

THE NINE OBJECTIONS TO ASTROLOGY

1980

In 1969 Michael Gauquelin's work *Cosmic Clocks* was published in English, followed in 1970 by his *Astrology and Science*, and in 1973 by *Cosmic Influences on Human Behaviour*. These books were accompanied by a number of other publications by a variety of authors, all of which sought to elevate the statue of astrology.

These publications were accompanied by a growing general interest, and by an increased self assurance and public presence by astrologers themselves.

However at the same time there was a strong reaction by those opposed to astrological practice. This came from certain sections of the scientific community, but perhaps most noticeably from the Christian Churches.

The Student Christian Movement (for example) published a book by J. S. Kerr entitled *The Mystery and Magic of the Occult*. In it astrology is treated at some considerable length. However, this apparent seriousness does not reflect an unprejudiced approach to the subject. Kerr introduces his book by saying, "The resurgence of the occult in the midst of history's most scientific period is a phenomenon that amazes some, puzzles others, and thoroughly excites the thousands who have found a new dimension of spirituality – for good or ill – in these long discredited arts."

This growing war against so called occult practices found another outlet in 1975, when an Anglican Commission of Inquiry in Australia published a report entitled *The Occult*. The general tone of this may perhaps be judged by an Appendix contributed by the Reverend Dr Stuart Barton Babbage. He begins this by saying, "It is clear that people must believe something. If they have nothing sensible to believe, then they will believe nonsense..... Today, with the withering of faith, we have the flowering of credulity." Then in a particular reference to astrology, "Today the educated man knows that the science of astrology is a fraud and a fiction. We no longer ask incredulously,

Twinkle, twinkle, little star,
How I wonder what you are!

We know the answer;
You're the cooling down of gases
Into incandescent masses."

It was against this background of a quite sustained attack upon the intellectual basis of astrology that the following essay was written. It seemed to me that in spite of the considerable output of anti-astrological material, the arguments against its practice fell under a number of convenient headings. I therefore tried to examine these, and to discover how sustainable they were.

□

In the 5th century AD Saint Augustine wrote a book which he called his *Confessions*. In this he devoted some space to an attack upon astrology.

Augustine was born with a Christian mother and a Pagan father. For many years he followed the teachings of a religious sect called Manichaeism. This was a curious eclectic religion with ideas drawn from a wide variety of sources. In order to achieve enlightenment the devotee practices a number of practices and techniques, of which astrology was one.

In 383 AD Augustine went to Rome to lecture in philosophy, and then to Milan. Here he fell under the influence of Saint Ambrose and was converted to Christianity. With all the fire of a true convert, he turned against all that his old faith had espoused. This included the practice of astrology.

In his attack in the *Confessions*, he compared the social conditions of the son of a slave and the son of a landowner, both born at the same time in the same place and therefore sharing a common horoscope. As both apparently lived totally different lives, this seemed to Saint Augustine to demonstrate that astrology did not “work”. In other words, he advanced the argument that astrology was unscientific, and in this he has had a very considerable following in the western world in the last two centuries or so.

In one sense it is perhaps strange that the claim can be made at all that there are “scientific objections” to astrology at all. The normal scientific method is one in which a theory is advanced and experiments performed in order to test the validity of the theory under a variety of circumstances. The theory is then retained, modified, or rejected according to the nature of the results obtained from such experiments.

Yet in fact no such effort was made with respect to astrology until well into the last half of the 20th century, and this in fact tended to lend support to the astrological concept rather than denigrating it. Prior to this astrology was rejected simply because it appeared to offend some of the philosophical bases of western science. Indeed, I hope that I will be able to show that the so called “scientific objections” to astrology are rather surprisingly unsubstantiated by actual evidence, and are really little more than the “belief statements” of scientific dogmatism.

In general those who seek to speak against astrology – and contrary to proper scientific procedures – make the initial assumption that astrology cannot work, and then advance various arguments to justify this already entrenched assumption. If however one examines the various objections raised against the practice of astrology, they seem in general to take one of the following nine forms.

9. The Copernican Theory

This objection rests upon the proposal that the concept of a sun centred solar system – expounded by Copernicus in the 16th century – destroyed the older idea of an earth centred one, in which the sun and planets revolved about a fixed terrestrial globe. This earlier cosmology provided the essential structure of astrology. Today astrologers still erect their charts using such a central earth with a zodiac encircling it

containing the sun, moon, and planets. Thus – it is suggested – this demonstrates that astrology is dependent upon a concept which has been shown to be untrue. Since its initial premise about the structure of the solar system is false, then the whole structure which this supports must equally be false.

Two answers may be made.

In the first place it needs to be remembered that Copernicus did not “invent” the heliocentric system, as this was certainly being taught by some ancient astronomers as early as the 5th century BC (notably by Pythagoras). Astrology certainly flourished in these ages, and there is no reason to suppose that the concept of a sun centred system was seen in any way to challenge basic astrological premises.

Exactly the same point may be made with regard to Copernicus himself (as well as Kepler and Galilei) all of whom continued to be committed astrologers while accepting whole heartedly a heliocentric system. Doubtless many astrologers in Europe were upset – as indeed most certainly were many theologians – to learn that the earth was not fixed and immovable in the heavens, but their astrology was none the worse for this.

Secondly it is proper to point out that we still alternate between a geocentric and a heliocentric astronomy according to our purpose. A heliocentric astronomy is excellent for certain mathematical purposes, for portraying the spatial nature of our system, and for the demonstration of the workings of gravitational forces. It is however unsuited to a number of other practical circumstances.

To locate a planet or star the astronomer uses a system of coordinates that assume a stationary earth with the heavens revolving about his own location. Similarly all celestial navigation necessarily assumes a geocentric universe.

In the same way the astrologer is required to determine the relationships of the sun and planets to the geographical place of birth at a given time. This is an operation analogous to the astronomer seeking to locate a star from his observatory. Both are geocentric operations, because the “focus” is a certain terrestrial location. Quite obviously there simply can never be a heliocentric observational astronomy, as the sun is a rather inhospitable place for observers! However in the not too far distant future there will no doubt be a lunar centric astronomy, and perhaps a lunar centric astrology as well.

Astrology therefore is not conditional upon a geocentric universe being a physical reality. The astrological chart is simply a diagram of the way that the heavens looked at a certain time and at a certain place on earth. The art of the astrologer is in interpreting what meanings may be contained in the relationships of the bodies of the solar system with respect to a specific terrestrial location.

Whether this is a true or false art is certainly a question to be asked, but it is unrelated to our conceptual structure of the solar system.

2. The Planets cannot have an Effectual Influence upon the Earth

This is perhaps more a declaration of faith than a disproof of astrology. It is simply the statement “astrology cannot work” put another way.

It is however given some teeth by pointing out that one of Newton’s gravitational laws states that the attraction between two bodies is proportional to their masses and inversely proportional to the square of the distance between them. Given the enormous distances which separate the earth from the sun and other planets, it becomes obvious that the gravitational influence upon terrestrial events from an interplanetary source is almost infinitesimally small. For this reason – it is argued – the astrological premise of planetary influence cannot be accepted.

Again two answers may be made. In the first place – even accepting the grounds of the objection that planetary influence is essentially gravitational – the sun and the moon must obviously be excepted. Not only are the tidal effects of the moon clearly demonstrable, but there are a number of other well established lunar effects upon terrestrial events. The sun however is pre-eminently the source and sustainer of earthly life. Thus it is plainly evident that there are in fact a large number of terrestrial circumstances that are indivisibly linked with non terrestrial conditions.

While this may be so obvious as to seem almost pointless to make the statement, it does at least establish the fundamental requirement of an astrological system. That is, that there is a demonstrable relationship between certain celestial and terrestrial circumstances.

The major flaw in the objection however is the assumption that the only possible effectual influence that the planets can have upon earthly conditions is by way of gravitational forces. At a superficial level it can be pointed out that the mere sight of a great planet like Saturn through a telescope can create a feeling of awe and wonder in the observer. This is an “effect” produced in a person by the heavenly body in a way unrelated to its gravitational influence.

However as our knowledge of the planets is extended, it becomes increasingly apparent that the solar system is a vastly more complicated structure of inter related electromagnetic phenomena than we previously imagined. The concept of a simple “gravitational” solar system is as outmoded as is that of a fixed earth. This objection is therefore one which rests upon a quite inadequate model of the planets and their relationships to the sun and earth.

The work of K. Takashi in 1968 demonstrated that the planets were able to generate tidal forces within the sun, and that these forces were the generating factor of sun spots. This – and later work by R. D. Wood in 1972 – was published in the journal Nature. However sun spots are also a primary source of cosmic radiation, which is known to have a profound effect upon some genetic processes. Thus these understandings do in fact provide some evidence of a demonstrable link between planetary position and life processes. Links which come via the sun itself. Once more it seems that there has been established the basis for an astrological system.

3. The Zodiac is an Imaginary Structure

Here we find questioned the essential conceptual basis of the astrological structure. The objection argues that the Zodiac is not a “thing”, but an imaginary band in the heavens about 14 degrees wide. This band is arbitrarily divided into twelve sectors, and the star patterns in each sector are the “Zodiacal stars”.

However while from earth all these stars appear to be fixed in the dome of heaven, in fact their “groupings” have no existence in reality. Two apparently adjacent stars may be separated by thousands of light years of space, and a dim and insignificant point of light may be a galaxy of a million suns at the edge of the known universe. It thus becomes absurd to argue that it is possible to assign a distinct “character” to a zodiacal sign when it is composed of such unrelated stars in real space.

This argument is really more philosophical than scientific. Whether the zodiac is an effectual concept can only in the end be determined by investigation. Thus both astrology and science are equally at fault, as neither has produced sufficient data by which the question may be properly judged.

However while the structure of astrology may not (at present) rest upon incontrovertible evidence, it cannot simply be dismissed as arbitrary. Its concepts are based upon those same kind of mathematical and harmonic ideas that appear to underpin a large part of the natural world. In 1954 the great modern physicist Paul Dirac wrote, “With all the violent changes to which modern physical theory is subjected, there is just one rock which weathers every storm, to which one can always hold fast – the assumption that the fundamental laws of nature correspond to a beautiful mathematical theory. This means a theory based upon simple mathematical concepts that fit together in an elegant way, so that one has pleasure working with it”.

In his later years Carl Jung also came to the belief that the archetypal patterns which regulate both matter and spirit are best expressed through structures based on simple numbers. His disciple Marie-Louise von Franz pursued this concept in the book *Number and Time*.

It is obvious that astrology also uses “simple mathematical concepts that fit together in an elegant way”, as it seeks to examine the relationships between the structures of the solar system and human experience. That it does this through the mathematically elegant structure of the intellectual zodiac ought not – in itself – been seen as a reason for its condemnation. The final verdict may need to await more substantial evidence, but until that time the fact that the astrologer imposes upon celestial and terrestrial order some “beautiful mathematics” may well speak for his art, rather than against it.

4. New Planets

Until the year 1781 only five planets were known and the whole astrological system was erected upon these. With the sun and the moon they made up the seven celestial lights: itself a number of great symbolic value. In that year Uranus was discovered as a sixth planet. In 1846 Neptune became a seventh and Pluto was found as the eighth in 1930.

These new planets destroyed the symmetry of the old astrology and made it suspect. At the very least these discoveries implied that all previous astrological work had

been inadequate. At the worst they suggested that if right information could be obtained by using wrong tools, the whole operation was pointless anyway.

Obviously the discovery of the outer planets did put a severe strain upon astrologers. They proved however to be fairly adaptable beings, and while many in the 19th century refused to admit the reality of Uranus' existence (let alone use it in their horoscopes) Pluto was incorporated into astrological tables within three years of its discovery.

There has (as would be expected) been much debate about the meanings of these newly discovered planets for interpretive purposes. Those meanings now commonly used continue for the three outer planets the connotations indicated by the mythological associations of their names. The progression from Mercury to Saturn is one from youth to age and of immaturity to wisdom. This kind of "growth" pattern is then extended through those areas represented mythologically by Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto.

This is obviously a process of unashamed analogy. Yet there is often found a "fitness" about the conceptual framework of nature, through which old myths are relived in the most advanced technological circumstances. The writer Fritjof Capra explored just such correspondences between modern particle physics and eastern mystical tradition in his work *The Tao of Physics*. To pursue meaningful analogies can be one of the most fruitful kinds of "hypothesis formation" in science. If so, then why not also in astrology?

However it may also be noted that the outer planets demand by their nature a different interpretive treatment by the astrologer from the other visible members of the solar family. Saturn is the outermost of the visible planets and requires on average one and one half years to pass through each of the twelve Zodiacal signs. However Uranus (the first of the outer planets) takes seven years to achieve this, Neptune fourteen, and Pluto twenty one. Thus because of these very long term effects it is only reasonable that astrologers should deal with them in ways different from those other planets which formed the basis of ancient astrology.

Astrology is not a "closed system" in which all of its data is accepted ready made and unalterable from the ancients. The investigation of new ideas is a continuing work and astrological journals contain a plethora of new concepts and methods. The question which needs to be answered is often not whether anything new should be used, but which parts of the new deserve further study.

The new planets came as a shock to astrologers who had become used to a stable planetary system. However they do not of themselves impose any basic threat to the art.

5. Astrology Fails to Take Into Account the Precession of the Equinox

This objection may be briefly explained in the following way. While our calendar year begins at midnight on 1st January, this corresponds to no natural event. The "natural" year commences at noon on that day of the year which marks the precise division of a day into twelve hours of light and twelve hours of darkness during the

northern hemisphere's spring. That is, the vernal equinox on or about the 22nd of March.

That place in the sky against which the sun is located at that time is the First Point of Aries, and is the beginning point of the Zodiac. This point – when viewed against the background stars – is found to move westward each year by about 50 seconds of arc. The result is that the starting point of the Zodiac (0 degrees Aries) is no longer in that star constellation named Aries, but is very close to the end of the constellation of Pisces. Some time in the next one hundred years it will enter the constellation of Aquarius, and the “Age of Aquarius” will have properly begun.

It is therefore argued that even if astrology were valid at one time in history, it cannot be so now, as the Zodiacal signs used by astrologers do not correspond to the actual star groups called “Aries”, “Taurus”, and so on.

As with the objection based upon the helio and geo centric systems, this argument too may be met by the fact the ancient astrologers were well aware of the phenomenon of precession. The Zodiac in the temple of Denderah in Egypt contains representations of both the fixed (sidereal) and movable (tropical) zodiacs. This edifice may be dated to the second millennium BC. Apparently Egyptian astrologers used both: the moving Zodiac for “temporal” affairs and the fixed one for the great ages of civilization .

Certainly one must admit that the later Western astrologers do not seem to have taken this particular astronomical fact into consideration, but this does not thereby invalidate their work. Their horoscopes were essentially concerned with what the Egyptians would have considered to be “temporal” affairs. It may perhaps be more a comment upon the narrowness of our own view of life that the significance of precession was lost to astrology. Only in a civilization that could stretch unbroken over millennia could such a celestial motion take on importance. In the great temple at Luxor the alignment of the central court was altered no less than four times during its use in order to correct for the changes in star positions associated with the precession of the equinox.

While there is a small group of astrologers today who use an astrology based upon the “fixed” Zodiac, the great majority remain faithful to that system which has its Zodiac marked and determined by the vernal equinox.

Nor is this difficult to explain. Astrology does not generally deal with the “stars” but with the planets of our solar system. The Zodiac it uses is a method of describing the relationships which exist in this family as it travels through space. It is quite literally the “family circle” of our system, and so its origin point is rightly determined by an event occurring within it, and which is descriptive of the earth's relationship to the sun itself.

Indeed it may be argued that astrology's general insistence upon using the tropical (moveable) Zodiac in order to describe planetary relationships, is something which should be considered to be in its favour, rather than the reverse. The moveable Zodiac establishes the planets' relationships to the earth with respect to the solar system, which is the heart of the astrological concept.

Now these five objections which we have now examined, have been based upon the real (or supposedly real) physical properties or circumstances associated with the solar system, and which – it is claimed – preclude the operation of the astrological hypothesis. We have seen however that in reality they in no way approach such conclusive refutations, nor do they demonstrate any convincing scientific reason for rejecting astrology. The next four objections however are of a somewhat different nature, as they raise a number of practical issues related to the actual practice of astrology.

6. Astrology – to be Valid – Should Deal with Conception and not Birth

The traditional birth chart is erected for the precise time of the first breath after birth, or as close to this time as can be ascertained. Yet it is evident that our nature is determined almost entirely at the point of conception. Therefore, it is argued, if astrology is to be valid it ought to deal with conception not birth. This is an idea which in spite of its theoretical appeal has – to say the least- a number of significant social and practical difficulties.

However this is far from being a new objection. There was (for example) an ancient astrological rule called the Trutine of Hermes which attempted to draw a relationship back from the birth chart to a supposed conception chart. The astrologers of the ancient world certainly recognised the problem and assumed that the answer lay in some kind of significant natural relationship between the time of birth and the time of conception.

That such a general rule exists we know very well from the commonly applied calculation that the birth normally takes place two hundred and eighty days after the first day of the mother's last menstrual period. That is, by knowing the child's date of birth we have access to knowledge about some of the circumstances which surrounded conception. If astrology is to be valid, it would seem that it is a of relationship of this kind between conditions at conception and those which surround the initiation of the birth process which needs to be postulated.

If this should be so, then a case may be made in which the astrological tradition may be considered as handling conception at "second hand". The planets at birth which the astrologer uses to determine the person's nature are not causative. The true causation may be influences upon the genetic process – the nature of which we have at present only very imprecise knowledge – but which can be linked to solar/planetary phenomena at the time of conception.

However because conception and birth are linked by determinative natural processes – and because the planetary conditions at both events are also related by the laws of planetary motion – the birth horoscope must by necessity have some kind of natural relationship to one that could be erected at the time of conception. It is this relationship which astrology has perceived and made practical in its traditions. The horoscope therefore is not imaging the causes of human personality, but is simply one way of describing what already exists at birth.

A second objection which in a sense flows from this one involves our understandings of genetic science. The astrological thesis demands that in some way there must be a correspondence between the nature implanted at the moment of conception and the planetary or solar “circumstances” surrounding conception and/or birth.

Genetic studies postulate that our characters are the result of genes, which are “a particular configuration of the nucleic acids at a particular point on the length of the chromosome”. The genetic code of the genes is that “code by which inherited characteristics are handed from generation to generation. The code is expressed by the molecular configuration of the chromosome cells”.

Yet the question of the means by which any one particular configuration of chromosome cells is determined or preferred over another remains unanswered. Not only that, but since the genes exist and operate at the molecular level – which is particularly sensitive to sub-atomic radiation of the kind generated by the sun – it does not seem impossible that factors which could be described as “astrological” could enter into the process at some stage.

The argument from genetics is also (naturally) as good as present day genetic science. Experiments by Roger Williams reported in the *New Scientist* for September 1968 indicated that genes themselves are not determinative of inherited characteristics. He postulates other factors which he terms “inducers” and “suppressors”, which actually control the genetic process.

As to the nature and origin of these he offers no suggestions.

7. Time Twins

This is the classic argument first raised by Saint Augustine. Astrology must grapple with the problems of babies born at the same time and in the same place but of different mothers. Both infants must have identical horoscopes, and therefore ought to show marked and obvious similarities in their life experiences.

The astrologer would meet this argument firstly by saying that we need to distinguish between environment and experience. This was Saint Augustine’s fault (if fault there be), since he rested his case upon the fact that one of the time twins was a the son of a slave and the other the son of the land owner. However if it could be shown that similar significant events in the lives of the two coincided, then the astrologer’s case might be felt to have some substance in it.

Unhappily there is no statistical evidence which can be presented either way. There are however a number of well authenticated cases of a thought provoking nature. I am well aware that anecdotes in the end prove nothing, yet these may not be without some value.

Samuel Hemming and George III of England were both born on 4th June 1738. Hemming set up his iron monger’s business on the day that George III came to the throne. Both were married on 8th September 1761, both fathered the same number of children of the same sex, and both were given to racing and gambling. On the day

that the king was kicked by a horse Hemming was also kicked, and both were incapacitated for the same length of time. Both became ill on the same day, and both died on 29th January 1820.

When King Umberto of Italy was introduced to a restaurant proprietor, he remarked upon the similarity of their appearance. Upon inquiry it was learnt that both had been born at the same time on the same day; both had married on the same day; and both had a son named Vittorio. The proprietor had begun his business on the same day as the accession of Umberto to the throne. The king then learnt that the man was to take part the next day in a shooting contest at which the King was to present the prizes.

However when the time came to carry out this task Umberto learned that his “twin” had been killed while cleaning his gun. He expressed a wish to be taken to the scene of the accident. Before he arrived there he was himself killed by an assassin’s bullet.

In January 1979 James Lewis tracked down his missing thirty five year old twin brother, both boys having been adopted out at five weeks of age. His brother’s name too was now James (James Springer). Both had married a girl called Linda, divorced her, and married again to a girl named Betty. Both had named their first son James Allen. Both had worked successively as a part time deputy sheriff, McDonald Hamburger employee, and filling station attendant. Both spent their holidays at the same Florida beach, drove the same model car, and had both had two confirmed heart attacks.

While this last is not strictly a “time twin” example, the fact of total separation from the cradle makes the possibility of these external events of their lives being related to genetic factors highly unlikely.

Obviously we can come to no firm conclusion with respect to this particular objection. Never the less there is some evidence that even in the difficult area of time twins the astrologer’s case still has some arguable merit.

8. Induced Births

When a birth is artificially induced it is evident that the natural “link” between conception and birth is broken. If the birth had been allowed to go full term the horoscope for the natural birth would obviously have been quite different from that erected for the time of the induced birth. As one cannot have two birth charts – and in any case it is obviously impossible to determine what would have been the “natural” time of birth (or even the place) – this would seem to put the astrologer in an impossible position.

It probably does!

The astrologer has no option but to erect a chart for the actual time of birth and to interpret that chart. Some have suggested that horoscopes should not be erected under such conditions, as astrology is a “natural” art and ought not therefore be applied to “unnatural” circumstances. The majority however would claim that the chart of an

induced birth is appropriate for the person, and that this has been vindicated by their experience.

However “experience” here is quite subjective and even among astrologers there seems to be no collected data to substantiate such a claim. To explain the validity of astrology in such circumstances it is necessary to suppose that “to be induced” is as much a part of a person’s life potential as (say) to marry under certain circumstances. Given this assumption the birth chart then becomes a valid document for the interpretation of the personality.

The objection however is really a “problem in astrology” rather than an objection to it, as the matter does not become an issue of importance unless the general validity of the astrological process in the case of normal births has already been accepted.

9. Mass Tragedies

This final objection was apparently first raised by J.B.S.Haldane in an article printed in the *Daily Herald* during September 1939. Basically it asks the question about the relationship between individual destiny and large scale events. Did the millions of Jews of the second world war who died in the death camps all have a common death written into their horoscopes?

Once again the problem is not new. Ptolemy considered that the individual’s destiny was “subsumed” to the greater destiny of the state, nation, race, or geographic area. However it appears that the actual determination of such national or racial horoscopes are fraught with immense difficulties, and while mundane astrologers still ply their trade today, the results are at the best inconclusive.

What is interesting about this objection is that it is the only one – of all those considered – that enters the realm of prediction. The astrology that has been discussed so far has been natal astrology, concerned with the individual’s birth from which certain information is extracted to describe the person’s nature and his or her likely reaction to life situations. Haldane’s objection assumes that not only should the astrologer be able to delineate the chart in a way that properly depicts character and life circumstances, but he is also able to predict the nature, date, and circumstances of death.

This is demanding prediction of a very high order and presupposes an immensely sophisticated system. Certainly it is asking astrology to display a degree of competence which no life science can hope to approach at the present time. It is also demanding a feat that the great majority of astrologers would happily admit to be far beyond their abilities.

Whether it ought to be is another question. Certainly the problem is a real one and cannot simply be dismissed; yet it is no more a disproof of astrology to demand from it an ability to handle the most recondite matters with ease, than it is a disproof of modern medicine that it cannot readily cure all known diseases. To demand such an unreasonable level of proof may perhaps be a demonstration more of the objector’s prejudices than of a genuine questioning of the astrological position.



These then are the supposed weighty and scientific objections to the practice of astrology. On examination however they appear to be far less substantial than we may have been led to suppose. Indeed, apart from revealing that there are some areas of uncertainty in astrological technique, there is little in any of them to suggest some fundamental reason why astrology cannot work.

Of course it would be possible to go on from here to talk about the work of John Nelson and the relationship between radio communication and celestial phenomena, or Professor Piccardi's physical experiments and annual celestial cycles, or of course the statistical studies of Gauquelin. All of these are strongly suggestive of a correlation between terrestrial events and circumstances and solar and planetary phenomena. These however are probably quite well known to most of us, and we have probably gone far enough for our present purpose.

The astrological thesis may certainly suggest a world which is somewhat different from that espoused by the particular 'scientific' view point which many people almost unconsciously accept today. However I think that this may well be a problem which lies elsewhere, rather than in the practice of astrology itself.