individual ... and even that individual hides behind a variety of false names viz: Christos Beestos, Stephen Brown, Anton Long and his legal name David Myatt, but all the letters from these ‘individuals’ are written on the same typewriter! Such deviousness and dishonesty are unacceptable to the Temple of Set.”
14 Anton Szandor La Vey, *The Satanic Bible* (New York: Avon, 1969), 13. In Peter Gilmore’s introduction: “ When a member of his magic circle suggested that he had the basis for a new religion, LaVey agreed and decided to found the Church of Satan as the best means for communicating his ideas.”
15 Created amidst the social upheaval of America in the 1960’s, the Church of Satan took advantage of a favorable counter cultural environment in which to promote itself as unique, naughty, and perhaps a bit avant-garde, attracting a membership across the socio-economic strata, including
individual from centuries of Christian-dominated behavior modification that LaVey deemed conducive to a “herd mentality”, and which was contrary to human nature. As atheists, CoS members regarded Satan as a metaphor for liberation. LaVey encouraged all interested people to worship their own selves as divine, and to embrace their own carnal nature; indulging in all the sensation and enjoyment that life had to offer.

In 1975 the CoS experienced a schism over a fundamental philosophical disagreement between La Vey and his friend CoS high priest Michael Aquino. As a result, many members, led by Aquino, left to start the Temple of Set (ToS) in 1975. This split was significant, as it signaled the first of many changes in the direction of modern Satanism. La Vey did not codify his system of belief, and subsequently there is no dogma, requisite systemized ritual, or bureaucratic enforcement of beliefs, within the Church of Satan. As a result the many varieties of Satanism that have developed in the wake of LaVey’s intrepid flagship, claim diverse beliefs. They represent a wide spectrum of Left Hand Path (LHP) practice that ranges from strictly law-abiding sensual freedom seekers, to those in the Sinister Tradition, such as the ONA, whose goals are not only concerned with LHP hallmarks such as the achievement of a kind of personal godhood, and liberation of the self, but to also (as they state) actively promote chaos and

a handful of popular stars (such as Sammy Davis, Jr. and Jayne Mansfield). LaVey’s measured, playful, and charismatic presence made him a dramatically flamboyant subject for the press, TV interviews, and documentaries wherein he would philosophically propose a belief of humans as inherently free, and under no obligation to any deity.

16 LaVey, *The Devil’s Notebook* (Port Townsend: Feral House, 1992), 9. “My brand of Satanism is the ultimate conscious alternative to herd mentality and institutionalized thought. It is a studied and contrived set of principles and exercises designed to liberate individuals from a contagion of mindlessness that destroys innovation.”

17 La Vey, *The Satanic Bible*, 17. In Gilmore’s introduction: “He dethroned the seeking of external saviors, and championed responsibility for all of one’s actions and the resultant consequences. That is perhaps the most frightening principle to a society wherein none are held accountable for their behavior.”

18 La Vey, *The Satanic Bible*, 70. Even so, LaVey conveyed a certain ethic in this regard as he was specific and emphatic regarding sexual encounters that they were a matter of conscious consent between adult humans: “Therefore Satanism does not advocate rape, child molesting, sexual defilement of animals...”

19 There are several compatible accounts of this schism. Asbjorn Dyrendal, James Lewis, and Jesper Petersen do a fine job of relating the story and its layers of meaning in their previously noted *The Invention of Satanism* (Oxford, Oxford University Press: 2016).
David Myatt, himself, has a history of Neo-Nazi activity starting in the early 1970s. His radical right-wing extremist activities appear to have started in the early 1990s with the U.K. Neo Nazi skinhead group Combat 18, and the National Socialist Alliance. He has also served 2 short-term prison sentences for his involvement in political street fighting. In 1999, the London Nailbomber, a former acquaintance of David Myatt’s, built three nail bombs, which were all detonated in public locations in London. The explosions killed 3 people, including a pregnant woman, and injured 140. The bomber acquired the guidelines from the ONA’s website (though this document is no longer available on the site).

Myatt converted to Islam in the 1990s, embracing a more radical approach. In the late 1990s he publicly announced support for Osama bin Laden, and declared war on America and Israel. In 2010 he rejected Islam, and embraced his own theory of Pathēi-mathōs – a philosophy of wisdom gained through suffering. This line of thinking puts a particular emphasis on the development of empathy. This philosophy, however, seems in direct opposition to other ONA group beliefs, such as those found in The Culling Texts which espouse a superior and entitled ONA position that is not tremendously concerned with considering empathy when selecting an appropriate (inferior/mundane) human victim for sacrifice. A myriad of contradictions and questions abound around the ONA leader who has been described as somewhat of a trickster figure. It has been suggested, even, that the ONA is a façade, some kind of imaginary front for one man who is spinning fantastic tales of practices of hatred, while

20 Anton Long and Chretien Sauvage, Hostia: Secret Teachings of the ONA (CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2013), 36: “…Satanists revel in evil…they do evil, they cultivate evil: they are evil in all senses of the term now accepted.”
21 Long and Sauvage, Hostia, 36:”…novices become involved with …the manipulation, changing, of individuals and events…which produces tangible results and often disruption /creation/evolution and thus continues the sinister dialectic of history.”
22 Order of the Nine Angles, ‘Excursus’, 19:”The essence [of ONA Satanism] is that it is a practical means, a practical way to create a new, higher type of individual – and eventually a new human species.”
24 Goodrick-Clarke, Black Sun, 217, 222.
25 Senholt, “Secret Identities in the Sinister Tradition” 265-267. Senholt offers an interesting array of facts and journalist quotes on these pages that give rise to the thought that it is possible that Myatt's temporary conversion may have been one way in which he could have continued the ONA agenda of promoting harm; through the use of the more radical aspects of Islam
advocating for creating chaos, all for the end goal of contributing to a ”Sinister Dialectic”. 28 

Aside from issues of leadership identity, there are more questions to be asked: Why is it that a group that claims to be exclusive and elite in the extreme, should be so shrouded in secrecy regarding membership, group names, locations, and organization numbers when they have such a public presence on the internet? Is it possible that the real objective of making such a great amount of ONA philosophical material readily available while otherwise maintaining such secrecy is really to recruit,29 to identify and attract like-minded people? Why else share so much information so freely with the rest of the world, if one’s group, in praxis, works silently and in secret? Of course there are more possibilities, amongst which is that the ONA is, in fact, everything that they claim to be. But if this is so, why are there more questions raised than satisfied, and why feel the need to rationalize anything to anyone?

The ONA’s public website is a rich source for primary text materials on ONA philosophy and practice.30 The variety of writings that members have published on the site differ quite a bit in subject matter, length, as well as in tone and voice. They also diverge in writing style from simple polemic, to the pseudo intellectual.

One of the better known of the writings on the website is the provocative “The Culling Texts”, a guide to the group’s philosophy for, and purported practice of, human sacrifice. This 26-paged document appears to be an older collection of seven short and related essays.31 Some of the essays are dated, and some are not. Authorship of the essays is uncertain as the first essay is signed by “R. Parker”, with the balance of writings either with no author indicated, or signed with one of the following acronyms; “ONA”, or “O9A”. As it is difficult to ascertain authorship in these instances, the reader is left to ponder if there is more than one voice represented.32 In the order they appear, the essays can be synopsized, thusly:

1. “The Theory And Practice of Sacrificial Human Culling” gives the ONA position of human sacrifice.
2. “Concerning Culling as an Art” is an ONA philosophical justification of human sacrifice, and partial mythology. Its addendum “Excursus: The Reason for Revealing a Secret Sinister Tradition” is an argument for the ONA occupying a superior position among other Satanists.

28 Senholt, ”Secret Identities in the Sinister Tradition, 269.
29 Order of the Nine Angles, Concerning Culling as Art, 9: “Being elitist, we simply have no interest in recruiting, guiding, training, the wrong type of person.”
30 The ONAs website address is: www.o9a.org
31 Note: this document is un-numbered. The assignment of page numbers are for the sake of clarity, and reference. The ONA have made this text available on their site in .pdf format. I have ascribed the very first page of this .pdf as page “1.” My numbering reference proceeds in the exact order of that pdf ending with page “26.”
32 The ONA refers to this group of writings as “texts”, and does not make particular note of authorship.
6. “Guidelines for the Testing of Opfers” is a practical guide on testing whether a person qualifies as a suitable Opfer (or, sacrifice).

For purposes of this short paper an analysis of the rhetorical claims of ONA regarding authority and authenticity, as well as the construction of a mythology of origin, will be examined using the essay ‘Concerning Culling as Art’. Evidence of ONA rhetoric relating to group origins, and more claims to Satanic authority will be examined through the ‘Excursus’ addendum to the essay ‘Culling – A Guide to Sacrifice’. Both ONA texts will serve to illustrate a brief conclusion, which proposes that the ONA uses rhetoric in these particular writings as a strategy to create authority through polemic and marginalization, and establish legitimacy and authority through the fabrication of a group mythology.

‘Concerning Culling as Art’ is a political essay that presents the ONA case for an imagined natural history of why it is that humans killing-off other humans they regard as having little intrinsic value is natural and has been the way of humanity from a time beyond remembering. The essay is the almost six pages in length and is signed ‘Order of the Nine Angles’ and dated with ‘122 Year of Fayen’ (an ONA-specific dating system) directly under that. The essay is presented in a narrative form. The rhetor uses a deliberative approach as he attempts to convince the reader that his case is sound, and employs pathos to propel his story as evinced both by a lack of sound reasoning, and by creating an antagonistic us-and-them dynamic in the story-telling. Natural language figures, used as a vehicle with which to point toward, and validate, a type of natural selection of humans in a (Social) Darwinian sense. Metaphor appears with significant frequency, seemingly as a device for building and reinforcing a certain emotion pitch within the artifact. As well there is a significant and frequent amount of marginalization, which occurs with the apparent end goal of disempowering and de-humanizing the other, or, those whom the ONA deems are inferior humans.

ONA use of narrative to foster reader participation in their story, and pathos to engage an emotional response, seem to point to a goal of persuading the reader toward agreement/sympathy on an emotional level with the sense of elitism that the ONA construes to be deserved. The rhetor is telling a story about how the ONA’s philosophy about human sacrifice is justified because there is a historical precedence. That at some unknown time, presumably before writing, “there arose
a certain feeling, in some humans for natural justice” and that this feeling was actually an instinct, one that allowed these certain humans to recognize bad and unhealthy behavior in other humans by means of having good taste. Further, these few, tasteful people, (who we construe are, eventually, the ONA, and perhaps others like them in the Sinister Tradition), were actually of noble character and would naturally rise to positions of authority in their tribes/communities because of their honorable-ness (whereas the other, bad humans would be ruthless and selfish and look for opportunities to usurp those noble folk).

This unfounded tale is optative in approach because as rhetoric scholar Roderick Hart indicates, it “expects listeners to consult their own general wishes and preferences or those of their social grouping when judging the speaker’s remarks.” The person who identifies with this line of thinking will be mentally and emotionally drawn toward accepting this rhetoric more easily. Additionally, the more extreme nature of the argument forces one to have to make a decision about whether they accept or reject the premises.

The use of metaphor in this essay results in marginalization of the Other, and creates a distinct superior/inferior dichotomy. On one page alone in this essay, the following two groupings of words, below, were employed (sometimes repeatedly) to describe this dichotomy of humans in the ONA constructed history.

1) A list of descriptors found on page 6 employed to relate what the ONA considered more superior people: “natural justice… natural aristocracy… natural and necessary aristocracy… personal distaste… personal qualities admired and respected… trustworthy… honest… loyal… brave… instincts… taste… good taste… good breeding… noble… nobility… noble character… noble instincts… noble human beings…dislike for rotten humans… dislike for humans of rotten character.”

2) And a list of descriptors used on page 6. to characterize those that the ONA considered undesirable: “rotten humans…rotten character… humans of rotten character… less noble… less noble person… far less noble… ignoble descendants… bad leaders… brutal… selfish… offending… harming… killing… tyrannizing…ruthless.”

In these examples the superior-identified tenor is given vehicles of desirable values and characteristics, whereas the undesirable tenors are given vehicles of shame and crime. It would seem that the ONA is perhaps emulating (to a similar end) Hitler’s example of using a parasitic metaphor to describe the Jews. Rhetoric scholar Sonja Foss quotes rhetorician Steven Perry in her observation: “Hitler’s critique of the Jew’s status as a cultural being... is not illustrated by the metaphor for parasitism: it is constituted by this metaphor.” The figurative language is not supplementary or subordinate to the argument; it is itself the argument. The listener or reader who does not reject the interaction of the

33 Order of the Nine Angles, ‘Concerning Culling as Art’, 5.
35 Order of the Nine Angles, ‘Concerning Culling as Art’, 6.
36 Ibid, 6.
characteristics of infestation and Jews has accepted a claim about what the facts are and the evaluation expressed in the metaphor.”

The ONA uses naturalistic language in this essay, which supports claims of natural selection/Social Darwinism. The rhetor makes consistent use of natural language such as: “This feeling... this attitude... this instinct, this natural justice... good taste and good breeding... For Aeons there was a particular pattern to human life on this planet... these noble ones also tended to form a natural and necessary aristocracy, the means of a natural, gradual evolution... the rise of the mundanes is the steady de-evolution of human beings...” These word choices give one the sense in the narrative that a story with a higher power than the human is at work; one perhaps of predestination, but certainly of Nature. The story continues telling of the development of those with good taste over those who are mundane and rotten, and that struggles happen for power. As the tale unfolds the reader sees that the good breeding and natural aristocracy of the few will out, and a natural balance eventually will be restored with the few who are worthy (the implication being the ONA), always and eventually leading.

Ultimately, this appears to be an argument for Social Darwinism and National Socialism, which depends for support on the reader being one who, as communication scholar Walter Fisher indicates, doesn’t need an education to know what feels right for them. A narrative approach is then a quite suitable means to present an argument where one is subtly asked to make a decision about the story being told. The rhetor is making a more emotional appeal in this instance and is depending upon those for whom some stories are simply truer than others, dependent upon their own personal values and experiences.

Yet at the same time that a current political position is being stated, the group is also quite clearly creating a story of a lineage that was superior in aesthetic to other groups. Also, the reader is shown that these subjective aesthetic qualities – a sense of innate justice, and a propensity to display good taste – were earmarks of nobility and leadership. As a giant enthymeme, the essay nudges the reader – with limited information and implied meaning – to accept that the ONA retains these declared earmarks of superiority to this day, and that this heritage (however subjective) is both a birthright, and proof of worthiness.

A section of “Culling: A Guide to Sacrifice II” is entitled “Excursus: The Reason for Revealing a Secret Sinister Tradition” and is (in format tone and voice) what seems to be an addendum to the “Concerning Culling as an Art” essay. This

38 Order of the Nine Angles, ‘Concerning Culling as Art’, 5-9.
39 Walter R. Fisher, “Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument.” *Communication Monographs*, 51:1 (1984), 9. “...rationality was something to be learned, depended upon deliberation, and required a high degree of self-consciousness. Narrative rationality does not make these demands. It is a capacity we all share.”
short piece is an attack on all other forms of Satanism than the ONA-brand of sinister. What purports to be an explanation of the ONA rationale for disclosure of their culling philosophy and practices, quickly turns into an ad hominem assault on (all) other forms of Satanism, from a polarized position. The 1.5 page essay appears to be written with the primary aim of discrediting any other non-Sinister Tradition satanic group ("pseudo-Satanists") as opposed to the ONA and their philosophical ilk ("genuine Satanists"). Further, the aim of the essay also appears to be an effort to keep these other forms of Satanism marginalized through attempts to invalidate their beliefs by using name-calling, and claiming one's degree of darkness as the prime factors determining the genuine-ness of one's own practice of Satanism.

This blunt and inelegant document presents the case for ONA Sinister Tradition Satanism (and others which are akin to the ONA), to be superior to all other Satanists. The ONA boldly claims satanic authority for themselves, using the severity of their practices and the degree of darkness of their pursuits as their criteria.

If we are to accept that ONA Satanists come from a lineage of nobility, aristocracy, taste, justice and worth, and are in every way superior to mundane people, whom they despise, then this addendum states and makes the case for the ONA claiming the zenith position on the hierarchy of (sinister) Satanisms as well.

This deliberate effort to out-dark other Satanists appears to be a strategy for status elevation. I refer to this strategy as Self-marginalization. Self-marginalization is any deliberate attempt to acquire more status through projecting negative qualities upon oneself, or one’s own group. For the ONA, this is an engineered attempt for a group that prides itself at being the darkest variety of Satanism around to illustrate their authenticity as Sinister Tradition Satanists, and thereby gain more authority in that vein. They wouldn’t be able to live up to their reputation as “genuine Satanists” who are “dark” unless they take upon themselves the opportunity to reinforce to the reader that this is in fact the case. And if they are the most reprehensible of Sinister Tradition Satanists around, then they win that category, too.

ONA rhetoric uses pathos and marginalizing language to claim dominance over other satanic peer groups in a highly biased manner. The evidence for this is a provocation of emotional response by using polarizing rhetoric ("us-them" paradigm) For example, multiple sets of opposites are used (e.g. "genuine Satanist" – meaning the ONA, and "pseudo-Satanists" – meaning all other Satanists). It would seem that the rhetor wishes, strongly, to win readers to his position. Even though the ONA is secretive and present themselves as autonomous and exclusive, they are in fact making an appeal for support through their position as evinced by the degree of hauteur employed in their rhetoric. R. Hart succinctly explains this strategy: “The persuader wants to

---

42 Ibid.
make a particular kind of change, a public change. Those who dream social
dreams need the aid of others.”

The “Excursus” essay uses metaphor to attack and marginalize other Satanists
in the ONA’s claim to satanic authority. The clearest evidence for this is the
following attack on non-ONA/Sinister Tradition Satanists, nestled in the middle
of the brief piece. The rhetor describes these non-ONA Satanists thusly: “...they were one or more of the following: jerks, role-playing hucksters, babbling
pretentious nerds, fantasy mongers, pseudo-intellectual dabblers, mental
defectives undergoing genuine ordeals in the real world.”

This rather sophomoric approach seems less about logic and finesse, and more
about pathos and mudslinging. Even so, two points should be made here. One
is what communications scholars M. Stoner and S. Perkins have to say about
desecration, which is in effect what the rhetor, here, is doing in his attack:
“Desecration is an attempt to disrupt communication and cause confusion
by purposely violating the rules of rational discourse, particularly the rules
of interpretation of texts via contexts; desecration is irrational, mocking and
provides no serious alternative vision.”

The other point that needs illuminating is that the rhetor is clearly using
marginalization and negative legitimation in his text. Stoner and Perkins define
marginalization as “those beliefs, practices and customs that are often overlooked,
disregarded, ignored or explicitly oppressed.” Using Jurgen Habermas’
definition of legitimation as “the process whereby a political order’s worthiness
is recognized as just and right”, we can see that whereas other Satanists may be
quite political, they do not constitute political orders, yet their worthiness and
legitimacy is being judged by the ONA rhetor, nonetheless.

With its ad hominem attacks, genuine vs. disingenuous Satanist comparison,
and optative approach, the “Excursus” essay fosters a certain degree of
pathos. This is a text where a reader, who was not looking beyond surface
claims, might be swayed by the passion, the intensity, of the tone of the essay.
The “Excursus” essay might even be considered a rhetorical exigency of sorts
if one considers rhetorician Lloyd Bitzer’s definition in his seminal piece “The
Rhetorical Situation”: “Any exigence is an imperfection marked by urgency;
it is an obstacle, something waiting to be done, a thing which is other than
what is should be.” The ONA’s apparent need to appear as a true satanic
authority, at the expense of desecration, and the marginalization of any other
kind of satanic practitioner belies, if not a sense of urgency, then perhaps one
of desperation.

43 Hart, Modern Rhetorical Criticism, 11.
45 Mark Stoner and Sally J. Perkins, Making Sense of Messages: A Critical Apprenticeship in Rhetori-
cal Criticism. (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2005), 63.
46 Stoner and Perkins, Making Sense of Messages, 240.
Looking at the ONA, thus far it is apparent that there is considerable effort being put forth in these simple and occasionally strident pieces of polemic, to ultimately show that the ONA is authoritative, justified, and superior. Without any apparent substantiation, any documentation or outside support, the ONA is simply claiming their authority. This seems somewhat akin to part of Bourdieu’s theory of symbolic capital. In his essay “The Production of Belief”, using the paradigm of the production of culture, there exists a “refusal of the commercial”, since the commercial is readily available, not unique and not (of the coveted) new. As such, “...when the only useable, effective capital is the misrecognized, legitimate capital called ‘prestige’ or ‘authority’... economic capital cannot secure the specific profits produced by the field... unless it is reconverted into symbolic capital. For the author, the art dealer, the publisher, or the theatre manager, the only legitimate accumulation consists in making a name for oneself, a known, recognizable name...”

In another sense, the ONA’s construction of group mythos and authority is also in line with what Kocku Von Stuckrad has to say about social capital “Like the notion of secrecy, in academic analysis the concept of tradition should also be used in a discursive way only; tradition is always claimed and instrumentalized for the increase of social capital. The participation in a superior tradition and the disclosure of hidden knowledge become contested objects of desire; their possession adds to all forms of capital...”

Just a story?... Only a tale?... You of all boys should know that Man is the Storytelling Animal, and that in stories are his identity, his meaning, and his lifeblood.

Promoting and rationalizing the morality of grievous crime, the vitriolic and puerile attacks on all Satanists not in the ONA’s version of the Sinister Tradition, and the spite and intolerance for all others not of the ONA (the pseudo Satanists, mundanes, dross, and rotten people) are all components in the construction of a tale of a hate-filled exclusivity of a very small club (full of Genuine Satanists, descendants of noble and aristocratic people, inheritors of taste and good breeding). The message is reiterated throughout The Culling Texts that the ONA considers itself pre-eminent, superior, and entitled.

Given the variety of rhetoric contained in The Culling Texts, a picture of ONA-constructed reality emerges. It becomes clear through a narrative laden with naturalistic language that the author has built a vision of a certain exclusive aesthetic ideal, one that favors the only the ONA and its ilk, and that vision permeates through descriptions of time; from an ancient imagined period, to current societal course corrections (for which the group points out a pressing

need), to a future, shaped by a highly subjective and exclusionary ONA breeding program designed to produce more evolved human beings.

ONA marginalization of those who are not ONA, and the creation of a mythos in which there is a future-world that is free of those whom the ONA considers weak and unworthy – by its own insufficient, nebulous and subjective criteria – is a clear hegemonic model in which the ONA, and those like them, dominate in their self-appointed superior role.

But one question remains: where are all the other people in this future scenario? Do they even exist? And if so, how do they exist if the dominant ONA and kindred ruling class hold them in such disdain?

This author would maintain that the ONA vision is just and only that, a vision. As of this writing the group is almost 50 years old and remains, worldwide, a presence on a microscopic scale. It seems in this steady-state status that the mythically elitist and despotic future described by the rhetoric employed in “The Culling Texts” remains only the product of imagination. For without significant amounts of either human or monetary resources, the implementation of the ONA’s Sinister agonic plan for a selectively bred, superior human race to come, will take a very long time, indeed.
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