

CHAPTER TWELVE
THE LUCIFER VALUE: CREATION'S CHAMPION

**“We may be but a speck of dust, but
our future is absolutely in being a
speck of dust to be reckoned with.”
John Brandenburg, *The Case for
the Face***

The Lucifer texts are most unusual and most human stories. The texts, and Lucifer himself, deal with all the basic questions embedded in our natural experience. They deal with the foundation of ethics: self-love and love of life. Some of the basics can be expressed in four simple words: creativity, chaos, corporeality, and carnality. Human beings have been working on these questions since the written record and before, and Lucifer presented them to our ancestors in the story/history of the Garden of Eden.

Corporeality, being in a body, having a material substance as one's nature, has been an experience humans have struggled with throughout the histories of their cultures. Some of the responses have been extreme. The Dragovitsa were so horrified by the reality of a dynamic, complex cosmos that they wished a separation from all material substance. Some of these Bogomils believed that Lucifer (as the Archon of Darkness) must have created our material world because it was such a horror that only a fallen being who opposed the good god, only a Dark force which entrapped the Light force particles within matter, could have done such a thing. Their hope was that through bodily mortification they could free themselves from the heaviness and darkness of corporeality and attain a more luminous and aethereal nature capable of rising to the Light. The Albigensians and The Shakers refused to reproduce, to make more corporeal beings, because of their rejection of matter. The Bogomils had a story about Lucifer to support this rejection, as I've detailed earlier. Lucifer/Satanael was the older son of a deity remote from the material cosmos, who was highest of all in merit and the right hand man of the Father. After the failed rebellion, Satanael was forced out of the celestial court and into the void, probably space. Rather than being completely defeated, Lucifer/Satanael created a new world for himself and the Tenth Order, our cosmos, but the Bogomils saw

this world as gross, miserable, full of suffering, and evil. Our corporeal nature is a product of that cosmos, and Russell recounts the most disgusting version of the Bogomil story, a version degenerated from The Tripartite Tractate. Lucifer fails at his creation of Adam, who lies lifeless for three hundred years. During that time, Lucifer wanders his created world, eating animal flesh which is considered unclean, and negotiating a bargain with his Father that his Father will help him create a living human being. His Father had agreed in order to share these new sentient beings and fill the depleted ranks of the celestial court, but Lucifer was not about to participate in his further defeat and removal from power. He wished to imprison the human soul contributed by his Father to Adam within a corporeal and therefore corrupt substance. Lucifer achieves this by coming back to the unconscious Adam, stopping up Adam's bodily orifices with his hands, and regurgitating animal matter into Adam's mouth, defiling and trapping him within a body that is disgusting because made of natural matter. His Father still helps him create Eve, however, whom Lucifer proceeds to make love to in the form of a serpent's tail. The result is Cain and his twin sister Calomena/Luluwa. For that act of opposition or struggle for shared power, Lucifer is stripped of his creative power and his celestial form. Although still ruling over the material cosmos, he is destined to be defeated again, and again "cast down from heaven," which to make sense has to mean something close to being pushed out of the ordered celestial territories. The final result of this history for human beings is that to be saved and united with the celestial court we have to reject and despise the material world, hope for End Times in which human material bodies and the entire material world will be destroyed, and because we are part of the material world, feel disgusted with our corporeality and refuse to reproduce more material human beings.

This is an awful evaluation of ourselves, one of the clearest examples of how humans unfortunately despise and abhor their physical bodies, and because we *are* physical bodies we then despise and abhor ourselves. Russell describes this emotion: "...the sense that we are radically alienated from a reality of beauty, truth, and light seems deeply rooted in human experience. Throughout human existence, in virtually every society and every time and place, some have felt the strong appeal of religions and philosophies that offer hope of bridging that perceived gap, of removing that sense of alienation, and of restoring us to our rightful place in reality " (1). This is a gentle way of describing such

self-rejection and self-disgust, and the offered hope of bridging the gap has historically worked itself out as self-mutilation/self-mortification of the body, abstention from sexual reproduction, and a death-wish to achieve the only unification possible, unification after death of the body. I agree with Russell that there is such a powerful emotion, and I think the sense of being alienated from other beings like us may have a basis in the history of the cosmos, but I disagree that the solution of some religions and philosophies is a good solution.

I have personally tried to work through the problematic feelings about corporeality myself, and I suspect many of us share those feelings. As a child, I did not have a problem accepting my exterior material body, covered with skin. It was the understanding of what the interior body system looked like that troubled me, and the affirmation that there were many important things going on under the skin which did not pay any attention to my cognitive activities that gave me an uneasy feeling. The gurgles and contractions, the triggers to behaviors, the mucous and tissue -- I knew they were essential, but I didn't really want them to be me. Like Sartre, I had a few problems emotionally (though not cognitively) with the mucous-covered natural world (2). Wandering the fields of the farms on which I grew up, I would observe without really wanting to the reality of matter. Every now and then, I was curious, and a healthier response blossomed. As a preschooler on my great-grandmother's farm, I found a small, black, dead bird. I wanted to have the heart of that bird to keep, for some strange reason, but I discovered that stepping on the bird to push out the heart was not good biology or anatomy. Mostly, though, I winced as I turned over a young meadowlark lying by a fence, beautiful still on the top, but filled with crawling insect life eating its remains on its bottom. That was the true reality, I knew, of the biosphere, and had to be accepted. Accepting was not that easy. I understand that for many it isn't. My Ethiopian son-in-law remembers a medical school classmate of his who could not accept the awful reality of a dead body and mortality; he committed suicide after anatomy class, jumping out a window. Even intelligent young adults, specializing in the biosciences, have a great deal of difficulty accepting the material cosmos.

It took me until undergraduate studies to finally reach a treaty with those feelings. I had cognitively tried for years, because I sensed it was a serious problem and needed

some resolution. But I did not have the philosophic system to accomplish this cognitive task successfully, and even if I had had, it is not only a cognitive task but an emotional one. Somehow, without being all that consciously aware of it, my being negotiated a truce with itself, an acceptance of corporeality. It came in a dream, not a session of deep thought.

The dream was in color, quite brilliant color. And it only consisted of an image held for moments until the self finally accepted the image. The location was a swamp, with all the browns and olives and grays of a murky swamp. A clear blue sky was overhead and the light filtered through the heavy vegetation, wet and dripping with sparkles reflected off the drops of heavy water. An expanse of dark and green-brown water was in the middle of the scene. Something was floating on that expanse. It wasn't quite a body, yet it was very much like a body, only the skin was transparent and a lattice or tapestry of red and blue blood vessels covered the whole shape. I began to draw back from the image, but the idea came to me that I must not do that. I must try to stay in the swamp water scene and look at reality. Extruding from the almost-body shape were three organic tubes that formed curves disappearing into the dank of the water, looking almost like the swelled intestines that popped from burnt horse bodies I'd once seen in the remains of a stable. These tubes were more colorful, however, flushed with all the artist's palette of shades. My instincts felt death and decay, could almost smell the rotting, and yet this form was alive and pulsing with some sort of energy. Again I had to struggle not to pull away. A sunset was now coloring the sky with exaggerated bursting scarlets, oranges, ochres, peaches -- a spreading watercolor toward the horizon. The almost-body and its curving tubes were alight with the warm colors, the water colors, and the earth colors; the red and blue vessels filled the shape; and I finally focused on the beauty of the colors rather than the rotting swamp and the bizarre shape floating in the fetid water. Yes, my mind told itself, the colors are beautiful. Pay attention to the colors of this material world, of this living body floating in a primeval bath of precious liquid. The scene can be beautiful. Look at it long enough and see the beauty and the pulsing of matter, of biological organization. Look, accept, and enjoy.

I woke from the dream with a sense that some peace had been negotiated. It was difficult to accept and find the beauty in material systems seen in their full reality, but it

was not impossible -- because it was there. The treaty is an uneasy one, because the forces repulsing acceptance of matter are strong within the human being, and that strength remains an interesting philosophic and ethical problem that has not been explained. Still, at the core of the self, the treaty was made and is held. Corporeality is really a marvelous organized system that can accomplish in a small-sized and easily mobile package what we can only dream of constructing in artificial intelligences at the moment. The body system is fantastically organized and its complexity rivals the complexity of the cosmos. Through apoptosis it is unfortunate that the self is programmed to terminate, but the self is so evolved and developing that it can understand some of that mechanism and may, given enough time, heal itself of programmed cell death. At that point, we will have to seek new territories in space, and will have finally eaten the fruit of the second tree in the Garden of Eden, the tree of lasting life. We will have become like our human conceptions of gods. But we are held back on this human project of growth by both our rejection of corporeality and of continuing development. We construct our own alienation and separation from the cosmos, and then blame Lucifer for this, although the stories show he has been urging us forward from the beginning and that it is the ruler of the celestial court who advocates continuing alienation and stagnation.

Actually, *The Lucifer Value* is a love of dynamic systems, which implies the love of matter, and love of the material body, of corporeality. The complex organization of dark and luminous matter in the cosmos is valued in its entirety, based on the complexity and diversity of the cosmic system.

If corporeality is dysvalued, then carnality also becomes a negative feature, and the term 'carnal desires' makes the negative evaluation of the pleasurable activities of the human body obvious. Carnal desires are deemed to be unworthy and requiring repression. The most extreme examples of this are in monastic organizations, both Eastern and Western. Both Barber and Gibbon give details of the denial of basic bodily needs and the mutilation of the body typical in the early monastic movement in Egypt, the Mideast, and Western Europe (3,4). Even the military monastic orders were subject to extreme deprivation and prohibition of most of the sensual pleasures. The ego or the self (the mental aspects of the body) was not forgotten or forgiven in this rigid, rule-ordered

masochism, as Barber points out in the rules of the Knights Templar (5). Pride was to be broken, but this actually meant that spirit was to be broken. Pleasure was considered a temptation to be resisted. Neither heterosexual nor homosexual pleasures were to be fully enjoyed, although the monastic orders of Western Europe did engage in both illicitly. St. Augustine may have been compassionate about human needs and failings, and had a long early biography of trying to enjoy sensual/sexual pleasures as much as possible within a Manichean tradition, but what he ultimately offered was forgiveness for engaging in such carnality, not acceptance of carnality as ethical (6). The Buddhist tradition in the East emphasized the same separation from the pleasures of the body, the same ascetic attempt to control, starve, and fail to acknowledge the worth of bodies living in this wheel of material life. From the archaeological remains of monasteries as far west as the Tarim Basin and the Silk Route in Eurasia to the transformation of the Mongol Karakorum central city into a Buddhist monastery, the emphasis on reining in, controlling and negating the pleasures of the body is a strong one (7).

What are the evils of carnality? The most extreme rejection and statement of its evil is found in cults who judged reproduction to be such an evil that humans should cease having babies. This was not only a cult response, however, since it can be found in philosophic schools of the Neoplatonic period and in mainstream religious institutions whose priests and nuns maintain celibacy. Celibacy becomes the virtue, and human sexual love and reproduction become the vice. At best in many theisms, sexual reproduction is seen as a necessary evil to increase potential souls to be saved. It obtains its ethical approval from the soul, not the body; from salvation, not sensuality. Lucifer is portrayed as hypersexed, even grossly pictured with enlarged goat scrotum, although such activity cannot be found in the original old texts which began his story, even if we look at the descriptions of Lucifer and Eve or of the interbreeding of The Watchers. Orgies are not part of the original stories, and Enoch does not relate hypersexuality as the reason for their casting from the celestial court (8).

In *The Books of Adam and Eve* (9), there is some indication that marrying or making love to the women of Cain's people is prohibited, and that enjoying the arts, good food, dancing, jewelry and painting one's self leads to evil. Lucifer even takes on a female form to seduce Adam, saying he is Eve's sister and has been sent to him because Adam

has separated from Eve, continually uncomfortable with having sex with her. Lucifer suggests he/she may substitute for Eve, and bear Adam five children as Eve bore him five. Adam fights the temptation as Lucifer embraces him, and is again rescued by God. Lucifer tries a different approach with Adam's son, Seth, who spent his days fasting, praying and asking God for mercy and forgiveness. Lucifer appears as a brilliant angel and invites Seth to dwell "in beautiful places, in another world than this earth. Our world is one of light and our condition is of the best; our women are handsomer than any others; and I wish thee, O Seth, to wed one of them... Thou shalt then abide by me and be at peace; thou shalt be filled with splendour and light, as we are... And if thou wilt hearken to what I say, thou shalt wed one of my daughters; for with us it is no sin so to do; neither is it reckoned animal lust." Seth returns home to his parents and is eventually pressured into an arranged marriage with his sister Akelia. Here we have the continuing source of seeing sexuality as a sin and linking it to animal lust, or corporeality of the material ecosystem. We also have Lucifer's rejection of this judgment about sexuality, and the embracing of the body and of pleasure in the functions of the body.

This *Lucifer Value* stems from the valuing of the complex system of the cosmos, and the material that is organized within it, including the human organism. It values love of growth and development, which implies love of replication, sexual reproduction, all the sensing functions, and the creating function of dynamic systems.

This brings us to creativity. In previous chapters, I've discussed the choice that Lucifer made for a dynamic system at the very beginning. That system was a system of growth and vitality, rather than a closed and static system. We can see the link this *Lucifer Value* has with carnality in a positive sense, its sensing feedback mechanisms and its creating function. It is love of complex systems and cosmic diversity, and it means there is love of creating new combinations, modifying functions, and the vital expansion of levels of organization into infinity. The energy of a complex cosmos infuses everything, as energy transfers are really the key to ecosystems, basic to their existence and our understanding. In the cultural traditions influenced by theisms or modern naturalisms such as postmodernism, however, creativity is not seen as a value. In The Books of Adam and Eve, we have Adam and his progeny perched on a mountain in their Cave of Treasures. The treasures of the cave are the figs, golden rods, and myrrh taken

from the Garden of Eden by God's angel and given to Adam and Eve. The couple are still treated like children and urged to remain in the cave with the remnants of the Garden, not to explore their world or leave the mountain cave. Cain and his children do break free and begin to create cities and civilizations, but this activity is abhorred and God orders Adam and his sons to avoid all interaction with the worldly peoples below. Generation after generation remain on the mountain, apart from the vitality and creativity of the world below, frozen in rituals of care for the mummified bodies that accumulate in the cave, in fasting, and in offering sacrifices and prayers. It is Lucifer who continues to attempt to have them leave the mountain and begin to live and create. Adam dies after 930 years on the mountain, following the above routine without change or growth, over and over again, creating nothing in this world. One of the generations' patriarchs, Jared, finally yields and leaves the mountain to join Cain's people. He returned in disgrace. God finally makes very clear his judgment of creativity and growth, sending the flood to kill all the world's population except the family of one of the patriarch's of the mountain, Noah. Creativity is destroyed. Change is considered an evil.

This may partly explain the long history of destruction of civilization, from the murder of the woman Hepatia who headed the library at Alexandria, the defacing of Egyptian monuments and pagan temples by early Christians, the suppression of different ways of thinking... to the Taliban's destruction of Buddhist monuments in Afghanistan. There is an inherent rejection of the value of growth, diversity and creativity in many transcendent theisms, particularly among the monotheisms.

This rejection results from the negative value placed on the last *Lucifer Value*, chaos systems. The dynamic features of growth, diversity, creativity, development depend on a complex system that is sometimes referred to as chaos systems, although there are multiple names for the concept, general systems theory being another. The Lucifer stories are all about the conflict between static order and chaotic or dynamic organization that results in an open system. Lucifer chose for a dynamic cosmos, as I've described his choice, and that put him in opposition to the predetermined, unchanging order that God had willed (or monotheisms presume God willed because of attributes of omniscience and omnipotence). Yet God had created Lucifer to be as he was, so either God is not omniscient and omnipotent, or God supports what Lucifer chose and in that case Lucifer

should not be punished, but embraced. If Lucifer is embraced, *The Lucifer Value* must also be embraced, and this will require a major transvaluation of current values.

In many ways, we are all children, or more appropriately descendants since the children metaphor is a demeaning one, of Lucifer and his choice to oppose. We have our innate worth and self-respect because of that choice, and we have our developing future because of that choice. The children and descendants of The Watchers, the Nephthalim, met a terrible end, and their initiative and creativity have been demonized in the historical traditions, or been suppressed by benign neglect. The descendants of Lucifer now experiencing such a brilliant striving for the stars may meet the same fate according to the texts of the Apocalypse, which casually and gladly describe planetary destruction in a new form, rather than the Flood. There is nothing ethical about such unnecessary destruction as punishment for the free choice to oppose, to be different, to be dynamic, to have self-respect.

In a secular public square, the ideas I have been talking about may seem alien, based as they are on old texts combined with new ethical theory. In this secular public square, there is little relevance for ethics, except as political ideology and activism, and no relevance for historic religious texts. Ironically, political ideology and activism share the same danger as transcendent theisms in eliminating the inherent worth of the human organism and willing a static system, in not supporting free thought and the learning program, and in commanding conformity. With the erosion of these basic bioethics values based on human nature, and the denial that values can be found in the complex cosmos, the secular public square is producing what any closed system produces: stagnation and malfunctioning because of inability to be self-corrective. There is no acceptance of opposition, and when Lucifer the opposer is not accepted, the system is without complexity and diversity, whether we are dealing with transcendent theisms or modern naturalisms.

Also disturbing for the valuing of free learning programs, my reading of the old texts had taken me from Sumer and Egypt to the princes of the Mideast and Scythia, and to hints of “heresies” that had been historically suppressed. The first inkling I had of this possible suppression came when one of my sons returned from The Czech Republic with photos of its eastern regions. He showed me a photo of an old stone fortress at Prerov,

whose openings were bordered by the colors of the Order of the Dragon, blood-red enclosing white. I had first learned of the Order of the Dragon when I read the history of the Basarab princes of Wallachia and their membership in a group within the Teutonic Order, the Order of the Dragon reestablished by King Sigismund of Hungary. I was curious about this organization, because it played a crucial role in the Balkans at the time of the intense military pressure from the Islamic Ottoman Empire. At a point in history, this Order had been pivotal in preventing the spread of Islam through Eastern Europe and into the heart of Christianity. I assumed there would be multiple histories written about it. My son assured me that was not the case. He thought there might be some German research from the Teutonic Order, but doubted it would be unbiased. He suggested that most of the history and artifacts of the Order of the Dragon had been destroyed, perhaps intentionally. The Order might have been in The Ukraine and throughout the Caucasus, but he thought it went very far back in history and was now lost in time. Naively, I didn't think about how unusual that actually was, unusual because the Order had been still strong and functioning in our fourteenth and fifteenth century, and such historical importance I assumed would not generally be so quickly lost.

My attempts to find a history of the Order were fruitless, almost as frustrating as trying to locate a book on the history of St. George, which concerned another project I was working on. There were books listed on St. George, but most went back to the late eighteen hundreds. I did track down a few new ones, but the primary source, *The Acts of St. George*, seemed beyond reach (10). With a good deal of web searching, I finally found a link that took me to an Irish university and the translated Acts. The Dragon of the original Acts is far different than the slaying of the dragon in the French romanticized stories of St. George. In the Acts, the Dragon is the world ruler, Dardanus, that George seeks at the court, and George is the noble son of rulers in the Melitene area of the Scythian regions. The Dragon is not a beast, but the legitimized ruler who meets at court with his vassal states. The significance of the Dragon symbol still escaped me, but in the ancient world it was apparently very important. George was a powerful figure, a pure warrior, and his story does appear to predate Christianity. The spread of his cult was also amazing. Healing shrines to George appeared throughout the Roman Empire, and the depicting of him as a mythic figure spread even to the far North. He is one of the most

important persons in Estonian and other Baltic peoples' folktales (11). He is given primacy and power over most aspects of those societies' institutions and economies. He moves into chivalric fables, like a military saint and the military orders, becomes important in France and then becomes the patron saint of England and the saintly leader of the secular military order in England at the time, the Order of the Garter. Along with George comes his Dragon. Despite the importance of this saint's life in Christian and secular history, George too drops from the historical record and one has to search hard to find him. That surprised me, because my family's church in Western New York was not only a healing shrine but was dedicated to St. George and its original bell was rung for him, and I assumed such status would not so easily drop out of sight except for its French romanticism (12). I still hadn't made a connection between Cappadocia and the Carpathians.

When I learned that St. George and books on his Acts were still important in Ethiopia, a country that has managed to retain a good deal of the ancient texts, and that St. George was once on the national flag, I again wondered why history had been so careless with him. I also learned that the Apocryphal writings were more extensive than I had imagined and contained some very fascinating things. That raised another question for this book that I had not anticipated. Why had the official sacred texts been so sanitized? Hints of the fuller stories remain in the official versions, but it is clear that there has been historical suppression of much information (13). It is not that the provenance of these Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha are so inferior to the writings that made it into the official versions (14). The Book of Enoch has good provenance, and the same can be said for the Gospel of Thomas. There is also the Gospel of James, the Book of Tobit, one of the Maccabees, Jubilees, the Gnostic Nag Hammadi library -- a number of texts that by consensus were dropped by both Judaic and Christian religious institutions. Even the Apocalypse would likely have been dropped if St. Augustine had not argued for its inclusion (15). The proliferation of Gnostic texts was extensive, and some editing for inclusion needed to be done. However, dropping the significant details of the stories of Genesis is odd, and leaving frustratingly tiny references to those details in the official versions only compounds the oddness. How much has been lost, or the reasons for rejection are not clear, but it would not be unreasonable to conclude that historical

suppression had occurred and is only now being rectified by archaeological discoveries, now when it has been converted to apparent irrelevance for the secular public square. I did not think it was irrelevant, and I was amazed at the tenacity of Ethiopia for maintaining so much, and the sands of the Mideast for hiding and preserving so much. In terms of modern culture, however, it has been successfully reduced to largely irrelevant information, or fantasized as poetry and symbolic fiction, and narrowed to interior personal dynamics which convert all metaphysics to subjective personal psychology.

Finally, in going through Russell's history (16), I was suddenly surprised to find, in a place I least expected, another bit of the puzzle of the Order of the Dragon. There, in a discussion of the Bogomil/Cathar heresies, was the name given to the version of Bogomilism that was most dualistic: Dragovitsa. The Bulgarian Kingdom was one of the centers for this heresy, and for some reason the heresy was named Dragovitsa, or, Order of the Dragon. Remembering Gibbon, who lumped all heterodoxies into Manichean (and was more right than wrong), the trail now led from Alexandrian and Near East Gnosticism to Paulicians, Bogomils, and the churches of the Balkan area: *Ecclisia Aransensis, E. Bulgariae, E. Dalmatiae, E. Latinorum de Constantinopoli, E. Malenguiae, E. Philadelphiae in Romania, E. Sclanoniae*, and most importantly, *E. Drugunthiae and Dragometiae* (17). A new book by Yuri Stoyanov had filled in this piece of the puzzle, and his new addition of Sethian/Egyptian basis for the suppressed metaphysics and religion of "The Other God" (Lucifer, et al.) had partially extended the connection. It was now a simple step to make the connection to the churchers in Languedoc, Spain and northern Italy that were called Cathar. The connection to the military orders was also clear. The Counts of Toulouse (Cathar sympathizers and likely Cathars secretly) were also Knights Hospitallers. The Templars sprang from the Hospitallers, and their Inquisition testimony is best read with an understanding of Cathar Gnosticism. Spain served as a refuge for the Knights Templar (who simply renamed themselves), and the Teutonic Knights sprang from the Templars, likely retaining the conceptual system of the *Drugunthiae, Dragometiae, Dragovitse, Dragovitsa, Order of the Dragon*. No wonder a brutal Crusade was launched against Languedoc. Now we can understand the real reason for the Inquisition. No wonder Dracul and Dracula were demonized. And how much more can we now understand.

Another history on the Knights Templar (18) also brought up the likely Bogomil/Cathar connection. Since the Teutonic Knights who housed the Order of the Dragon for a time also were intimately connected with the Knights Templar, another spread of history opened -- but as quickly partially closed. The texts of such heresies were usually destroyed, and we have only the versions given by the prosecutors in many instances. Russell's references are primarily secondary interpretations or tracts written by opponents of the heresies, and again history has covered over a significant belief system in both the Eastern Roman Empire and Western Europe. Religious persecution destroyed the people and the fortresses of the Dragovitsa, demonized them, and dropped them from popular sight. But at least I had a hint of the ongoing existence of the Order of the Dragon, even if our cultural history was intent on forgetting it. Now the demonizing of Vlad III made sense, since the whiff of a specific heresy hovered over the Order. It was possible to deal with the Basarab princes as myth (that is, vampires), or as fighting men of a religious heresy. It was not as easy to explain why the popes would support them, or why the Hungarian kings would sometimes be their allies, but in light of the history of the Knights Templar, it did make some sense. The same characterization technique was used on the Knights Templar, reducing them to esoterica and a standard for rejecting information as madness. It was made harder to dispute the verdict of official history, because, while the documents of their trials at the hands of their enemies were profuse, the records their Order kept carefully from its inception have gone missing. We do not have primary sources of sufficiency to understand their decisions or to document their importance for European and Mideastern history, although they were extremely important for both. We have the charges of their enemies, but not the Order's own historical documents. The Templars were officially suppressed, and it appears they were historically suppressed as well, though we could argue that the accidents of events had happened to destroy almost all their records, as it had for the Order of the Dragon but not for the Orders of the Hospitallers or the Teutonic Knights (19).

What had this to do with the Lucifer stories? A great deal, it turns out, for if the secondary sources are accurate, the Dragovitsa concentrated on the Genesis period and Lucifer's history. It re-described Lucifer's choice of opposition in other than the official monotheistic terms, coming close to creating a dualism or polytheism. It contained both a

harsh ethical evaluation of Lucifer and a gentle one that was close to reconciliation, inconsistent but in many ways more ethically and philosophically sophisticated and less assumptively rigid. This heresy probably depended on very ancient Sumerian mythologies and on old apocryphal and gnostic texts like the Nag Hammadi library that have not been completely saved, and give only hints of a much richer history of Lucifer and the first ethical act that has been lost. We talk about maintaining sacred texts, but the only reasonable conclusion is that most have not been impartially maintained, and that we have a skewed, biased history of the major monotheisms, and also a skewed and biased history of good and evil.

That conclusion became more reasonable for me when I read John Brooke's history of the Radical Reformation, tracing its European sources and analyzing American history in terms of it (20). The history that unfolded gave a far different view of Europe and America, and the leading players in our history. Scientific, political and social systems that had been relegated to the class of occultism and esoterica reappeared as serious historical positions that might be correct or incorrect, but were not to be disposed of with negative labels but rather with adequate arguments. Our leaders of intellectual history had taken such positions seriously or held them themselves, until these positions were pushed down into the silliness of occultism, where they will be allowed to wither away without further notice. Still, these had been important positions and played a major part in our history, so I was relieved to see that historians were engaged in historical revisionism rather than historical suppression. Naturally, historical revisionism has received a negative connotation itself, since it opposes the consensus and the repression of free thinking, always, as Lucifer showed us, a dangerous position. Yet if done well, historical revisionism is the ethical and rational methodology, and allows a fuller understanding of our human world. I very much appreciated Brooke's look at sources that had still not vanished or been unfairly discredited as unscientific or irrational.

There was a close connection between the Radical Reformation, religious alternative groups like the Ebenezer Society/Society of True Inspiration, secret political societies advocating free thought, and it appears, the Lucifer stories. There were many strange societies formed at this time (some having become only symbolic now, like the Masons), and they posited a connection between the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Gnostic texts,

and political and religious freedom. There were Masonic Lodges, Rosicrucians, Illuminati, an explosion of secret societies, all historically documented despite claims of secrecy, and all accepted as factors in this time period by historians. There is only one secret society that is denied to have existed by every historian who looks at this ferment, and that is the Luciferans. Unlike the Rosicrucians who believed in an elaborate story of hidden rooms and documents, and a rule of Secret Masters, and whose existence is well-documented by individuals saying they were/or were not Rosicrucians and by popular books, there is only mention of a secret society called the Luciferans and no texts. Historians accept that the Rosicrucians existed as a secret society, or that people who believed they did formed such a society; but they do not accept that there was a Luciferan society since they find only mention, not evidence. Whether existent or not, the mention of such a society still shows the influence of the Lucifer stories in European history, and their connection to free thought and individual liberty. But it is only a mention, and rejected.

Its rejection may have been a good thing for those at risk of being trapped in the Witchcraft/Sorcery repression that occurred along with the Reformation and the struggle for political and religious freedom. Carus and Russell give us the traditional sources for this repression; Brooke reviews the less-traditional (21,22,23). The close connection at the time between “sorcery” and science put many in jeopardy, and even religious leaders involved in the repression were themselves at risk of slipping and falling into their own trap. Many things became labeled sorcery. Some were saved by making and having accepted a distinction between black or evil magic and white or good magic, but the “cunning folk” were always in danger, as Brooke relates. Scientists were equally in danger, but that did not stop most intellectuals from continuing to question and learn, in spite of the high risk. This reaffirms how important the learning program is to human beings, how central a part of human nature it is. Many things have to be relearned, however, because it is difficult to save our historical knowledge and progress. If we had not had the accident of Patrick being taken a slave to Ireland, Ireland’s isolation, its conversion to Christianity, its love of words and writing, then we would not have had the Irish monks who copied the books of the Roman Empire as those books were being lost

and destroyed on the continent (24). We must be grateful that the Irish monks copied indiscriminately and did not suppress our information.

Still pursuing the Order of the Dragon, I discovered that the House of Vere of Anjou is listed as the sponsor of its records. That may seem more esoterica, but there is in fact a current connection. The genealogy of the House of Vere goes far back, to the marriage of King Vere of the Bruichnigh to the Dragon Queen of Anu in 170 A.D. It wasn't the impressive credentials of their descendants that struck me, even though these included a Commander-in-Chief of the 2nd Imperial Army, a prince of Charlemagne's court, Magna Charta barons, an Admiral of the West, and probably Robert de Vere/Robin Hood.. What struck me was that this aristocratic lineage not only thought it traced from Noah (whose father ran from the midwife crying this baby was not human), Meleager (of the Caledonian Boar Hunt), and Diomedes (who was at the siege of Troy), with its leaders carrying the title of Princeps Draconis and Prince de Vere; but that part of the pedigree insisted the first son had married Princess Melusine, the daughter of Lucifer, who changed back into a dragon when that was discovered. The introduction of Lucifer into this high-achieving noble family in itself is very interesting, because it again indicates that Lucifer's values are important in any theory of ethics based on human nature, and should not be prima facie labeled evil and rejected.

It is also interesting because it is one more indication of the longevity of the Lucifer stories through history, myths concealed in esoterica and occultism but operating within groups that had major significance throughout history. Despite Inquisitional suppression or benign repression, fragments of the Lucifer stories stubbornly reappear. If we paid better attention to them, we might attain a more mature knowledge of good and evil and we might understand the dynamic cosmos that contains us.

The discovery of a lost civilization near Annau, in Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, where Scythian princes might have ruled and where an Order of the Dragon might have legitimized that rule, brought the old genealogy back to life for me (25). What appears at first glance to be a mythic symbol may turn out to be history after careful observation, as it so often has if we but think about that.

Now the pieces of this intellectual puzzle were beginning to come together. Historians, thought still with disagreement, were making connections and seeing the

forest for the trees. Runciman documented a direct connection from the Gnostics (the Nag Hammadi Library) to classic Manicheans to Paulicians to Bogomils to Cathars (26). Assyriologists are considering that the Ethiopian, Slavonic and Hebrew versions of the Books of Enoch may be the saving of texts about Enki, that Enoch = Enki (27). Scholarship on the Dead Sea Scrolls links the uncensored Judeo-Christian early texts with the more complete Gnostic and Apocryphal texts (28). The Cathar link with the military orders of the crusades, especially the Knights Templar, can be inferred from Inquisition records, via a common Gnosticism (29). The resurgence in Freemasonry or Gnosticism is reasonably clear (30). There appears to be a thread from our present to the ancient Sumerian texts. But what those texts really say has been ignored either accidentally or purposefully. They tell a very strange story, much stranger than the theological interpretation that has prevailed. They place a history on the intellectual table, but it is swept off in favor of a mythopoetic agenda. They give an account which is a naturalistic story of man, but that account has been trivialized and neutralized by 19th and 20th century accretions of occultism.

My hopes for a careful, rational look at old sources of information were threatened again when I attended a Bertrand Russell meeting. A philosophy professor I had studied under was presenting a very preliminary paper on a topic he was analyzing: myths and truth content. Since I was completing this book, I was eager to hear another viewpoint on the uses of myth. But again, I was greeted with an example of the cultural suppression of the one hypothesis that it was not allowed to entertain. The philosopher looked at the three common alternatives for understanding myths (and also included parables, which are quite different): myths are poetic and symbolic truths or dynamics, myths are stories carrying wonderful insights, or myths are literal and fundamentalist accounts. He was dissatisfied with the first two because these alternatives did not give myths sufficient importance for a religious view or an appreciation of the mysteries of existence. He totally rejected the last alternative because he said it was “absolutely absurd.” Then he proposed an interpretation of stories, primarily parables, to indicate that myths encompassed an important concept that would be banal if expressed cognitively or empirically. This important “truth” was open to multiple interpretations, and some could be contradictory, but like the postmodernist narratives or conversations, that did not

really matter. These stories had their own way of truth, an intuitive grasping of some sort, that need not follow the standards of logic or empiricism. He proposed this description of myths as the only correct one, open to the individual's interpretation, fluid in meaning -- and definitely not a description of reality. There was no argument offered for rejecting the literal or historical/empirical reading of old texts except that it was clearly absurd. The content of these myths could not have actually happened, he asserted, as an assertion only.

One of the academics attending the meeting was disturbed that anyone could even consider using the Lucifer texts or other myths to analyze ethical questions. He immediately equated use of the Lucifer texts with religious faith and obedience, and concluded that any ethics derived from such religious authoritarianism would be the coercive imposition of values on the entire society. His framework of anti-theism would not allow him to see a naturalistic reading of those texts, any more than a religious fundamentalist's framework of theism would allow him to see a naturalistic reading. The very medium of myth, for him, made any rational look at ethics impossible. But that conclusion depended on seeing myth as transcendent religion rather than cosmological empirical hypothesis.

The meeting brought me face to face with cultural suppression. No one present would have considered the possibility of reading myths as what the myths said. Yet there was no reason to reject that alternative, and some reasons for accepting it. I remembered some expressions in the Nag Hammadi texts about the remembrance of things, and went back to reread those phrases. The forgetfulness was there from the beginning, according to the origin myths. The Logos has looked into the depths and doubted: "Therefore it was an extremely painful division, and a turning away because of his self-doubt and division, forgetfulness and ignorance of himself and of that which is." (31). Here is Russell's sense of being alienated and divided from something we should recall and be united with. It will take some sort of conversion with the help of the Totality to allow "the remembrance of the things which exist...The prayer of the Totality helped him to return to himself and to the Totality, for it caused him to remember those who have existed from the first, and them to remember him." The texts were talking about a terrible forgetting and a desperate need to remember.

This forgetting accelerated after the initial defect of self-doubt and division. We now had a material world in which humans were suppressed by the ruler beings who used forgetfulness as a tool for suppressing (32). The chief ruler being is described as a god of the blind, whose “thoughts became blind.” This ruler appeared out of the primal waters, “having a great authority within himself, but not knowing whence he came into being.” The theme of not remembering became important for both the celestial rulers and humans. Those rulers were determined to suppress not only knowledge of origins, but human knowledge of the rulers themselves, casting Adam out of Paradise and down upon the earth “so that he will no longer be able to know anything more about us.” (33) The same theme is repeated in the Enki myths, where humans are told they must not long for knowledge of the laws of the cosmos or capacity to decree the fates (control), that those capacities are only for the Anunna, those who came from the sky (34). That theme is again repeated in the biblical Garden of Eden account, where the humans are not to have the knowledge of the Elohim, those who came from the sky. However, because humans are made in all the myths in the image of the gods, or with tissue from the gods, the human brain is capable of attaining such knowledge and of remembering by piecing together information that humans have for some reason held onto dearly over millennia. If we wish, we can have Lucifer/Enki’s Sumerian *me* and *gis-hur*, and if we choose, we can accurately remember our past. But for some reason, we do not choose. Ruling out a literal (if garbled and expressed in inadequate ancient metaphors) interpretation of old texts refines the tool of suppression, making remembrance difficult and potentially cutting us off from development. Covering the Lucifer texts in poetry, symbol interpretation, psychoanalytic sibling rivalry (35), assumed empirical absurdity and mocking, and theological abstraction which commands a contrite heart and broken spirit keeps humans from remembrance, keeps humans suppressed and repressed. This historical suppression brings us back to ethics, then, because one of the prime *Lucifer Values* is the free operation of the learning program, and this implies the willingness to entertain all hypotheses.

In the mythical language, we need to remember that we are all the children or descendants of some life-form that is slightly different than we are. In the scientific language, evolution tells the same account of changing hominid species, so the idea is not

so absurd as culture would make it. In the myths, Lucifer/Enki may have made us, literally made us as a bioengineered project, from the sacrificed life-form, Kingu, or from the flesh/tissue of other Anunna. That is also no longer so scientifically absurd as to be rejected out of hand. In the myths, Lucifer/The Watchers may have interbred with existing humans who have been freed from the Garden by Lucifer and allowed to develop their capacities, and we may be Nephthalim, almost completely destroyed by a global flood, but rescued by one of those life-forms. Or in the myths, Lucifer/the Chief Archon Ruler may have rescued a small remnant of hybrid humans by saving Ziusudra/Xisouthros/Atra-hasis/Noah from a global flood. This Noah, in the Ethiopian Book of Enoch, is pictured in a very strange way (36). At his birth, his hair is white as wool, his face shines light, his eyes are like flaming light and the whole room is lit by him, he sits upright, and he speaks a strange language as the midwife holds him. His father trembles at his sight, convinced Noah is not from him, is not “one of us.” Those are all peculiar topics if the old texts are only literature and fantasy, if the writers were creating fairy tales like the Brothers Grimm. We have not asked one of the main questions: Why are these old texts about cosmological themes and why are they so treasured that, despite suppression, they can reemerge after 2000 years or can spread as living knowledge for 3000 years through Semitic and Indo-European cultures or can be seen underlying our modern cultures even now? Humans continue to struggle for remembrance, in the same way my son unearths Silurian life-forms from the rocks, another son mines history, a daughter looks at stratigraphy -- the suppression tool of forgetfulness has not worked completely.

Edward Wilson wishes for human ethical maturity, and it may be that maturity is connected to remembrance and to discovering one's place in the cosmos. The Lucifer texts give a partial understanding of what that place might be, if we read them carefully and avoid demonization. Those texts even indicate we may be less mature than those humans who lived 8000 years before us in Sumeria. Maturity is not an automatic progression, built into the genetic program. It takes dynamism, struggle and change; and that is uncomfortable. The Nag Hammadi texts even talk about that, indicating the sensitive systems theory concepts that older civilizations were able to entertain, without our scientific advances which would have made that understanding so much easier. Or

perhaps it is the other way around. Perhaps the older civilizations were much better at scientific synthesis work, lacking the instruments for scientific analytic work, and helped lay the groundwork for the present unification of synthesis and analysis in our developing science. That synthetic thinking capacity may have extended to ethics, creating a much fuller understanding of ethics than contemporary analytic and narrowing detail, which is falling toward a nihilism, an emptiness. Systems thinking such as the old texts demonstrate can correct that fall, in both science and ethics, but in an ironic way. Lucifer, using him as the concrete expression of systems theory, can show us how to fall into the bottomless and understand that such trajectories through infinite levels of perception and organization are wondrous extensions of ethics and empiricism within the expanding cosmos.

All the various life-forms of the cosmos are subject to the discomfort of open systems. Lucifer is not a “comfortable” thought. That is the price of free thinking and free action in the dynamic cosmic system, of creating or understanding patterns, *me*, that are so complex we may float in the bottomless and cry out that we do not know where we are. But those same patterns, that we can reasonably posit repeat themselves throughout the infinite levels of organization or perception, give us the means to discover where we are and who we are in the cosmos. If we have the brilliance, courage, and even stubbornness of Lucifer, we may even be able to say: “I am singing a hymn within myself.” (37) Once we shake off the suppression of forgetfulness and recognize our human nature and the systems order of the cosmos, we will be able to hear that singing, and once heard, nothing can silence it. The chants of the myths from these old texts can be remembered, and perhaps the history and science can too.

At the end, then, I have done what modern cultures have decreed should not be done with ancient texts and knowledge, and I have done it stubbornly without bowing to the decree and submitting the learning program to command. I have used the Lucifer texts in an empirical, fundamentalist way, as making literally concrete the abstract questions and concepts of ethics. I have read the texts in a different way than as mythopoetic literature or fictional stories of inspiration. I have used the Lucifer texts in another empirical, fundamentalist way, as accounting for real experiences or memories of real experiences that our ancestors first kept alive by word of mouth and then by the written word. I have

read the texts in a different way than abstract, static and ineffable “religion.” I have taken the words at their face value. In the texts of Enki, the word is powerfully organizing and encompasses the cosmos. In the Gnostic texts the word, or Logos, attempts to understand the incomprehensible and looks down into chaos, creating the cosmos. In the Lucifer texts, Lucifer speaks the words of an impossible idea, and that impossible idea generates the open system of the cosmos. Within that open system rests the features of ethics. The words are good.

“This is the paraphrase: -- For you did not remember that it is from the firmament that your race has been protected.”

The Paraphrase of Shem, Nag Hammadi Library