

Astrology as a Revolutionary Science

ROBERT HAND

This paper should not be construed in any way as belittling the significance of any form of humanistic or spiritual uses of astrology. I believe, along with many others, that astrology has a great contribution to make to the welfare of humanity as a counseling tool and a device for expanding human awareness. But the time has come for us to examine the bases of astrology in a scientific manner; to cast aside obscurantist attitudes and to reveal to the world the usefulness and spiritual merit of what we are exploring. If we do not, then what we have to offer will be for naught.

The Merits of Astrology as It Is

Independent of the validity of astrology being based on any objectively real physical effects or founded on any real planetary energy that influences human lives, astrology has value. This is something not generally acknowledged or realized even by many astrologers.

First of all, its symbolic language has roots in the collective psyche of the human race. If it did not, it would not have survived. And as such it has the ability to communicate something about people that they find meaningful. One of the widespread superstitions held by scientists is that the people hold beliefs (which scientists call superstitions) that are valueless, unreal and contradicted by everyday experience. Such beliefs are far less common among the races of humanity that is generally supposed. For any system to survive it must give people some genuine value, even though it may not be based on anything like modern scientific understanding. Astrology has survived for thousands of years on this basis. What modern system of psychology can say the same?

Secondly, the language of astrology is a particularly potent one. Two astrologers can convey the essence of a personality more clearly and concisely than the practitioners of any other discipline. When I say that an individual has Mars conjunct Saturn on the Midheaven square his Uranus rising in the first house, that code contains a huge amount of information. We know that such a personality type has little tolerance for others' criticism, that he may have spent his early life rebelling against a repressive father figure and that he tends to be irritable in a way that expresses itself in sudden outbursts of anger. We can also make educated guesses as to probable medical problems that may arise in the course of life. We did not even begin to develop the possibilities of that simple configuration, yet even in this example the reader can see how much more concisely astrology expresses psychological patterns than English or psychological jargon.

Astrology also has a unique ability to describe a human being in non-judgmental terms. (This does not mean that individual astrologers might not express certain symbols more negatively than others.) Compare the Freudian term 'anal-retentive' with the astrological equivalent, 'a difficult expression of a strong Saturn or Capricorn symbolism'. Most Saturnian types are not genuine anal-retentives, but I suspect that all anal-retentives are strong Saturn types. Psychological terminology is loaded with implicit judgments, despite any protest of neutrality,

while astrology is genuinely neutral in its language .

Herein lies the real value of astrological language, independent of the real nature of astrological influences. An astrologer can counsel and nurture with great insight, depth and support. Astrologers are genuine counselors.

Being more skeptical of the usefulness of academic training than most, I believe that astrologers should study standard counseling techniques to find out what other counselors are doing, but not necessarily to 'learn' how to counsel. Other paradigms of counseling language are impoverished with respect to astrology and an uncritical acceptance of standard counseling paradigms may only lead to a weakening of the effectiveness of the astrology.

Astrologers provide a type of counseling service that would otherwise not be available, and they can take pride in this. (There are horror stories of particularly bad counseling techniques being used by astrologers, but my experience with 'legitimate' professional counselors is that the horror stories are just as frequent. The ability to counsel seems to be an intrinsic talent which training may hone but not create where it is absent.)

Astrology — A Science?

Readers of my book *Essays on Astrology* (1984) know that I am aware that astrology is not a science or even a pseudo-science. Neither is medicine! There are true sciences behind medicine such as physiology and anatomy, but medicine is a craft. There is much in the art of healing that would not stand up to rigorous scientific analysis, yet is still effective. A craft is a set of techniques designed to achieve a practical result in the real world. Sciences are not aimed at practical results. Technologies and crafts may be scientific, that is, they may use the results of scientific study to become more effective, but they are not of themselves sciences. A craft can be quite effective without being based on science. Almost all technologies and crafts in use prior to the mid-nineteenth century were non-scientific. Craftsmen got more useful information by trial and error than by studying the sciences. The sciences simply were not powerful enough to provide useful information. At that point in history the sciences learned from the crafts.

Strong upper-class affiliations were at first a major barrier to the sciences learning from the crafts. Many of the earliest practitioners felt that crafts were 'vulgar empiricism', not true high science which is attained through pure reason. This kind of science reached its peak with Descartes who created mathematics that were valid and a natural philosophy that was almost totally invalid! Fortunately, in the late seventeenth century many scientists overcame their prejudices. Many even came from the artisan classes. The result was that the crafts were studied and the sciences learned from them.

However, some of this snobbery is still with us and is part of our problem with the sciences. Universities are not only seats of learning, they are also places in which the select few are admitted to study under the elite.

Astrology is a craft without a science. It is important to realize however, that this need not be

the case since astrology contains a latent science. A fairly large segment of the astrological community opposes this, in part because astrologers are afraid that their techniques will be invalidated by scientific studies. There is also a very real fear that a scientific approach to astrology will destroy the spiritual aspect of astrology that we all agree is essential. I understand and accept both of these fears. I am no more interested in having my favorite technique invalidated than anyone else. And I certainly recognize the spiritual dangers within the sciences, as I hope to make abundantly clear.

But astrologers should be aware that so far research, even by the debunkers, has not debunked anything. Scientific investigation has rendered some astrological techniques highly suspicious, but that is all. There are both good and bad reasons for this.

One good reason is that before scientific testing may be brought to bear on a new field of study like astrology, methods have to be developed which are suitable for investigating the new field. One cannot simply transfer a methodology from one field to another without significant alterations. Some astrological ideas are surviving such research tests, mainly through the work of the Gauquelins.

Among the bad reasons is that many astrological ideas are so poorly formulated and mushy in their thought content that no one can tell what they really mean in terms of observable consequences. Many astrological 'hypotheses' are too unclear to be testable. We must tighten up our thinking considerably.

But the main reason why we need a true science of astrology is that such a science would transform not only the other sciences but the very basis of our culture's attitude towards Man, God and Nature. If the fundamental assumptions of astrology at any level are validated then the metaphysical foundations of the sciences and of our culture are wrong! And it is the metaphysical assumptions of modern science and their broader cultural counterparts, not the intrinsic nature of scientific inquiry, that are threatening the world we live in.

The Roots of the Problem

It is of interest here to delve into the hoary past. The material under discussion is to a great extent derived from Joseph Campbell, the leading student today of the history of religion and mythology. (Primarily from his four-volume work, *The Masks of God*.)

My use of the word 'religion' in what follows is an expanded one. I do not mean what one does on a Sunday or Saturday, but the entire body of beliefs by which one establishes a relationship with the ultimate ground of being, what the late E. R. Goodenough called the *mysterium tremendum*. It governs one's day-to-day dealings with reality as well as whatever one's views may be on the nature of 'God'. Religion is a combination of metaphysics, ontology, epistemology, moral code, behavioral patterns and a simple reality system. It is often, but by no means exclusively, mythological in its expression. Non-mythological religions are very prominent in our own time, although it might be more accurate to say that the mythologies of these religions are more hidden than absent. Early in human history religions reached a very high level of sophistication. The view of most modern Westerners that they consist of naive

collections of superstitions is not borne out by studies of contemporary primitive peoples. If one looks at the religious concepts of so-called primitive shamans, as opposed to the popular religions of their peoples (popular religions always being rather primitive even now among the so-called advanced peoples of the West), the sophistication of these beliefs is astounding.

Modern representations of the earlier types of religion also survive, in fact are thriving today among advanced peoples. And these are extremely advanced philosophically, in many ways to a greater degree than modern religions. Taking Hinduism as an example of the older type of religion and Christianity as an instance of the newer type, it is possible with little or no compromise in one's religious beliefs to be a modern scientist and a Hindu. However, it is very difficult to be a fundamentalist Christian, as all Christians were until the nineteenth century, and practice modern science.

I call the older religions Type I religions denoting that they came earlier in time than the later Type II, but they are definitely not more primitive. This type includes Hinduism, Buddhism, and Taoism. In the West none of these has survived as major religions, but Hermeticism (from which astrology, as we know it, comes) and Neoplatonism are examples from the past which have not lost their influence entirely. There are also very strong strains of Type I in Kabbalism, Sufism and Quakerism. Mystics (in the true sense of the word) almost always move towards Type I forms of belief.

Type I religions have a number of common characteristics:

1. *No single moment of Creation* — The universe is alternately created and destroyed. This idea is most explicit in Hinduism although it is found in Kabbalism as well.
2. *Cyclical Time* — Time moves in circles which is related to the previous idea. There is no beginning and end to the great wheel. We are in time and the object of transcendence is to get off the wheel completely — to get out of time altogether.
3. *No clear boundary between self and unself* — Mysticism does not mean mystification, but recognizing that the apparent diversity of creation is an illusion and that we are all at one with each other and the ground of being. The mystical principle de-emphasizes the ego which is, among other things, an awareness of the isolation of the self from the unself.
4. *Definition of reality* — The universe is an illusion, therefore individuals can legitimately differ in their views of what is real and what is not. There is no definition of orthodoxy and consequently no definition of heresy.
5. *Experience of the Divine* — There are priests and doctrines, but every believer is able to experience the divine directly, and there are paths available for this purpose. Various systems of yoga and meditation are found in Type I religions. But looking out at the world and trying to understand it empirically makes little sense because the world is an illusion.
6. *The Diffusion of Consciousness and Spirit* — Consciousness and spirit are diffused throughout the universe and are not limited to one God, human beings and a number of

demonic entities. Type I religions look polytheistic from our point of view, although they believe that the apparent multiplicity of gods are all aspects of one being. Nature is something to be worked with and lived in, not dominated and mistreated as dumb, brutish or a machine.

7. *The Nature of Paradise* — The final state of being is not at the end of history, for history is outside time and will never end. The circular image of time going nowhere represents the inherent meaninglessness of our plane of existence. As the wheel turns, we continuously incarnate and reincarnate until we attain moksha, liberation, enlightenment or nirvana. These are always nearby and at the same time far away, but the distance is in terms of consciousness, not time.

The Birth of Type II Religions

Somewhere around 500 BC a new religion came into being in Persia, taught by the prophet, Zoroaster. This was the first Type II religion. It had Type I roots, but in the course of its development it became a completely new kind of religion. Zoroastrianism has the distinction of being the first religion to persecute on purely doctrinal grounds. The object of their attention was Zervanism, a Type I religion that worshipped the principle of infinite, unending time, Zervan, which was also the Persian term for the planet Saturn. Fortunately the Achaemenid emperors realized that religious persecution was not compatible with holding together a multinational empire, and Zervanism was tolerated.

At the time of Zoroaster there lived near the Mediterranean sea coast a tribe of primitive monolatrists. (Monolatry is the practice of worshipping one god to the exclusion of others while recognizing that there are other gods. It is their monolatry that was primitive, not the general level of their culture.) The tribe was abducted en masse to Babylon when Jerusalem was conquered by the second Babylonian Empire. There the Judeans encountered a rather advanced Type I system of star-worship involving astrology and number mysticism.

It is apparent from Daniel and other books of the Bible that the Judeans used number mysticism and astrology, but they also despised it. They had no problem with using the stars to interpret the will of God, but with the idea of worshipping the stars as gods, because only their god was important. The Bible prohibits only the kind of astrology practiced by the Babylonians and other peoples of the region. When the Persians conquered Babylon, the Judeans were exposed to Zoroastrianism with its one god of light and goodness in eternal warfare with the spirit of evil. The Judeans decided that they and the Persians were worshipping the same god, it being much easier to adopt the religion of your liberators than that of your oppressors. The Persians allowed those Judeans who wished, to return and rebuild Jerusalem. The ethical monotheism of Judaism comes directly from the fusion of Yahweh with Ahura-Mazda. From Judaism comes Islam and Christianity. Thus were born the Type II religions.

Let us review the major tenets of Type II religion in the same way that we did with Type I.

1. *Creation is a unique act which occurs only once* — At the end of time there is a unique

moment of destruction. In Christianity it is the Last Judgment.

2. *Time is linear* — Nothing is repeated, there is no second chance.

3. *Self and unself are separate* — The individual is an isolated unit, different from, in kind, and alien to all of nature. This is the opposite of the mystical view, and it has serious consequences.

4. *There is only one reality* — Any deviation from the truth flaws the whole and makes the world corrupt and evil. Thus the universe becomes the history of warfare between truth and evil. All Type II religions like Zoroastrianism are dualistic, even though they deny it. Their view of the power of evil exalts it to such an extent that it is close in power to that of good. This dilemma has caused no end of tortuous reasoning in Christianity. If God is wholly good then he cannot be the whole of the universe since there is observably evil in the universe. This is the problem of evil. There is no such problem in Type I religions.

5. *God is external to the self* — Like all aspects of the unself, therefore one must look outside oneself to find God. More reliance is placed on divinely sanctioned writings and priests. Even though a few favored individuals may hear the word of God within, it is only a kind of psychic ear that operates, not a sign that God dwells within.

6. *There is no diffusion of consciousness and spirit* — They are to be found in only three types of entity: God; his angels and saints; human beings and diabolical entities. Matter is inherently dead and can only be animated by one of the three types of entities. (What to do with animals becomes an interesting problem.) Because Nature is dead it is easy to treat it callously and cruelly.

7. *Paradise is a definite place and time.*

The Evolution of Type II Religions in the West

Judaism gave birth to two successful Type II religions, first Christianity and then Islam. (There were quite a few others as well, such as the various Gnostic sects and, more lastingly, Manichaeism. But none of these had anything like the impact of Christianity and Islam.)

The gospel according to John implies that Christianity began as a Type I resurgence within Judaism with the mystical Word or *logos* at the centre of all being. But in the hands of St Paul and his successors that element was nearly expunged, except for various mystics who periodically restated the essential unity of humanity and God. These either had to keep a very low profile during their lives or face the stake. Mainstream Christianity developed into the vast political structure that we see the remnants of today. God is somehow 'out there', there is only one truth (as witness the endless feuds and schisms among the various branches) and time is linear, with the heavenly kingdom at the end. Islam never became quite as monolithic as Christianity, perhaps because it was spared the horrendous union of the Latin legal tradition, with its hairsplitting concern with detail, and the intense, monotheistic fanaticism of the Judaic tradition. Islam has the latter but not the former, but even so it has had its

share of theological conflict.

In some respects Type II religion is a significant step backwards. But it was not merely a serious mistake in the history of the human race. It has had a vitally important function.

In Type II religion, the individual is not distinct from the surrounding universe and the ultimate nature of reality is not clearly defined. Both these tend to discourage the development of the strong individualism and egoism that has characterized the West. Yet I believe that the development of the ego has been a necessary step in the development of the consciousness of the race, just as it is in the growth of the individual. (I must acknowledge here that I do believe that in the very long run there is some kind of overall evolution of consciousness in history. I do not think that history is merely tracing very large circles. Maybe it is a bit more like an ascending helix.)

The God of Type II is a 'jealous God', that is, he (note the fact that it has a sex) is an ego. With Yahweh egoism enters history as a cosmic principle. His separateness from us and our separateness from nature force human consciousness to go on its own and develop a very clear and definite concept of the self. As a result, Type II ego-consciousness has developed to an extreme degree in the West. We have developed ego-consciousness to the point where we identify our being almost entirely with the experience of having an ego.

In Puritanism and Calvinism, the deity is simply the ultimate ego and that makes him separate from us. All egos are separate from us. One is reminded of Shaw's famous quip, 'God created Man in his own image, and Man returned the compliment!'

After the peak of alienation of Man from God in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it became clear that if God was that far from Man we might better dispense with him altogether. Thus late Reformation Protestantism evolved into Deism and then finally agnosticism and atheism.

There is a famous anecdote concerning a conversation between Napoleon and the astronomer Laplace. Laplace was demonstrating to Napoleon that the theory of gravitation was sufficient alone to explain how the solar system was regulated. Napoleon allegedly asked Laplace where God fitted into his theories. Laplace is supposed to have replied, 'God? I have no need of that hypothesis!' The story is probably apocryphal, but it does illustrate the fate of the Father God, as the adolescent ego of the West matured into adulthood.

Life and the Universe

Primitive humans and Type I religions believe that life-energy in some form is scattered throughout the material universe. The most primitive form is *animism*, in which every rock, tree and stream has an animating spirit. In the more evolved pagan religions of antiquity the material universe is heavily populated with non-human, spiritual entities that act, move and converse much like human beings. In Type I religions the universe itself is a single entity which may be beyond our comprehension but is still nevertheless alive. The material universe, ourselves, and any other entities that may be perceived, such as gods, demigods,

nymphs, dryads, etc. are aspects of the single living One. In all early religions the basic model for interpreting the universe has been that of the behavior of living things. The worldview is organic.

Type II religions began much like the so-called pagan religions. There was a chief deity, but he was surrounded by many other types of living entities such as divas or angels. With Judaism there began a kind of contraction of the life-energy into smaller and smaller numbers of entities. All kinds of nature spirits disappeared or were converted into devils and demons. Any idea of a life-force diffused throughout nature disappeared. Gradually the material universe was converted into dead, inanimate matter manipulated by God and the Devil. Humans and animals were conceived as being particles of the divine trapped in inanimate matter.

In the Middle Ages the Church branded anyone accepting life-energy, such as the women who were nature worshippers, as agents of the Devil. Such women were closet followers of Old Religion which has many Type I elements within it, especially the idea of life-essence in matter.

Another group who differed were the alchemists, magicians and astrologers who pursued the secrets of nature. These studies lead to the conclusion that either we are tools of the stars or our consciousness is connected to the life-energy of the universe. In a way, we and the planets are one. All these groups were natural philosophers and magicians. (Please note the use of the present tense above. Natural magicians have not died out! We astrologers are natural magicians!)

The Evolution of Mechanist-Materialism

A new strain of thought in the later Renaissance was called mechanical philosophy. Although in its early stages it was nominally Christian, it was the logical outgrowth of the increasing sense of distance between God and humanity. Aside from occasional diabolical energies manifest in nature, matter was dead and God too far away for either him or his minions to be active in regulating affairs on a day-to-day level. Therefore, the behavior of matter was explained 'purely in terms that did not require the intervention of life-essences. The obvious metaphor was the machine. All nature was explained in terms of machines which meant there could be no action at a distance, no mysterious 'occult' forces, no occult sympathies or antipathies, nothing but the effects of matter directly contacting matter.

The early stage of the movement was entirely theoretical. It was not yet fashionable to perform experiments, although workers like Galileo certainly pointed the way. Descartes developed a theory of natural philosophy to explain all observable nature in terms of direct action. His mathematics were brilliant; his natural philosophy almost completely wrong. His work foundered on mathematical astronomy developed by Kepler, who was more a natural magician than a follower of the mechanical school. Descartes' natural philosophy was finally superseded by another transitional figure, Isaac Newton. Newton was a member of the mechanical school, but he spent much more of his life studying alchemy than physics. Newton was severely attacked by the more extreme mechanists precisely because his principle of

universal gravitation reintroduced an 'occult' property.

However, the mechanists finally accepted gravitation because it worked so well. It was tacitly decided that it was simply a mechanism which was not yet understood. It is still not completely understood. The mechanists also took over from the natural magicians the principle of observation and the empirical method took its place alongside mechanical theory.

Science as a Type II Religion

Science is one of several Type II religions about at the present. The *scientific method*, on the other hand, is not a religion, but a method for attaining knowledge. Using Hindu terminology, the scientific method is a form of jnana yoga. It is an epistemology that is quite capable of being independent of a particular religious or metaphysical viewpoint. The scientific method is a set of techniques used to interpret nature according to the precepts of the religion of Science, much as Aristotle's philosophy was used to interpret nature in terms of Christianity in the Middle Ages.

Many authors, myself included, have used the term 'Scientism' to distinguish the current religion of Science from the actual practice of inquiring about the nature of the universe. I will continue to use the word Science to denote the religion.

Scientists object to Science being called a religion. In their eyes Science has no Cod, and is practiced independently of the issue of God. It has no churches, no established liturgy and no rigid dogma. Except for the last item, this is basically true. But this points out some of the ways in which Science is different from Christianity. But let us look at the criteria that we have already set forth for a Type II religion and see how well Science fits.

1. *Creation* — Most cosmologists believe that the universe came into being at the moment of the 'Big Bang', the one and only moment of creation. The universe will end in an entropic heat-death. ('Steady state' theorists views are more like Type I, but they are not the mainstream at present.)
2. *Time* — The mainstream of Science treats time as linear, despite the increasing complexity of relativity and quantum mechanics. The one moment of creation leads by a single path to the one point of ending.
3. *Self v. Unself* — The self and nature are clearly distinct. Science has the same egoistic worldview as late Renaissance Christianity and is a logical outgrowth of it. Only in ecology and modern physics has the oneness of observer and observed been re-established.
4. *Definition of Reality* — First, there is only one reality, and all departures from it are in error. Science does not claim to know what reality is, but believes it is getting closer to it all the time. No other field of human endeavor is likely to do as well as Science.

Second, Science believes that the laws of nature are constant throughout time and space. We have not been able to experience this, but it is believed that the inquiries of Science are

getting closer to laws which have always governed the universe and govern it everywhere. The idea that the laws of the universe may evolve and differ at various points in time and space is quite outside the established system of belief. Even statistically oriented sciences have to postulate that the laws of statistics are constant, even if other laws are only statistical tendencies. This is the Uniformitarian Hypothesis, explicitly set forth in geology but found throughout the sciences.

5. *Experience of the Divine* — The experience of the truth replaces the divine in language, and is sought entirely outside the self. Reality is 'objective' reality, which raises an interesting problem.

When one postulates that the search for truth must be carried out in the world outside the individual, and that the universe is essentially not alive, and there is no God, then one has a fundamental reality that cannot be experienced. Science has a God's-eye view of reality with a God. Human life is thus subjected to criteria that cannot arise out of human or any other kind of experience. What the individual experiences is believed to be subjective and superficial, and therefore not really true. Outside us exists an abstract idea of pure truth that is completely independent of our existence, a truth that can be comprehended only in the eyes of somebody whom we have banished from the universe. Other religions teach the existence of a transcendental reality beyond human experience, but do not claim to be able to decipher it.

I trust the reader can see the paradox here. The religion of Science divorces people from the experience of their own validity. Instead of trying to understand what they feel, they are taught to deny it. When the Virgin Mary appeared at Lourdes, it was written off by people who were not there as a mass hallucination. Are there any well-authenticated examples of mass hallucination in history? Or is this simply a judgment because it violates a belief system? Several hundred people's experience has been rejected in the name of an unperceivable abstraction of reality.

From this has arisen the cult of the expert, the child psychologist who has never been a parent, the anthropologist who makes no effort to get into the experience of cultural mores for fear that it would cloud his 'objectivity'. In many cases direct, personal experience counts as a disqualification for expertise.

6. *The Diffusion of Consciousness and Spirit* — This is simple. There is neither consciousness nor spirit in nature. It is no longer clear in the minds of psychologists that either consciousness or spirit exists even with human beings. We are just machines who hallucinate that we are conscious. If we are all machines operating solely as the consequences of environmental influences, then who is B. F. Skinner?

7. *The Nature of Paradise* — Although Science has no official conception of a paradise, it is closely allied with a set of ideas that do. It can be argued that as a whole this set of ideas so permeates Science that it qualifies as part of it.

Why study Science? Because the increase in knowledge is good. Why is it good? Because it brings about the ability of the human race to make life better and better. If scientists believed

that their understanding was simply going round in meaningless circles, old ideas coming up again, having their day and being replaced in turn by other old ideas, I doubt that many would be attracted by it. Historically, institutionally and actually, in the minds of most people both in and out of the sciences, Science is closely connected to the idea of Progress. What is progress? It is the Type II idea of the paradise at the end of linear time.

There is not a single criterion in which mainstream Science fails at being a classic Type II religion. Modern science is the latest stage (along with Marxism) in the deterioration of Type II religion. Its key characteristics are that everything operates unconsciously as a machine, that the essential driving forces of the universe are dead and blind, and that consciousness, even in human beings, is an illusory epiphenomenon of the laws of physics and chemistry. It is a death cult because out of the multiplicity of nature, with an almost infinite variety of possible interpretations, it has chosen to exalt death above life and unconsciousness above consciousness.

Christianity has at last perceived this fact but its reaction is primitive and retrogressive. It would move us back towards an older consciousness. Christianity requires belief in ideas that are contradicted by genuine experience and observation far more than Science, but given the spiritual barrenness of the scientific worldview, the resurgence of primitive forms of Christianity in our time is completely understandable.

And now we know the religion of Science and its true name, a name which I have already used in this essay, mechanist-materialism. The idea behind Science and the word itself must be enlarged to include any rigorous inquiry into truth, not merely ones that follow the canons of mechanist-materialism.

Astrology and the New Science

Astrologers have a worldview that holds that every human being is tied to the workings of the cosmos, not as a victim, but as a full participant in and manifestation of its workings. Carl Jung postulated that there are *archetypes* of the collective unconscious that link all individuals to each other and to the race as a whole. These archetypes exist both within and outside the human individual. Planetary symbols are archetypes and operate more like living entities than machines. Astrology is an art based upon the mystical idea of the unity of all human beings with the cosmos. There are other systems of thought that share this feature, but astrology is peculiar in that it is amenable to study by the scientific method once the scientific method is shorn of its connection with mechanist-materialism.

The most powerful reason for developing a science of astrology is to make a conscious attempt to overthrow the mechanist-materialist worldview. It would also be useful for the new science to improve what astrologers actually do with clients, but this is secondary. It will take a long time before a science of astrology can be of much use to the art, given the incredible complexity of practical astrology and the difficulties of creating a scientific method suitable to the new field of study.

In fact, for the foreseeable future, it would be well to keep the science and craft of astrology

separate. The science can draw inspiration and ideas from the craft but it should not try to pass judgment or otherwise impinge too closely upon its practices. And at the same time the separation would benefit the new science because it would not have to deal with the whole weight of astrological tradition which undoubtedly contains much that is of little value to the new science.

The Astrological Hypothesis

The new science of astrology must not simply become another branch of mechanist-materialism. Some efforts along those lines may be seen already in the writings of the more scientifically oriented of astrology's researchers. We must assume for now and probably forever that the science of astrology will be the science of a radically different kind of reality from the sciences of mechanist-materialism. I would like here to set forth the basic metaphysical principles of the science of astrology:

1. All points in the time-space continuum are qualitatively unique.

This point is offered in distinction to the classical Newtonian view that all points in time and space are identical and essentially featureless except for their mathematical dimensions. Astrology makes it clear that there is something specific about each point in time and space.

2. Every event associated with any point in the continuum bears the quality of that moment expressed according to a symbolic language that is inherent in both nature and consciousness.

No science has ever effectively dealt with anything but mathematical quantities, certainly nothing as complex and hard to define as symbolic language. However, in the short term, the methodology of the Gauquelins offers some possible paths. In the long term, the sciences of linguistics and information theory are going to have to be tapped as well. Beyond that it is anyone's guess.

3. The quality of every point in time-space can be found by examining the relationship to every other point in time-space.

Each cross-section in time is an analytical tool, although we must improve astrology's understanding of the sequences of symbols in time as well as their relationships in space.

4. The science of astrology will focus on the planets as expression of the symbolism because planets are convenient. They are mathematically regular and predictable. Other entities can and have been used.

Astrology must be kept as astrology and not some other science of correlations. We must recognize that the astrological hypothesis is a restatement of the old doctrine of correspondences that underlies all the so-called occult arts.

5. The Laws of the Universe may or may not be constant. They may evolve gradually over time as if the universe were an organism.

Astrology is a rejection of the Uniformitarian Hypothesis as it is usually put forth. Any understanding of nature is an approximation accurate only for a given period of time. At the highest level, however, it will probably be difficult to reject Uniformitarianism. For astrology to work, the archetypes must have an overall constancy in time even if we can allow for some changes in their expression.

The Nature of the Conflict

However fallacious the assumptions and practices of the craft of astrology maybe, the primary resistance to it goes far beyond its mere truth or falsity. Academicians who study astrology for historical reasons invariably feel called upon to apologize for their interest, even though it is obvious that the influence of astrology has been enormous. Neugebauer in his book *Greek Horoscopes*, a compilation of every surviving ancient Greek horoscope written down, felt it necessary to bowdlerize the texts, expunging every reference to astrology that did not also contribute to our understanding of Greek astronomy — a remarkable feat of scholarship! Reactions to astrology run the entire range from fear to loathing. And very few of these reactions seem to be to astrology as it is, but rather to some view of the subject that people have in their heads.

I have dubbed this resistance to astrology *astrophobia*, the fear that astrology might be true! It seems to have two forms, religious and scientific.

Religious astrophobia has ancient roots. As mentioned earlier, the Bible does not condemn astrology, only the worship of planets as gods instead of the 'one true God'. This is nothing more than the attitude of a Type II religion striving for a place in a world dominated at the time by Type I religions.

In the time of early Christianity, astrology became strongly associated with other religious traditions whose philosophical depth and profundity far outweighed Christianity's: Stoicism, a Type I religious philosophy, and the worship of Sol Invictus, the unconquered Sun. The latter was the official religion of the Roman Empire prior to the triumph of Christianity. Although it is usually portrayed as the pagan worship of the Sun, it was a late offshoot of the grandfather of all Type II religions, Zoroastrianism. The Sun was simply a symbol of the god of light and the good. But astrology became very closely associated with Sun worship as it had earlier with Zoroastrianism. The wise men who came to worship the infant Jesus are believed to have been Zoroastrian magi. The New English Bible translates the original Greek as 'astrologers'. This made it necessary for Christianity to discredit astrology, although it never totally did so even in its own ranks.

Astrology had the taint of paganism from that time on, and since anything that was not wholly Christian had to be wholly diabolical, astrology had that taint hanging on it as well. The point, however, is that the conflict was completely religious, rather than scientific or rational.

During the Renaissance things got even worse. Astrology and alchemy became associated

with left-wing forms of Christianity, mystical sects with concrete political views. Astrology was thrown out of the universities and out of the mainstream of thought as well. Meanwhile, the mechanist-materialists closely associated themselves with the establishment after some early conflicts and disconnected themselves from astrology as strongly as possible.

Astrology did not come close to dying out because of its inherent unreasonableness. Its near death was due to political and religious factors.

The conflict today is still essentially religious even though there are legitimate scientific questions involved. Why else would an established scientific committee in America falsify the Gauquelin results when they found nothing scientifically wrong with the work? Why else would committees in Europe quietly bury their results when they successfully replicated the Gauquelin results?

The work of Michel and Françoise Gauquelin, limited in scope as it is, is one of the strongest threats to mechanist-materialism in existence. What they have found has no known mechanistic explanation and it will strain the possibilities of mechanism to find one.

The desire to disprove astrology is so strong that a perusal of the literature of conventional scientific investigations of astrology will show some of the worst science ever attempted. The 1986 Carlson paper in Nature magazine, flawed as it is in many respects, is of uncharacteristically high quality compared to other similar studies. We find scientists consistently going beyond their expertise, including Carlson, who is not a psychologist, in ways that would not be tolerated in any other study. We find scientists making claims about astrology that astrology does not make, and then 'refuting' them. And we even find cheating as mentioned above. (This is not to say that astrologers have done scientifically superior research, but astrologers at least have the excuse of being both ignorant and untrained in scientific methods.)

What Astrology Must Do

We must face the problem of creating the science of astrology. Addey and the Gauquelins, whatever the future may say about their work, have already made a beginning. We must strive through our work to overthrow the mechanist-materialist worldview. But stating it thus may seem too negative. Let us put it another way.

We must re-establish the idea of the universe as a living, conscious entity of which we are all manifestations — limited, but definitely manifestations. Truth is not 'out there', it is in here, out there and everywhere, and it can be sought in a variety of ways. All the people who find the truth will find it differently and the sum total of all these differences and contradictory truths is the One Truth. The universe is the universe of all possibilities, not merely of some that can be obtained by some particular, limited means.

Physicists are the advance guard of this process. Quantum mechanics, despite the name, has completely rejected the mechanist-materialist worldview although it has not yet found a substitute. There are also students of statistical psychology who are finding things that are

completely incompatible with the mechanist-materialist psychology of Behaviorism. There are many others on the barricades with us, but they do not have the tradition or the philosophical underpinnings that we have.

We are going to have a difficult time not only because of external resistance but also because of internal difficulties. While we have to study existing science, especially the social sciences, for suggestions as to methods, we have to be very critical of them as well. We have to distinguish between methods whose function is to maintain mere orthodoxy and methods which are genuinely useful to our work. We also have to recognize the need for modifying existing techniques from other fields and creating completely new ones.

We also have a problem among astrologers, many of whom are antagonistic to the creation of a science of astrology. And there is some legitimacy in what they feel, as already indicated. but they have to recognize the larger issue. If astrology simply persists as it is, it will do very little for the culture as a whole. It will remain a deviant little group doing strange things within their own little world and disregarded by the rest of the world. *Meanwhile the rest of the world will go on treating nature as if it were dead, until it is.* Our existence is threatened, if not already doomed. It is far more important that we do whatever we can to help steer the world away from the death cult in whose grip it now lives. Mechanistic science cannot do anything but destroy life because it has no real comprehension of what life is. In a real sense, astrologers, helping in whatever way they can to support a science of astrology, are acting in self-defense. On the lowest level, a science of astrology may help to legitimize what we do so that people will stop trying to legislate against our activity. But on the highest level it will help to keep the world that we live in alive.

Not every astrologer can, will, or ought to become an astrological scientist. All we can ask is that everyone supports and acknowledges the effort. We must remain unified and work together at whatever level we can or there will be little else worth doing. Astrology will be a truly revolutionary science or there will be no astrology!

Two books which throw a great deal of light on the truth about the 'death' of astrology are the following:

Easlea, Brian, *Witch-Hunting, Magic and the New Philosophy*, 1980.

Berman, Morris, *The Re-Enchantment of the World*, 1984.

Copyright 1987, Robert Hand, Reprinted by permission granted to Astrolabe, Inc. 2011