

UNITED WISDOM

Crowley and Thelema: Will in the Context of a Particular Teaching

Traditions and Worldviews

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-28-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Crowley and Thelema: Will in the Context of a Particular Teaching

> *“Every man and every woman is a star.”*

Aleister Crowley, Liber AL vel Legis, I:3; within the revelatory frame, this is the voice of Nuit. Original English. Source.

About this article

The popular paraphrase “do what you want” sounds like release from every obligation. It is easy to imagine the phrase on a T-shirt or in a conversation after a difficult week. But if we look for Aleister Crowley's Thelema behind it, something unexpected emerges: a rigorous direction for life, religious revelation, a symbolic cosmos, and a practice far removed from simply fulfilling desires. A familiar formula opens the door to an unfamiliar teaching.

Thelema centers on a particular understanding of Will. To grasp it, retelling a slogan or the author's reputation is not enough. We need to read how Crowley distinguishes Will from whim and connects it with freedom, love, and the image of an individual path. This article examines The Book of the Law and the explanatory texts Liber II, Liber CL, and Duty, preserving distinctions among belief, an author's argument, and a verifiable historical event. We also consider uncomfortable parts of the corpus: martial language, claims to spiritual authority, and the tension between independence and obedience. The practical section offers a contemporary way to investigate the direction of one's own action, explicitly identified as the authors' adaptation rather than an initiation into Thelema. The task is to understand a particular teaching while retaining the right to assess its individual propositions.

I. Begin with the text, not the legend of the author

Crowley's reputation often precedes the reading of his works. Some expect a dangerous provocateur, others a great liberator. Either position can make the text invisible: the reader notices only confirmation of an attitude already formed. A more precise beginning is to select a work and ask what proposition it actually offers.

Genres differ within the corpus. The Book of the Law presents itself as a received revelation. Liber II explains the central formula. Liber CL develops the themes of liberty, love, life, and light. Duty offers rules of conduct. These texts are connected, but do not serve identical functions. An interpretation of an earlier formula is not its literal repetition, and a rule of conduct does not exhaust its religious content.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

We can reliably say that a particular author wrote or transmitted a particular claim without confirming its subject matter. Testimony about receiving a message from a superhuman source belongs to the history of belief and self-description. It does not become an independently established event merely because it appears in a primary text. For a respectful introduction, accurately naming both levels is enough.

This reading allows us to consider Crowley without obligatory heroization and without turning the article into a trial of his entire life. The question here is limited: what does Will mean in the selected works, how is it justified, and what difficulties arise in applying it? A historical biography is broader than this task. We will not fill it with unconfirmed details for the sake of an appealing portrait.

II. The Book of the Law and a new religious history

In the introduction to The Book of the Law, Crowley reports that it was dictated in Cairo on April 8–10, 1904, and connects its source with Aiwass. The date and place belong here to his account of the text's origin; the source's superhuman status belongs to a religious claim. The introduction also presents a transition to a new aeon associated with Horus. Crowley, Liber AL vel Legis.

An aeon within this frame is more than a calendar interval. It is a way to explain a change in the world's spiritual order and the human place within it. Turning it into an ordinary sociological description of a period would erase an important part of its meaning. Crowley connects historical change with a religious order, not merely with changing social habits.

This teaching should be distinguished from the neutral proposition that “people have become more independent.” The latter can be investigated historically by specifying a place, period, and indicators. An aeon is a broader worldview scheme. It organizes events into a meaningful story, but cannot be confirmed by one suitable political or cultural example. Otherwise, any observation can be declared a sign of the age already accepted in advance.

For a participant in the teaching, the origin story also becomes a basis of authority. If the text belongs to a new spiritual order, accepting it can change one's relationship with a previous religious and moral frame. For an outside reader, this is a subject of study: how is an event narrated by the author connected with a universal law? The distinction helps us understand the scale of the claim without accepting or rejecting it solely on an emotional impression.

III. Will and desire are different words

In Liber II, Crowley directly contrasts the central formula with ordinarily doing what one likes. Will is understood here as a single direction, rather than a collection of competing whims. Freedom comes with a demanding requirement: discover your path and do not be distracted from it. Crowley, The Message of the Master Therion.

This distinction does not automatically tell us which desire is true. A person can call any strong impulse “my path.” After explaining the term, the chief difficulty therefore remains: how do we recognize it? Inner certainty can matter, but does not by itself rule out error. Especially if the declared path changes each time an action meets an obstacle.

In ordinary life, we can distinguish several levels. There is enjoyment of an activity, a decision to try it, sustained commitment, and an idea of one's calling. They can support one another, but do not coincide. Loving music does not mean already knowing the shape of one's entire future life. Experiencing disappointment in a project does not mean losing the only opportunity for fulfillment. These contemporary examples help reveal the difference without turning it into a Thelemic conclusion about a particular person.

Thelemic Will has a stronger meaning than a well-formulated goal. It is connected with an understanding of human nature and a person's place in the whole. Translating it simply as “my values” is therefore convenient but insufficient. A value allows discussion and revision; Will in Crowley's work acquires a particular spiritual status. Before using the word, it helps to decide whether we accept that status or are merely using a limited analogy.

IV. The star and its path

The image of every person as a star connects individuality with ordered movement. In Liber II, it supports a hope that true wills do not collide. This proposition belongs to Crowley's teaching, not to an astronomical observation or a proven law of human relationships. Liber II.

The image has an appealing side: a person need not repeat someone else's path. Uniqueness does not make a person superfluous, and order does not require sameness. But the metaphor does not yet resolve conflict. Two people may sincerely seek different actions involving the same land, the same time, or a shared obligation. Which path should be recognized as true when their claims are incompatible?

One answer is possible within the teaching: conflict shows that at least one side is not following genuine Will. For an outside examination, however, this is still an explanation, rather than a testable criterion. We need to understand how to distinguish mistaken recognition from an actual limitation of the environment. If every conflict is declared a lack of spiritual maturity, real conditions can disappear from the discussion.

The star image is best read as a precise statement of the author's worldview, with its limits discussed separately. A contemporary reader may take from it the idea of different paths while retaining the need to negotiate, share resources, and consider consequences. Such borrowing need not accept a cosmic guarantee of harmony. It becomes more honest when it openly names its own narrowing of the meaning.

V. Love under Will

The combination of love and Will in Thelema does not mean the simple advice to “do everything with kind feelings.” In Liber CL, love is described through the joining of what differs and its relation to unity; Will directs the movement. Here the religious and metaphysical frame extends beyond ordinary interpersonal affection. Crowley, De Lege Libellum.

The word “love” easily creates a false sense of agreement with other traditions. Christian love of one's neighbor, romantic attachment, the Thelemic formula, and friendly care do not become one concept merely because they share a word in translation. Comparison becomes possible after clarifying each position's aim, grounds, and demands.

An account of union can help explain why freedom in Crowley's work does not necessarily mean isolation. But it does not remove the question of a particular other person. Unity in a metaphysical sense does not mean a partner's consent to an action. A discussion of living relationships requires separate grounds: the participants' wishes, the right to refuse, obligations, and observable consequences. These cannot be obtained automatically from a cosmic image.

For a contemporary reader, the difficulty itself is useful: how can a stable direction be joined with openness to another person? If Will becomes the sole measure, another person's disagreement is easily declared an obstacle. If direction disappears for the sake of every other person's wish, independence is lost too. Crowley's teaching offers its own answer, but acquaintance with it does not release us from our own work on this contradiction.

VI. Liberty, learning, and obedience

In Liber CL, liberty is considered a condition of action, and the search for Will is connected with spiritual training. Obedience to a teacher can also be interpreted there as the fulfillment, rather than the surrender, of Will. This is a fundamental internal tension: an independent path allows submission to guidance. De Lege Libellum.

The word “voluntary” does not resolve the tension. A person may voluntarily accept help, but needs to understand its limits. Who defines the goal? What counts as a sign of progress? Can advice be declined? If a teacher declares every disagreement the student's immaturity, the concept of Will begins to work against the original independence.

Not every discipline is suppression. A musician follows exercises, an apprentice follows a demonstrated technique. A restriction helps acquire a capacity that is not yet present. But in these examples, a distinct result can be identified and the quality of teaching discussed. When the result is declared a spiritual realization inaccessible to external verification, the relationship requires closer examination. This is an analytical comparison, not a claim about every Thelemic community.

For precise reading, it is important not to conceal the text's demands beneath contemporary language of comfort. Crowley is not simply inviting a person to follow a mood and feel good. He connects the path with effort and the overcoming of distractions. But a historical description of this demand does not imply a recommendation to entrust control of one's life to anyone who uses Thelemic terminology. The teaching and a particular relationship with its representative must be distinguished.

VII. Duty: individuality encounters others

In Duty, obligations are distributed among one's relationship with oneself, other people, humanity, and other beings. The tasks include investigating one's abilities, developing them proportionately, and refining the expression of Will. The text shows that Crowley's corpus is not confined to a solitary slogan. Crowley, Duty.

Yet systematic rules do not guarantee that all their foundations are compatible or convincing. Sometimes an author's formula requires further examination. Is respecting another person's Will enough if we do not know how it is defined? What should be done about someone whose possibilities are limited by circumstances? How do we distinguish granting freedom from indifference? These questions arise from the very attempt to move from metaphysics to life together.

The strength of an individual rule can be considered without accepting the entire corpus. Developing abilities proportionately is an intelligible task. Its practical explanation, however, depends on what counts as proportion. A person with limited time chooses which skills to attend to now. This decision may rest on goals and conditions rather than on a claim about one unique cosmic function.

Such reading preserves the possibility of learning from an author and arguing with him. We need not choose between complete fidelity and complete rejection. We can name a precise proposition, its grounds, and the limit of our acceptance. This is especially important for a research article: the reader receives a map of arguments, rather than an obligation to enter a worldview for the sake of one interesting thought.

At the same time, Duty is not a neutral charter of equal pluralism. In the section on humanity, the author proposes establishing the Law of Thelema as the basis of conduct; in his discussion

of others, he sharply redescribes pity. Duty, B:5, C:1. These propositions need to stand beside respect for another person's Will. Otherwise, the reader will hear contemporary advice that the text does not offer in that form.

We do not need to repeat cruel language to name the question: how is the universal demand of one Law compatible with the distinctness of individual paths? Different answers are possible within the teaching; this overview does not establish one interpretation for all communities. It reveals a tension in the selected document and preserves the possibility of moral assessment. Individuality does not become immune to criticism merely through its religious name.

VIII. An uncomfortable text also belongs to the teaching

The third chapter of The Book of the Law contains martial, cruel, and religiously insulting images. In the introduction, Crowley himself acknowledges that the chapter can provoke strong rejection. Keeping only the words about freedom and love would produce a smoothed version that does not represent the selected source. Liber AL vel Legis, Chapter III and introduction.

Describing this language does not mean recognizing one literal interpretation of every line. Symbolic, ritual, and social interpretations may differ. But an appeal to symbolism does not automatically settle the ethical question. We need to explain precisely what is being symbolized, on what grounds, and why that explanation does not serve as permission for actual harm.

It helps the reader to distinguish three positions. We can study a difficult text as a historical document. We can accept a particular theological explanation within the teaching. We can reject a particular stance. These positions do not exclude a respectful attitude toward people who understand the work differently. But respect does not require silence about content that may conflict with our own moral grounds.

The same discipline is needed when discussing authority. The force of a literary voice is not evidence of a superhuman origin. A scandalous reputation does not prove every proposition false. And an attractive idea of independence does not make the whole corpus a safe universal instruction. Precise reading sustains this complexity without replacing it with either promotion or a collection of frightening details.

IX. A finite task and infinite Will

In “Of Liberty,” Crowley distinguishes a finite direction of activity from infinite Will, associated with the realization of the True Self. His examples of finite occupations include the poet, the prophet, and the artisan working with material. This is a substantial clarification: the author's word “Will” is not confined to a career and does not mean merely choosing a profession. De Lege Libellum, I, “Of Liberty”.

The distinction explains why a contemporary translation into the language of productivity often loses part of the content. A work goal permits a schedule, a quality check, and changed conditions. The Great Work in a religious sense presents a broader horizon that cannot be measured solely by a completed task list. Replacing the second meaning with the first creates a new secular interpretation, rather than a brief account of the entire teaching.

The reverse confusion also creates a difficulty. An ordinary project can be declared an expression of higher Will, and its actual consequences cease to be discussed. A poor result is then explained by other people's inadequacy, while changing the plan looks like betrayal of a calling. This conclusion does not follow from the distinction between finite and infinite alone; it arises when elevated language is used to shield a particular decision from scrutiny.

It is revealing that in the same section Crowley acknowledges his own distractions from his chosen task. The authorial voice changes for a moment: we encounter more than the proclamation of a Law, but also an account of a mismatch between intention and action. This admission allows us to read the demand for discipline without imagining that the founder always fully embodied every formula of his own. Nor does it make his life experience universal proof of the method.

The reader receives two separate questions. What activity am I actually able to perform and willing to sustain? What broader meaning do I give it? We can have several important roles without automatically considering them spiritual fragmentation. Crowley offers a stricter teaching about direction; our distinction helps us understand it more precisely, then decide where to agree and where to retain a different conception of a full life.

X. A rule of conduct does not replace the question of consequences

In Duty, another person's freedom is discussed alongside one's own, and humanity's tasks alongside personal discipline. This proximity matters: individual Will is placed in a shared world. Yet the text's propositions rest on a Thelemic worldview, rather than a universally accepted procedure for resolving disputes. Duty, sections A–D.

Consider a hypothetical conflict. One participant sees creating a journal as their direction; another does not want to give it time. Recognizing different paths helps keep refusal from being treated as a personal insult. But the practical question remains: were promises made, who pays for the work, and can the deadlines change? Answers require agreements, not merely an assumption of harmonious stellar orbits. Respect for a person's distinctness becomes observable when refusal is actually accepted.

Another case is disagreement between a teacher and a student. The teacher may see a weakness in a skill that the student does not yet notice; the student may see a mistaken demand. Both are possible. We therefore cannot immediately declare every external restriction suppression, or every instance of obedience spiritual growth. The grounds for the restriction and a way to test it need examination. This is our contemporary question to the teaching, not an account of every existing Thelemic relationship.

Finally, the scale of humanity can conceal the individual person. An elevated goal does not make a particular request voluntary or turn a participant's loss into an insignificant detail. In research reading, it is important to keep the changes of scale in view: the author discusses the cosmos, then the personal path, then rules for shared life. Each transition needs its own justification. Thelema then remains a particular, complex teaching with which we can have a substantive conversation, retaining responsibility for actions chosen today.

XI. How personal Will becomes a social rule

In Liber II, the harmony of paths is explained through the image of stars: each moves in its own direction, and collision is connected with a breach of order. In Duty, this picture acquires a social task. Crowley discusses restructuring laws to protect individual liberty and defines crime through the restriction of another person's rights. This is a specific transition from a religious image to a program of conduct. Liber II, Duty, section C.

Let us examine its logic. If every person has a particular direction, society should leave room to follow it. But people do not necessarily know their Will yet, and their declared interests collide. A system therefore needs a way to examine a violation, not merely a general image of celestial order. In Duty, the basis becomes the actual restriction of the injured person's freedom, read through the Law of Thelema.

This transition reveals the seriousness of the claim. The teaching offers more than a personal feeling of independence: it offers a measure to be used by institutions. The author discusses rules of punishment and social organization. To become acquainted with his thought, we need to recognize the scale of the program; accepting a particular contemporary measure requires an independent assessment of its grounds and consequences. Historical exposition here does not provide legal recommendations.

There is an internal tension too. Shared freedom is explained through a universal Law, yet the person still has to discover their own direction. How can it be distinguished from a convenient excuse? Who is entitled to decide whether another person's action expresses Will or a deviation? The star image does not answer every such problem. These questions arise from the very attempt to turn a personal path into a general rule, and cannot be dismissed merely as a misunderstanding of the slogan.

The distinction of genres now yields a substantive result. Revelation proclaims the Law; explanation connects it with liberty and discipline; a program of conduct carries it into the shared world. Each transition adds a new claim. Readers can assess them separately, retaining the right to understand the original formula without accepting all its social consequences.

XII. Understanding Will means preserving more than a slogan

Crowley's Thelema offers a powerful conception of individual direction, joined with a religious cosmos and demanding practice. That power is lost when the teaching is translated into simple permission to follow any impulse. Its real difficulties disappear along with it: recognizing Will, relating to another person, the teacher's role, and uncomfortable parts of the primary text.

Research reading has a different aim. It reveals where the author explains, where he proclaims, where he claims a special source of knowledge, and where he leaves a question open for the reader. This does not require accepting every proposition. Nor does it require deciding in advance that nothing meaningful can be found in them.

A contemporary person is entitled to reflect on their own direction without claiming already to know a cosmic purpose. They can learn discipline while retaining the right to revise a goal. They can value the uniqueness of paths while considering the shared world and another person's refusal. These decisions have their own grounds and need not secure approval through the name of a famous esoteric author.

At the beginning, the formula sounded like release from obligations. After reading, it proves to be an entrance into a particular teaching about humanity and the world. Preserving this distinction is already a substantive result. Words about Will then become a subject of thought rather than a convenient excuse for any act; acquaintance with Crowley expands the space of questions without giving him the final word on our lives.

What this means in practice

What follows is a contemporary exercise devised by the authors to distinguish intentions. It is not a Thelemic initiation, a way to discover a transpersonal Will, or a repetition of Crowley's practices. Its benefit is limited: seeing more clearly which action you choose and why.

Take a small question, such as participation in a new project. Record separately what you like, what you can do, what you are ready to do regularly, and what others expect. These are not four obligatory reasons to agree. Sometimes an enjoyable activity does not fit the conditions, while useful work requires a skill that can be acquired. There is no need to reduce everything immediately to a single calling.

Then name the cost of the decision. How much time will it require, who depends on the agreement, and what will happen if you decline? Not every obstacle is external suppression. There may be a lack of resources, a real obligation, or incompatible goals. Recognizing them makes the choice more precise and does not necessarily reduce freedom.

Formulate a direction for the coming period in ordinary language. For example: “I want to test whether I am ready to lead this project for four weeks.” This is more modest than “I have discovered my true Will,” but permits observation. You can establish a result after which you will continue, change the conditions, or stop. Revision within this frame does not become spiritual defeat.

If a teacher or community is nearby, it helps to check that their support preserves your ability to disagree. Advice should have an explanation, not merely an appeal to superior status. A person may choose a religious discipline, but other people do not thereby receive an automatic right to define that person's desires and relationships. Keeping spiritual language distinct from concrete agreements helps preserve the meaning of both.

When testing a direction, it helps to leave yourself the possibility of reporting a change in advance. Suppose you undertook four weeks of work, but the conditions changed substantially. An ordinary conversation about deadlines and workload is not an admission of spiritual inadequacy. You can explain what remains important, what has become unworkable, and what solution you propose. The other participant also has the right to reject the new conditions.

Distinguish conviction from evidence in your own record. “This corresponds to my direction” expresses your attitude. “This is a good plan for everyone” requires information about others and the outcome. When these statements diverge, there is no need to abandon meaning immediately or declare the shared world hostile. Clarifying the scale of the claim is more useful. This discipline preserves the value of personal choice and allows other people to discuss consequences in language they understand.

Key quotation

> *“‘Do what thou wilt’ does not mean ‘Do what you like.’”*

Crowley, Liber II: The Message of the Master Therion, the paragraph beginning “From these considerations”; original English. Source. The distinction comes from the author himself. It returns the slogan to the teaching, but leaves open the question of how Will is recognized and why a particular decision deserves trust.

Connections between traditions

These are our analytical comparisons, not proven lines of influence. The words “will,” “nature,” and “love” retain the meanings of their respective texts.

Positions and sources	Shared question and divergence
Crowley, Liber II and Epictetus, Enchiridion, I, IV	Thelema distinguishes Will from whim; the Stoic relates will to nature and available action. The shared question concerns stability of direction. Crowley's true Will is not equivalent to the Stoic distinction of what is within our power. One teaching's cosmic guarantee of harmony cannot be transferred to the practical choice of another.
Crowley, “Of Liberty” and Tao Te Ching, §2, Legge	The demanding concentration of direction is compared with the sage's action without appropriating the result. A question of effort and control arises. Daoist nonaction does not mean discovering Thelemic Will; Thelemic discipline is not a translation of the Daoist position. The difference between ways of acting matters more here than the shared word “path.”
Crowley, Duty and Matthew, 7:16–20, KJV	Rules of conduct are compared with discernment by fruits. Our question is what allows an assessment of a belief's application. The Gospel does not recognize the Law of Thelema, and a Thelemic justification does not remove the need to examine a particular act. The systems' moral foundations diverge; the comparison does not conceal that divergence.
Crowley, “Of Liberty” and Sendivogius, the author's preface	Both texts make demands on the seeker, but investigate different subjects. In one, the Great Work is connected with the True Self; in the other, with nature and alchemical knowledge. Later use of a shared expression does not prove that early material work originally meant Thelemic self-realization.

Positions and sources	Shared question and divergence
Crowley, Liber II and Blavatsky, The Key to Theosophy, section III	Individual direction and a program of brotherhood offer different scales for a shared undertaking. Our question is how a person's distinctness relates to a universal design. Theosophy and Thelema do not become one school through an interest in spiritual development; their own foundations of authority and cosmology remain.

Primary sources

1. Aleister Crowley. Liber AL vel Legis / The Book of the Law. William E. Heidrick Memorial Library, O.T.O.. The introduction, selected passages of Chapter I, and Chapter III, including III:42–53, were read; the origin of the revelation was not independently confirmed.

2. Aleister Crowley. Liber II: The Message of the Master Therion. The full short text on Will and whim was read.

3. Aleister Crowley. Liber CL: De Lege Libellum. The preface, “Of Liberty,” and selected paragraphs of “Of Love” were read; not Crowley's entire corpus.

4. Aleister Crowley. Duty: A Note on the Chief Rules of Practical Conduct. Section A and selected paragraphs of B–D were read; this edition is a transcription of a Yorke Collection manuscript.

Additional primary texts for the comparison map:

• Epictetus. Enchiridion, English translation by Thomas Wentworth Higginson. §§I–IV and XXIV were read; comparison of the relationship to nature and action. The modern preface does not support the article.

• Laozi. Tao Te Ching, translated by James Legge. §§1–2 and 8 were read; an English intermediary, not the Chinese original. Comparison of the limits of naming and the relationship to action.

• Gospel of Matthew, 7:16–20, King James Version. The entire selected passage was read; comparison of a moral claim with the fruits of action, without a conclusion that religions agree.

• Sendivogius. A New Light of Alchymie, John French, 1650. The prefaces and first discourse were read; the map distinguishes historical alchemy from the later Great Work.

• Blavatsky. The Key to Theosophy, 1889, section III. The selected section on the society's aims was read; the scale of a shared undertaking is compared.

Tags

Crowley, Thelema, Will, true Will, desire, whim, Liber AL, The Book of the Law, Liber II, De Lege Libellum, Duty, Cairo, Aiwass, revelation, Law, star, freedom, love, mentorship, obedience, discipline, Great Work, True Self, independence, responsibility, spiritual authority, religious context, history of esotericism, critical reading, practical decision

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of the United Wisdom project. He researches inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how the principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.