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This essay is the first published work by Geoffrey Cornelius which expresses some of the key ideas for what would later come to be called divinatory astrology. It would take more than fifteen years before he published the first edition of his Moment of Astrology: Origins in Divination. More than thirty-five years after this article first appeared, it still packs a punch, since it contains ideas and assumptions which present a significant challenge to the practice of much contemporary astrology. For readers unfamiliar with his work, the short essay which follows provides some historical context for understanding the significance of this groundbreaking article.


By Kirk Little

Nowhere in his published work does Geoffrey Cornelius indicate when he first formulated the notion that judicial astrology—the astrology of particular judgments from horoscopes—is best understood as a form of divination. From his initial experiences with it in the early 1970’s, Cornelius perceived horoscopic astrology as a form of divination more akin to the I Ching or Tarot than some type of science. Still, this was more of an intuitive apprehension than a thought out position. Like any novice astrologer, he spent his early years learning the craft, but always with one eye cocked askance at the explanations he received for how the stellar science worked. Despite his incipient heresy, by the mid 1970’s Cornelius made a name for himself at the Astrological Lodge of London as a technically competent astrologer, who developed such an expertise with the Topocentric house system, that he was listed as the primary consultant for it in Geoffrey Dean’s Recent Advances in Natal Astrology: A Critical Review 1900-1976. He also exhibited a strong interest in the varied phenomena he encountered in astrological practice. Along the way, he also developed a reputation in the world of UK astrology as someone willing to challenge orthodox views.

Cornelius’ heterodox views were on display at the 1978 Astrological Association’s annual conference, where he was offered the opportunity to give the Charles Carter lecture. Indeed, it was there, that he first presented the horoscope for the “Anti-Astrology Signature”. His lecture title "Old Lumps of Rock—Conceptual Foundations of
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1 From a personal interview with the author in May 2002
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Astrology” suggests that he had little patience with the notion that planetary rays or other scientific explanations account for astrological effects. In that lecture, as he subsequently expressed the idea, he challenged one of astrology’s fundamental assumptions: “An effect or a sign produced in a distinct moment of objective time relates the situation on earth and the state of the heavens at that moment…” No doubt, Cornelius was aided in his task by his significant experience with the idiosyncratic workings of horary astrology, which supported his contention that astrology's successes had less to do with scientific astrological laws and more to do with "effective and worldly symbolism".

Cornelius’ powerful critique of one of astrology’s conceptual foundations arrived at a sensitive time for the UK astrological community. It was still absorbing the twin shocks of the Humanist attack from 1975 (which provided the horoscope for the “Anti-Astrology Signature”), as well as Geoffrey Dean’s massive study of natal astrology Recent Advances, published in 1977. Though the Humanist critique was much less well-informed than that presented by Dean et al, the former seemed as if it could be a more significant threat to astrology’s public image because of its high profile. It was announced in the Sept/Oct. 1975 Humanist magazine and republished in succeeding months by a number of newspapers around the world, including the New York Times. Coordinated by Bart Bok, an eminent astronomer and Paul Kurtz, a professor of philosophy, the manifesto, entitled “Objections to Astrology” was endorsed by 186 scientists, including 18 Nobel Prize winners. Unnoticed at the time, its broad brush condemnation of astrology had more in common with a Papal bull, than a summary of a scientific consensus. In retrospect, it seems to have had much effect on the public’s views of astrology, which remained vaguely but consistently supportive. To anyone seriously interested in astrology, it brought unwanted attention. Unfortunately, the collective response to this attack from professional astrologers and their organizations was both weak and unfocused.

Two years later, in December 1977, astrologers received even more bad news regarding the scientific standing of many of their practice techniques from the publication of Geoffrey Dean’s Recent Advances in Natal Astrology. One could be forgiven for wondering if the title was ironic, since this volume contained no “advances” and its contents were a largely negative assessment of the vast majority of horoscopic factors, from signs to planets to aspects and everything in between. Even more demoralizing for practicing astrologers was the active participation of a number of leading astrologers, including Rob Hand, John Addey, Charles Harvey and Baldur Ebertin. At the time of its publication, Dean, a former astrologer, did not have the fearsome reputation he carries amongst astrologers as a fierce critic of their discipline. Still, the combined effect of these two critiques were hammer blows for any astrologer who understood their practice to have some kind of scientific basis. This notwithstanding, the editor of the Quarterly, Ronald Davison – and perhaps many astrologers at the time – were quite dismissive of the scientific critiques, as evidenced by the following editorial comment from p. 74 of this issue:

The Humanist Attack on Astrology

Readers may have noticed that we have paid very little attention in our pages to this attack. We firmly believe in the tactic: “Don't waste time worrying about them; let them worry about us”. However, Geoffrey Cornelius has sent in a very interesting contribution on the subject which we print more out of regard for its general interest than as a defensive gesture against the arguments of a group of blinkered materialists. The article appears on page 88.
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If in the wake of these scientific attacks, most astrologers sought refuge in the insulated practice of their craft, it was characteristic of Cornelius to look for inspiration in his opponent’s backyard. After all, if astrology has more in common with omens and intuitions than empirical tests, perhaps there was something in the 1975 Humanist attack itself, which provided just such a harbinger of astrology’s redemption from the judgments of science. In the fall of 1978, he published his first important essay on astrology as divination entitled "The Anti-Astrology Signature"4 in the Astrology Quarterly, the Lodge’s periodical.

Up to that point, almost all of the astrological community's responses to the recent scientific critiques had been to use the language of science to discuss the positive findings for astrology. Certainly, others prior to Cornelius, such as Dane Rudhyar and perhaps even Alan Leo, had rejected the notion that astrology is best understood as a science of stellar influences advanced through the logic of scientific methodology.5 What set Cornelius' response apart from his astrological contemporaries is that he largely concedes the scientists were correct when they characterize astrology as having a foundation in magic. In his essay “Astrology: Magic or Science?” accompanying the “Objections” manifesto, the science writer Lawrence Jerome stated, “Astrology is false because it is a system of magic.”6 This did not faze Cornelius. If the scientific case for astrology was weak, so what? Playing by their rules would never carry the day for astrology. While the implications for the "astrology as science approach" might limit the claims astrologers could make, it did not invalidate the whole of astrology, nor did it preclude the possibility that horoscope judgments could yield both truthful and helpful information. Notably, Cornelius based his response to the 1975 attack on a horoscope which had been published as an illustration to one of the articles in the Humanist. Less notably, the horoscope’s inclusion in that periodical was odd, since it had simply been put there to demonstrate something about horoscope construction and to show its skeptical readers what the object of their ire should be. While the horoscope itself was not essential to the Humanist attack, it became absolutely critical to Cornelius for its status as a Janus-faced omen: one face pointed the way towards astrology’s distant origins and the other towards astrology’s possible future.

To dramatically make his point, Cornelius used this “example” horoscope to demonstrate the validity and power of astrological symbolism. That horoscope, originally published in 1941 in an article...
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4 Astrology Quarterly, (Vol. 52, No. 3, Autumn 1978)
5 In his The Astrology of Personality, (Lucis, New York, 1936) Rudhyar addresses this issue in his first chapter, “Astrology Faces Modern Thought”, where he writes “We trust it will be apparent to everyone after some clear thinking on the matter that attempts at making astrology an exact empirical science by basing it on measurements of actual influences and rays are, if not doomed to failure, at least bound to explain or prove only a fragment of the entire body of ideas which constitutes and has always constituted astrology.” (p. 45) The prescience of Rudhyar's judgment has since been amply demonstrated by the Gauquelin studies. They constitute the largest empirical study to date of the astrological hypothesis of planetary influences; their most robust findings support only a tiny fraction of actual contemporary practice. In the page prior to his clear-eyed assessment of scientific astrology, Rudhyar took up the case of horary astrology: “‘Scientific’ astrologers may frown at horary astrology as being mere fortune telling. Nevertheless it is easy to show that natal astrology (study of birth charts) is a special case of horary astrology...a horary chart is the birth of an idea.” (pp. 44-5) Cornelius makes the case for Alan Leo moving away from his earlier determinism: “towards the end of his life he was beginning to express an angelic vision, a move towards Christianized daemones as the guides of our astrology”. Moment, Op. cit. p. 168
6 Ibid. p. 89
by the astronomer Bart Bok and Margaret Mayall\(^7\), was seized by Cornelius in 1978 as an "anti-astrology signature" which epitomized the whole scientific attack on astrology; he interpreted the horoscope accordingly.

On a purely rational level, using the horoscope from the Humanist made no sense. How could a randomly selected horoscope from 1941 have anything to do with the 1975 assault on astrology? The horoscope's actual origins remain obscure, but it was cast for a particular date, time and place: November 23, 1907 at 4 am for New York City. By the tenets of mainstream astrology, this horoscope had no possible validity, since as it was presented, it was unconnected to an actual person or enterprise, such as the birth of a business, organization or government and had merely been used to illustrate horoscope construction. Thus, the only connection this random map had with the scientific assault upon astrology was the fact that it had been published along with the "Objections to Astrology" article in the Sept/Oct 1975 issue of the Humanist. Yet Cornelius saw in its potent symbolism not only a convincing "anti-astrology signature" for the attack, but evidence of how astrology actually works in practice. He substantiated his contention by demonstrating how this "random" horoscope's progressions timed the publication of the Humanist attack itself. The 1907 horoscope, as Cornelius later put it, was "arbitrarily derived decades before its star turn"\(^8\) and thus became a powerful example of the 'unique case' principle, which would become a fundamental tenet of astrology as divination. Thus, "effective and worldly symbolism", not scientific laws must guide astrologers in their practice.

The high level of craft horoscopy on display in Cornelius’ work---as in this article, for instance---is often not properly acknowledged, perhaps because divination is often confounded with intuition and an “anything goes” approach to chart interpretation. While his delineations of the horoscope’s natal aspects, including a kite configuration, demonstrate his capacity for working within the mainstream tradition, it is his sure footed use of horary techniques which make the horoscope’s “anti-signature” identity come alive. Ultimately, it is through his use of various timing measures, including Secondary Direct and Converse measures, as well as transits, that “the true meaning of the map becomes declared (‘published’) and recognizable.”\(^9\) His supple use of various astrological techniques, as much and perhaps more than any philosophical argument, makes a strong argument for his contention that the fundamental assumptions of mainstream astrology need to be questioned and rethought. In other words, the application of astrology substantiates the idea of questioning and rethinking the philosophical basis of astrology. This essential relationship between praxis and theory remains an essential feature of Cornelius’ divinatory astrology.

"What Does the Signature Signify?"

A response to Cornelius’ “An Anti-Astrology Signature” was not long in coming. In the very next issue of the Quarterly, Norman de Gournay’s rejoinder "What does the Signature Signify" contested some of Cornelius’ assumptions about the nature of astrology. De Gournay was a long-standing Lodge member; his spirited philosophical defense of the tradition required reckoning. Significantly, de Gournay acknowledged the seriousness of Cornelius’ critique by taking him at his word. He noted that the secondary purpose of Cornelius’ delineation of the “Anti-Signature” horoscope was, to quote its author, “‘to suggest in outline its reflective power for misconceptions within
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\(^7\) "Scientists Look at Astrology", The Scientific Monthly, Vol. 52, No. 3 (March 1941), p. 235

\(^8\) Moment, Op. Cit. p. 31

\(^9\) "An Anti-Astrology Signature", Astrology Quarterly, (Volume 52, No. 3) p. 98
and without astrology, and to further raise questions about the nature of astrology.”¹⁰ In lawyerly fashion, he latched on to Cornelius’ use of the word “inevitably”---as opposed to a random selection---to describe the choice of Margaret Mayall’s horoscope for its inclusion in her and Bart Bok’s 1941 publication “Scientists Look at Astrology”.

While de Gournay chided Cornelius for embracing predestination or some kind of fatalism (by implying “that Margaret Mayall lacked freedom of choice”¹¹), his primary concern was that Cornelius violated “one of two hypotheses on which astrology is founded…the supreme significance of beginnings.”¹² De Gournay laid particular emphasis upon the second hypothesis: the well-known dictum of Hermes Trismegistus “that which is above is like unto that which is below”. In other words, he invoked the words from the Tabula Smaragdina or Emerald Tablet, which provides “the philosophical foundation of the magical tradition”¹³ and which has been used as a rationale for western astrology for centuries. That is, he endorsed the theory of correspondences and explicitly denied most modern astrologers believe “minute gravitational, electromagnetic or radiative emissions from distant planets, or far more distant stars, could possibly influence terrestrial births…”¹⁴ De Gournay suggested the dictum “the stars impel but do not compel” be replaced with “the planets inform but do not compel us to conform”, thus making room for free will. Somewhat ironically, in order to reaffirm the primacy of horoscopes based on historical beginnings, de Gournay interpreted the map for the launch of the ill-fated Titanic; he suggested the ship’s fundamental weaknesses--its character flaws, so to speak as evidenced by structural problems with the ship---need not have resulted in tragedy had Captain Smith “been warned by a competent astrologer and had had enough belief in astrology to have heeded a waring (sic) that extreme caution was vital.”¹⁵

“A Reply from Geoffrey Cornelius”

In his response to de Gournay, carried in the same issue, Cornelius acknowledged and responded to the two “threads” of his objections: predestination and beginnings. He found their differences in the former to be more apparent than real and suggested the issue of fate and free will “continually presents itself in astrology” and that it “is relevant to Mayall’s choice only in so far as it is relevant in every astrological situation, and it should not be seen as a special factor in this case.”¹⁶ What follows that statement are Cornelius’ earliest published remarks on what would become aspects of his philosophy of astrology as divination: “I am not at all sure that every single situation in life will yield an inevitable reflection. In the article, I qualified the point by linking it with the idea of significant context…it is nevertheless my experience, and the experience of many astrologers, that certain events and moments yield horoscopes of extraordinary meaningfulness. With the poetic and symbolic attitude that underlies astrology, one learns to recognize such moments (italics mine).”¹⁷ The unique or significant context, a symbolic attitude, human initiative---for which Cornelius subsequently adopted the ancient Greek term katarche---and the openness to recognizing the moment of astrology
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¹¹ Ibid, p. 6
¹² Ibid. p. 6
¹⁴ Ibid. p. 7
¹⁵ Signify: Op. Cit., p. 8
¹⁶ Ibid. p. 9
¹⁷ Ibid. p. 9
would remain fundamental aspects of his radical reconfiguration of astrology’s conceptual foundations.

De Gournay’s second concern, expressed in his article under the title of *The Science of Beginnings*, represented a genuine difference between the two men. In his reply, Cornelius stated “The concept of ‘Beginning’ is of immense significance, but does not exhaust the possibilities of astrology…I will mention the validity of the horoscope for the moment of death, as summarizing life achievement and offering a basis for time measures backward to the main features of life.”

Though not acknowledged here, Martin Heidegger’s influence on Cornelius’ thinking may be perceived in his questioning of the importance of clock time or scientific notions of time, which treat time ‘spatially’ in quantifiable, measurable units. In his reply, Cornelius addressed *The Problem of Time* and under that paragraph heading openly admitted “Margaret Mayall’s chosen map does not have a temporal location at the beginning, middle or end of an attack upon astrology.” Rather than engage in a lengthy polemic, he respectfully asked his critic to “temporarily to suspend a priori judgment as to whether or not such phenomena are ‘in theory’ possible, and instead apply his astrology to see whether it does or does not in fact yield astrological significance.”

There the matter seemed to lie. No one else took up the thread of de Gournay’s argument in succeeding issues. It is unlikely at this juncture that Cornelius’ article changed many minds and in succeeding months, the *Quarterly* returned to business as usual, which was and is to represent the varied views of the Lodge’s members.

Kirk Little/January 2016
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18 Ibid. p. 10; Converse measures were not identified by de Gournay as problematic, but would also be a challenge to anyone wedded to a causal model of stellar influences.

19 In the first edition of *The Moment of Astrology: Origins in Divination* (ArkanaPenguin, London) he writes “This whole approach to the description of astrology owes much to two primary sources of inspiration. One is the phenomenological hermeneutics of Martin Heidegger, and the reader familiar with his work will be able to trace this influence in stances I adopt.” p. xxi, p. xxiii in 2003 edition

20 *Signify*, Op. Cit., p. 10

21 Ibid. p. 10
AN ANTI-ASTROLOGY SIGNATURE

The Horoscope used in “The Humanist” Attack

Geoffrey Cornelius

The attack on astrology published in the September/October 1975 issue of “The Humanist” is probably our era's most significant single attempt to discredit the subject. The core of the attack is a 414 word statement headed “Objections to Astrology: A Statement by 186 Leading Scientists.” The statement was drafted by Bart Bok, a professor of astronomy, former President of the American Astronomical Society, and a campaigner against astrology over many years; Lawrence Jerome, a science writer; and Paul Kurtz, professor of philosophy and editor of “The Humanist.” This was then sent to a selected list of distinguished members of the American Astronomical Society and the National Academy of Sciences, including some foreign members, for endorsement. The signatories form a scientific elite, chiefly in the fields of astronomy and physics. The majority have a professorship or post of similar status; they include eighteen Nobel Prizewinners.

The statement informs us that “there is no scientific foundation” for the tenets of astrology . . . “indeed . . . there is strong evidence to the contrary.” The first strand of the objection is the impossibility of the substantial causal connection between stars, planets and events on earth: “Now that these distances can and have been calculated, we can see how infinitesimally small are the gravitational and other effects produced by the distant planets and far more distant stars.” The second strand of the objection is that astrology is based on magic and superstition, part of an ancient “magical world view,” the encouragement of which by the popular and uncritical dissemination of astrology “can only contribute to the growth of irrationalism and obscurantism.” The statement is coloured by the humanist position: “we must all face the world, and we must realize that our futures lie in ourselves, and not in the stars.” The attack is unequivocal: “We believe the time has come to challenge directly, and forcefully, the pretentious claims of astrological charlatans.” The attack was also intended to have maximum public impact; the relevant copy of “The Humanist,” with covering press release, was circulated to “thousands of newspaper editors in the United States and abroad.”

In the same issue two articles give detailed discussion of the themes outlined in the statement. Bart Bok’s “A Critical Look at Astrology” bears on the first strand; that of the impossibility of a physical foundation for astrology. Bok questions the idea that minute gravitational, electromagnetic or radiative effects could be particularly significant at certain precise moments, such as birth, and he questions the qualitative distinctions between the various planets: “Astrology demands the existence of totally unimaginable mechanisms of force and action”. Bok also shows an example of a horoscope and its construction; to this end we will refer shortly. He concludes with a statement drafted thirty-five years before by the psychologist Gordon W. Allport, and endorsed by the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues “Psychologists State their Views on Astrology.” This attacks astrology and other forms of occultism as “unwholesome flights from the persistent problems of real life . . . our fates rest not in our stars but in ourselves.”

Lawrence Jerome’s article, “Astrology: Magic or Science?” discusses the history of astrology in relation to an essential theme: “that astrology has nothing to do with physical effects of the stars, and that such considerations obscure its real basis: ‘very few writers have come to the nub of the matter: astrology is false because it is a system of magic, based on the magical “principle of correspondences”’ . . . astrology arose as magic and . . . were only attempts to associate the ancient “art” with each important new science that came along.” The debate that has followed Jerome’s attempt to discredit the statistical validity of Gauquelin’s work should not be allowed to obscure the main point. On his central theme Jerome’s article is well argued, and should demand the attention of the astrologer.

The Horoscope in Context

In the attack in “The Humanist” a single horoscope is illustrated, with diagram and explanation relating to its construction. No interpretation is given. It appears in Bok’s article, where it is noted that the horoscope had originally been used in a previous article by Margaret W. Mayall in 1941.
The horoscope is cast for 'November 23, 1904, 4 am Eastern Standard Time' 40N43, 73W58 (ie for New York). 0°00 is shown on MC, and it is possible that this was the chosen basis of construction. The map has been recalculated to hold 0°00 on MC (at 4:00:00 am EST 0°00 is on MC), with Topocentric Cusps instead of the round degree Placidus cusps originally given (for details of the original map; note 5). In the article it is entitled: "A Conventional Type of Natal Horoscope." As will be demonstrated, this horoscope takes on an additional significance: that of being a symbolic representation of the attack upon astrology.

The questions raised by the attack go far wider than the particular discipline of astrology. Its significance is emphasised by the choice of a special issue (of "The Humanist") commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Ethical Culture movement in the United States; we are really witnessing a concentrated attack by one whole way of thought upon another. Astrology is chosen as an ideal field for a skirmish in this eternal war. That this skirmish involves turbulence and schism in the ranks of the stargazers is neatly pictured by the coincidence of the attack with the first of a series of transit Saturn-Uranus squares extending over eighteen months. The first contact of this tense configuration came on 4th October 1975, with Ⓐ at 1°28 squared by ⋅ at 1°28. Ⓐ had entered Ⓐ on 17th September, thus transiting the MC of the example horoscope. One immediate feature of the symbolism becomes apparent with the association of Saturn, traditionally, and Uranus, recently, with astrology and astronomy.

The example horoscope as an 'Anto-Astrology Signature'

The example horoscope is not the natus of either Bart Bok or Margaret Mayall; so it appears to be a fortuitous map, that could easily have been any other map. Mayall may have gone to the New York House Table for 00, MC, she may have chosen 4 am as a convenient round time for purposes of her diagram; she may have had some birth data, say for a relative, and an appropriate ephemeris. Whatever the casual chain that attended her choice, its detail may be considered irrelevant—she chose this map and no other. From the astrological point of view, the single map appearing in a context so charged with significance will inevitably not be random: it may be expected to show astrological features that indicate why that map, and not some other, should be unconsciously elected. Such features can be termed signatures, and the whole map may prove, under testing, to be a signature for the meaning that underlies the attack. 'Signature' is here understood in its archaic and magical sense of the significant appearance of something in accordance with an inner truth.

Conscious astrological election in principle cannot be ruled out, since the map offers such immediately appropriate symbolism. It is unlikely, since several details would be chosen only by an experienced astrologer. However, if it were consciously elected, then the election can be shown to be astrologically effective beyond possible conscious choice, by the test of time measure to events appropriate to its symbolism.

General features of the map

The main aspect pattern of the map is the Grand Trine in water, involving Ⓐ, Ⓐ, Ⓐ. The opposition of Ⓐ Ⓐ brings the configuration to an imperfect 'Rite'. The initiatory principle in a Grand Trine is usually suggested in its cardinal member, here Ⓐ; in Ⓐ; the Ⓐ opposition then provides a potent channel for the main force of the map.

Movement in the Grand Trine is contained by several hard aspects to its components (⌀ to Ⓐ, Ⓐ to Ⓐ, and Ⓐ, Ⓐ to Ⓐ). The square of Ⓐ to Ⓐ is most significant, but its closeness and the mutual application; with Ⓐ retrograde, it must be treated as afflicted.
A second important pattern is seen in the T-square involving Ψ & Π (ruler of ASc.) both square Π; Π is then involved by □ Π, which is itself Δ Π.

The □ should always be observed for its ephemeral enhancement of slow-forming patterns: here it emphasises the handle of the Kite, its first application being Ψ & Π. This axis is also picked out by the line of the nodes.

The most obvious symbolism relating to the attack is that of □ Ψ, falling across the IX-III axis (which is unaltered whichever major house system is adopted). These houses are understood to relate to higher and lower mind respectively. Ψ is a particular significator for astrology or astronomy; its placing in Ψ in III is in this context suggestive of a limited and materialistic conception of the subject, while □ in Ψ in IX is suggestive of a popular religious or spiritual view of life with which Ψ contends. □ Ψ carries a similar symbolism of what are sometimes called 'religious difficulties'.

Specific Indications of 'Anti-Astrology': the Horary Approach

This map would appear to allow a subtle psychological reading, and many astrologers would be sufficiently encouraged by the directness of the symbolism already discussed, to immediately develop such a reading. However, although the map is presented to us as an example natal horoscope, it seems to me inappropriate in this initial exercise to apply the method of approach used in natal astrology, since the first purpose is to establish the symbolism of a theme far simpler than the meaning of a human destiny. I am disposed to adopt the interpretative mode of traditional horary, the power of which, in relation to maps of this sort, resides in clear analysis which strips the symbolism to those elements with direct bearing on the limited issue under examination. A sharpness of judgment is then possible, that might prove misleading if applied to the profound dimension of the natal horoscope.

To utilise traditional horary method, this map must be treated as 'asking a question of astrology'. We can then rapidly determine whether the map is readable within the limits of this approach. According to usual procedure, the ascendant and its ruler, Ψ, are taken as significators of the querent (those who would challenge astrology). The querent being an art or science locates this as a ninth house question. Immediately the horary radicality of the map leaps into significance: Lord IX (□) rises, with □ in IX (the □ is always considered a 'co-significator' for the querent or the issue; it has great power to bring matters to pass and has an immediate significance that is not usually granted in a natal reading). As a basis for the reading, the prime authority in horary, William Lilly, will be quoted:

'Of profit by, or proficiency in, any science, &c.

The ascendant, its Lord, and the □, are for the querent and the 9th, its Lord, or planet therein (if more than one, the nearest to the cusp), for the science.

See whether the Lord of the 9th be fortunate or not, oriental, angular, &c; and whether he behold the Lord of the ascendant with • or △. If he be a fortune, and aspect the Lord of the ascendant, the man has scientific knowledge, and will gain thereby; the more so if there be reception. If the aspect be □ or □, the man has talent, but shall do no good by it. If an infortune either aspect the Lord of the ascendant or 9th, the man has wearied himself, but to no purpose, for he will never attain the knowledge he desires. If infortunes be in the 9th, or its Lord afflicted, the party has but little scientific knowledge.

The □ must also be observed with the Lord of the 9th; for if they both apply to fortunes, the man is scientific; if to infortunes, the contrary . . . .

A distinction should be made more carefully here than in most IX-th house questions between querent and quesited, since the opponents of astrology seek not an identity, but a contra-identity. For this reason, and by virtue of the map, the □ being in IX, I feel it would be unjustified to give co-signification of the □ over to the querent; in this map it should be given primarily to the quesited. The first application, to □ Ψ, provides a basic theme for the whole reading, as earlier discussed. Ψ is then to be given over primarily to the astronomers attacking astrology; this assignment is corroborated by the parallel between it and □.

The opponents of astrology are then chiefly described by the ascendant ruler, Ψ, applying the □ to Ψ: 'the man has wearied himself, but to no purpose' . . . . Ψ will then point to the nature of the conceptual limitation out of which the attack arises, by its □ to Ψ, and by its disposion of Ψ in III. Ψ has no major relationship with □, ill, with the IX-th or its ruler, in any usual horary sense; the two rulers actually show an inversion of the requirement given by Lilly for gain and understanding through the science, since they are out of aspect and mutually receive in detriment (Ψ in the sign of Ψ detriment, □ in the sign of □ detriment).

The opposite house to that of the quesited is usually understood as complementary, with the relationship between the two as one of outcome, each of the other, or of polarity. Here polarity emerges as enmity. □ separates Δ from Ψ, its dispositor and Lord of HHrd. Ψ should also be noted as the dispositor of the factor, Ψ, which limits and oppresses the judgment of the querent. We can now more fully appreciate the import of a most significant factor of the Zodiacal state, the □ Ψ square, when this is precipitated in the mundane framework. Ψ, Lord of IX-th and hence a significator for astrology, is shown afflicted both by its application to the square, and by its retrogradation which, while it may indicate a depth of quality and a powerful inner function for astrology, also threatens an inability to successfully adapt to the outer world, or to give conceptual description to its substance.

As already discussed, Ψ is here given significature for the mode of thought that would oppose (or ideally, complement) astrology; by its nature, its placing in Ψ, and finally by house location (in X), it
is symbolic of the learned, authoritative and corporate opinion which passes in our time as guardian of our ways of thought; the appeal to the authority of 186 leading scientists, made in the attack, is a fitting expression of this principle.

The state of \( \phi \) allows a deduction that astrology is not merely the guiltless recipient of a pompous challenge; \( \phi \) is itself retrograding in to the \( \Box \), as by default and by lack of critical self-evaluation it has unconsciously attracted the external criticism. Treating \( \psi \) and \( \lambda \) as a Key signature for the whole issue, then the problem for both astrology and its opponents is well described, independently of the particular technique of horary. Carter's discussion in the inharmonious contact of \( \psi \) and \( \lambda \), as given in 'The Astrological Aspects', is curiously apposite:

'... there may be a wool-gathering tendency. The mind may be sceptical in religious matters, or, on the other hand, there may be superstition; that not uncommon person, the superstitious infidel, seems to come under these configurations. It is not a combination that will give balance in religious thought or practice ...

Reason and faith are commonly in conflict. It is often found in maps of those who have "religious difficulties" ... the native tends to exaggerate and scorn the full formality of facts. Judgment is poor and the native is not likely to give good advice, especially in matters coming under either planet.

He is a poor prophet, and astrologers with these afflictions are not likely to win credit for themselves or their art so far as predictive work is concerned'.

This is Carter being typically blunt and to-the-point. It is easy for the astrologer to see these weaknesses in his critics, but if we return to the present map with the above judgment in mind then how far can astrology, at least in our epoch, escape the negative verdict? Is the judgment not equally appropriate for us: 'astrologers with these afflictions are not likely to win credit for themselves or their art'. Even if we limit the \( \psi \Box \lambda \) to a description of the way opponents see the subject, the state of \( \psi \) gives sufficient indication that a major part of the blame for their misconception lies with the astrologers. Our incapacity to express the real nature of the art appears to be a theme of the map; coupled with the indication of \( \psi \), the interception in IX points clearly enough to this. In one interpretation, we would be invited to see the significators for Astrological signs, \( \psi \) being both in Water signs, as 'mute' or reticent, implying a failure on the part of astrologers to yield up complete information. I cannot resist a desire to stretch the judgment a little, to ask 'what has caused the loss of understanding?' then a traditional interpretation for theft will point an accusing finger at this miserable Mercury: peregrine (out of its triplicity, term or face) and in an angle, to indicate the thief. Jerome tells us that astrology 'robs man of his rationality, his most human feature; and its capacity to utilise a few gleanings from other sciences and superficially turn them to its own ends may, with an uncharitable view, be termed pilfering'.

The map seems to bear out a central theme of Jerome's attack: that in its description of itself, there has been an obstruction of the core issue of astrology. The super simple physicalism of Bok's sand is nevertheless a mirror of misleading and naive materialism which constricts so many astrological assumptions. If astrology in truth operates according to principles alien to present-day physical science, then astrologers should not allow themselves the deceit of presenting the subject as if it is really a variant of that science.

A deeper level of the symbolism now begins to disclose itself. There is a subtle theme of the VIIIth, or the principle of \( \Pi \), playing through this map and generating an interior dimension to the IXth house question. \( \Phi \) conjunct the IXth cusp mutually receives \( \phi \) in \( \Pi \). The Part of Fortune is in VIII, also disposed by of \( \Phi \). This is a side to \( \Phi \) on which it has been distinctly reticent. We further note the \( \Phi \) in the closing minutes of \( \Pi \) (part of the actual body of the \( \Phi \) is already into \( \lambda \)); and that the ruler of the asc. is also ruler of VIII. An interpretation of this symbolism is that the opponents of astrology have correctly identified the subject as having at its foundation a magical world-view, of the nature of the VIIIth. The full implications of this are unrecognised in the ordinary astrology of our age, hence the confused or mute nature of the IXth. The opponents feel that they can destroy the subject's credibility simply by exposing this identity. Perhaps astrology can be reborn only by accepting the identity.

* * * * *

I have touched briefly on the most immediate features of the map. Other details are consistent with these features, and deserve attention. Amongst them are the cuspal quality of the NC (trine its ruler, the \( \Phi \), similarly cuspal) implying a uniting or bridging of great principles; and the special status of \( \phi \) as Lord VII, carrying a symbolism of enemy to the querent. Since \( \phi \) dispels \( \phi \) in \( \Pi \) and carries a natural analogy with the VIIIth, we have another image of the underlying meaning of the attack. \( \phi \) is at a degree area noted for its association with astrology, which becomes a suitable representative of the magical and irrational world view of the VIIIth. The above two features suggest and require modes of interpretation different to traditional horary; for example the nature of \( \phi \) in this map draws attention to the possibility of treating it as a 'contest' horoscope, which would focus our attention primarily on the I-St-VIIIth, and their rulers. Horoscopes with a higher order of radicality are capable of being read, consistently, through various delineative approaches and at many levels.

The Refraction of Mercury: a Major Theme

Whether the map is approached using the wide synthesis of modern natal interpretation or the specific analysis of traditional horary, the square of \( \phi \) and \( \lambda \) is a foregrounder factor, by its augularity, exactness, and essentially pertinent symbolism. Horary allows a decisive prediction to be made from this square, since it allows us that, that is to say, to utilise a few gleanings from other sciences and turn them to its own ends may, with an uncharitable view, be termed pilfering'.
to perfect (technically termed ‘refraneation’) we are bound to assume that however devastating an attack might be mounted under the aegis of Ur, it must finally fail to hinder astrology. Astrology might almost be seen as playfully and deceitfully taunting the scientists.

The power of decision appears to be with the astrologers, rather than with their opponents, for it is the significator for astrology that dissolves the square. A similar indication, throwing the issue into the hands of the astrologers, may be read in the placing of the ☉ in IX; and after its battering from ☉ we next find the ☉ applying Δ ψ—an ultimately favourable indication for the question. Astrology however must rebel against its own conceptual limitation (☉ ψ ☉ in III), before it can discover itself in the trine, just as it must reverse the tendency of its thought before it can defeat the square.

The map for the station of ☉ is given here because it may throw light on the Anti-Astrology Signature. In its own right it may have only limited radicality and secondary importance; its horary indication appears to be obscure compared with the earlier map. However, several points of significance emerge: the intervening hours have seen a change in the Sun-sign, while the ☉ has crossed the ☉ of ☉ and is now coming on to the Δ of ☉. The ☉’s prior ψ ψ ☉ would be considered ineffectual in the usual horary approach, which ignores minor aspects; even if it is allowed that the ☉ translates some light from ψ to ☉ I would not judge that the configuration has the status of a perfected square— it is like a blow to the back of a nimble man, who nonetheless runs free. In another interpretation we may see the attitude of the opponents embodied in the square’s illusory appearance of perfection: they believe, incorrectly, that they have the authority to seriously damage the widely popular acceptance of astrology. The minor linkage achieved by ☉ ψ, if considered at all, places the form of the issue in the hands of astrology, to the extent that it is co-signified by ☉. Astrology has the opportunity to use this contact as a push in the right direction, i.e. it can better understand its own problems, stimulated by the criticism of others; yet in no essential way need it be hurt by such an attack. ☉ is given emphasis since ☉ rises; the translation of light by the ☉ from ☉ to ☉ may come to suggest clues as to the nature of a regenerated astrology, and asks us to ponder more carefully ☉ in the original map.

There is much in this map to indicate the necessity for the beginning of a new phase for astrology: the ☉ in the first degree of ☉ in IX, an early degree of ☉ rising, and above all the station of ☉ in ☉ in the VIIIth, point back to the theme implicit in the original map. Such a moment of potential regeneration might only occur when the challenge to astrology seemed to be most devastating. At the closest moment of the square we find the angles of the map divided between ☉ and ☉ rulership, with a greater part of control of the map in ☉. The elevation of ☉ ☉ is symbolic of a culmination of the attack begun in the earlier map. Whether the two maps together are capable of allowing an interpretation of the possible resolution of the conflict, I do not feel able to judge.

**The Measure of Time**

As further corroboration of the radicality of the Anti-Astrology Signature, its power of measure to the 1975 attack will be indicated. The map does not appear to offer any simple long-period measure by the traditional horary approach of symbolic timing. Not all conventional horaries are expected to offer symbolic measure translatable into objective time, and in this case it may be suggested that the theme of the map bears upon the whole situation of astrology, modern science and rationalism, without temporal distinction. The attack in “The Humanist” closely mirrors its symbolism, but would seem not to be essential as an expression of the coming-to-pass of what is indicated by the map. The scope of horary symbolic timing is probably necessarily delimited by the situation’s particular mode of coming-to-pass, whereas the force of the symbolism would have

---

**Mercury Station**

23 Nov. 1907  
17:48 UT  
40N43 73W58  
Cusps: Topocentric  
Time from American Ephemeris ☉ true 145538 St.D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decl.</th>
<th>20S14</th>
<th>22N38</th>
<th>13S39</th>
<th>23S56</th>
<th>14S10</th>
<th>17N19</th>
<th>55S0</th>
<th>23S23</th>
<th>21N49</th>
<th>15N39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
remained, relatively timeless, whether or not the 1975 attack occurred. This is one more reason why the map presents itself not as a horoscope for a particular event, but as a signature for a matrix of meaning within which the event may be understood.

Transits are often directly employed in horary, and it has been recognised that the other time measures ordinarily used in natal astrology will disclose significant detail when applied to horary maps. There is a possibility that 'regression to natal technique' may carry with it a disordering of the disciplined method of horary, so that it becomes increasingly difficult to place the symbols disclosed into relative significance. However, 'natal' time measures can be used to illustrate the nature of the 1975 attack as a catalyst through which the true meaning of the map becomes declared ('published') and recognisable.

Applying Secondary Direct and Converse measures to the period of the attack (strictly to 1st Oct. 1975, to stand for September/October) we find the map answering with distinct and obvious significance. Most Astrologers would expect the II11rd house to be strongly marked; we find that the direct Ascendant (SARA) has come to 21°33' within orbs of the radical II11rd cusp. The $\psi$ direct then picks out this cusp with precision: it is at 25°22' for the 1st Oct., and during the two months to which the publication is referred, September and October, the $\psi$ crosses the direct Asc. to join cusp III, hastening the union of the cusps and symbolising the bringing to manifestation of a published attack. Underlying this is the major solar contact: $\psi$ (Direct) $\psi$ (XIII) dispose of the $\psi$ configuration and stand for the opposition; $\psi$ is also Lord of III (XIII).

In the Converse series the underlying theme is provided by two major solar contacts: converse MC (SARA) at 29°45' $\psi$ (radical); and a converse $\psi$ and $\psi$ is a significator for the opponents of astrology in this map, and also rules III (XIII). The $\psi$ again gives a precision indication of the attack by $\psi$ (converse) $\psi$ (radical $\psi$ cusp at 10°30'), activating the radical affliction across III-IX. A further notable symbolism is given by $\psi$ (0°24') moving to the radical II11rd $\psi$ is the significator for astrology in the original map as well as ruling Asc. (4°20'): we are being referred to the nadir of astrology. There are a number of further significant contacts which will repay study. (Direct and converse positions in full: note 12).

A brief mention of another major timing approach is in order, to demonstrate further the radix of the map. In the Solar Return for the year covering the attack we find the striking symbol of $\psi$ (MC of return, closely squaring the radical MC. 61°$\psi$ rises, pointing to the radical $\psi$ at 7°47'. The whole map appears to be rich in pertinent detail, and, like the Secondaries, merits study.13

* * * * *

The particular delineative method that has been adopted is not meant to define a correct way of approach to this fruitful map, or to others like it. The first purpose was to sufficiently disclose the map's significance to the point where it can be considered established in its symbolic connection with an attack on astrology. This I trust has been achieved, and clear the way for other and more comprehensive methods. The second purpose interwoven with this was to suggest in outline its reflective power for misconceptions within and without astrology, and further to raise questions about the nature of astrology.

Paul Kurtz, in an editorial note for "The Humanist", tells us that '... the American Ethical Union and the American Humanist Association have long been opposed to cults of unreason and irrationalism. What better way to demonstrate this in this anniversary issue than by a major critique of astrology? In the terms of the limited theories of our culture, the art of astrology discloses a reality that truth seems irrational. But that reality is mysterious, pervasive and powerful. What better way to demonstrate this than the chance appearance in a major critique of astrology of a horoscope that exactly symbolises the attack: an Anti-Astrology Signature!'

8. Moon's co-signification: certain traditional horary questions give the Moon's co-signification over to the questioned (e.g. thing lost or stolen). The determinative power of the $\gg$ may be attributable to its indication of the matrix of the whole situation and its perfection. The special signifiers (ruler of Asc., and ruler of house of questioned) then symbolize distinct objective elements within the matrix. To the extent that the form of the situation is disclosed by the nature of one such element, either querent or questioned, then as a matter of practical reading of the horary, the matrix and that element may be indentified. Our understanding of co-signification is confused; it seems inadequately treated in the literature.


10 Regression to natal technique: Marc Edmund Jones gives an approach to this subject in his "Horary Astrology" (publ. Shamakla, Berkeley and London, 1975), ch. XIII. While not agreeing with the author on some aspects, I should record that this has been of great value for me, by its scope and detailed discussion of the nature of horary.

11 SARA: progression of MC by method of applying the Solar Arc in Right Ascension to the radical RMC (= LST), to find progressed RMC. This is probably the least used of the three principal secondary progression methods (the others are SAL, Solar Arc in Long., favoured by R. C. Davison amongst others; and 'mean SARA', Mean Sun's Arc in RA, also called 'sidereal time method', used by Margaret Hone and others). I favour SARA, which seems sensitive to distinct events, but this does not imply a rejection of the other methods, which have their particular sensitivities. Major themes can be expected to find a way of manifestation through all genuine methods: an example of this principle as work occurs in the present case where we find SAL producing a major angular contact with Asc. direct at 18 $\circ$ 02, a $\gg$ radical. This whole area of astrology is unfortunately confused and often weakly presented in the literature.

12 Anti-Astrology Signature measured by Secondary to 1st Oct. 1975: Direct 005:57 UT 30 Jan. 1908. $\circ$ 8:58 $\gg$ 32:22 $\gg$ 9:57 $\gg$ 11:34 $\gg$ 13 $\gg$ 22 $\gg$ 8:33 retrograde $\gg$ 24 $\gg$ 16 $\gg$ 14 $\gg$ 19 $\gg$ 12 $\gg$ 49 $\gg$ 2311 retrograde $\gg$ m 12 $\gg$ 36 $\gg$ l 14 $\gg$ 08. Cusp (SARA) MC 17 $\gg$ 12.

13 Solar Return 02:46 UT 22 Nov. 1974, for New York: Cusp (Topocentric to $\circ$) MC 1m. Asc. 63 $\gg$ XI 25 $\gg$ XII 16 $\gg$ II 17 $\gg$ III 28 $\gg$ 2. $\gg$ 2 $\gg$ 04 $\gg$ 15m 04 $\gg$ 3 $\gg$ 55 $\gg$ 17 $\gg$ 16 $\gg$ 8 $\gg$ 36 $\gg$ 18 $\gg$ 28 $\gg$ retrograde $\gg$ 0 $\gg$ 04 $\gg$ 8 $\gg$ 59 $\gg$ 8 $\gg$ 32 $\gg$ m 10 $\gg$ 41 $\gg$ 13 $\gg$ 11.

**ERRATA**

"An Anti-Astrology Signature" (Autumn 1978)

- P 89 line 2 the: should be 'any'
- 22 delete 'end'
- 35 delete inverted commas after 'theme'.'
- 40 latter part of quote should read: "... astrology arose as magic and physical arguments and explanations ... were only attempts to associate the ancient 'art' with each important new science that came along".
- p 90
  - 5 (at 4:00:00 am EST 0 $\gg$ L 02 is on MC)
- p 91
  - 23 casual: should be causal
  - 48 ... by its closeness
- p 92
  - 1 Mercury glyph: should be Pluto
- p 94
  - 47-49 Jerome's quote ends at 'feature', not at 'pilfering'.
- p 95
  - 2 obstruction; should be obscuration
  - 13 Pluto glyph: should be Mercury (twice)
- 29 delete 'I'
- 44 angularity
- p 96
  - 11 Scorpio glyph: should be Capricorn
  - 49 Mercury Station: cusp III is 22 1/2 Taurus; Fortuna is 15 1/2 Libra; Neptune is retrograde
- p 97
  - bottom line: the force of this symbolism
- p 99
  - 12 delete 'truth'
- 15 delete exclamation mark
- p 100
  - 11 identified

(additional note: true Solar Time has been used in the Progressions (We apologize to our contributor for the large number of errata —ED).
WHAT DOES THE SIGNATURE SIGNIFY?
by Norman de Gournay

Published in the autumn issue of the Quarterly was a most interesting article by Mr. Geoffrey Cornelius replying to an attack on astrology which had been made by some American scientists. While agreeing with the necessity to answer our opponents, may I be excused for doubting the astrological validity of the chart which the author calls the Anti-Astrology Signature, and on which he bases his conclusions?

At the end of his article, Mr. Cornelius tells us that the secondary purpose of his delineation of this chart was “to suggest in outline its reflective power for misconceptions within and without astrology, and further to raise questions about the nature of astrology”. However, in my opinion, his chart is itself contrary to the nature of astrology and the significance he claims for this chart is a misconception within astrology. Nevertheless we are indebted to Mr. Cornelius for a most thought provoking article which raises questions concerning the nature of astrology which should be answered.

The Anti-Astrology Signature This chart, cast for 4 a.m. on 23 November, 1907, at New York, was chosen, presumably at random, by Margaret Mayall merely to exemplify the construction of an astrological chart and, in 1941, published in an article she wrote attacking astrology. Mr. Cornelius contends that “from the astrological point of view, the single map in a context so charged with significance will inevitably not be random” and there is “a symbolic representation of the attack upon astrology” because “she chose this map and no other”. This assertion implies that Margaret Mayall’s chart was inevitable and although the ostensible reason for her choice of time and place was merely to produce an example chart, she was astrologically compelled to choose the time and place she did. But does astrology claim that “the stars compel”, or that anything is inevitable?

Predestination Astrology is often accused of fostering a belief in predestination, and if this accusation were tenable, there would certainly be an ethical objection to our study. It logically follows that if we can be persuaded that our behaviour was preordained, and therefore inevitable, we must also believe that we are, ipso facto, relieved of all moral responsibility for our actions. At the present time, when there is ever increasing criminality and violence in our permissive society, anything which tends to destroy moral responsibility must necessarily be anti-social. It therefore behoves astrologers to deny the misconception which associates astrology with events which were preordained and behaviour which is unavoidable. Consequently it is perhaps a pity that Mr. Cornelius should have used the word “inevitable” and implied that Margaret Mayall lacked freedom of choice. Not, of course, that this has moral or social implication in his context, but inevitability is not good astrology.

The Science of Beginnings So far my objection to the Anti-Astrology Signature has been founded on the philosophical question of predestination or free-will, but from the astrological point of view there is a more practical objection. One of the two hypotheses on which astrology is founded is the supreme significance of beginnings, and every astrological chart is cast for the precise time and place of the beginning of that particular person or thing which the map exclusively signifies, and about which its interpretation informs us. Therefore, unless Mr. Cornelius claims that the attack on astrology commenced precisely at 4 a.m. on 23 November, 1907, at New York, the chart he interprets is obviously not “a symbolic representation of the attack upon astrology”. All that can be claimed for this map is that it symbolises an unspecified birth, or other beginning, which may have occurred at New York at that time.

The Unity of the Whole The second hypothesis on which astrology is founded is best expressed in the well-known dictum attributed to the legendary Hermes Trismegistus, “that which is above is like unto that which is below, for the greater glory of the whole”. Here, it should be noted, the operative words are “like unto” and not “influences” or “affects”. Therefore, we might enlarge on this dictum and express it as, “the celestial pattern which is above, can inform us about terrestrial events which are below, because these are two parts of the same unified pattern or whole”.
It is understandable that the early astrologers, in order to account for the obvious correspondence between celestial patterns and terrestrial beginnings, should have believed that the planets influenced mundane events; a belief which presupposed a causal connection between that which is above and that which is below. To-day most astrologers have abandoned the theory of causal connections in favour of the theory of correspondences, but our opponents appear to be quite unaware of this and continue to argue away a claim which is no longer made. Hence when Bart Rok deniers that minute gravitational, electromagnetic or radiative emissions from the distant planets, or far more distant stars, could possibly influence terrestrial births, he shows complete ignorance of modern astrology. In this he is very similar to an opponent of watches proclaiming that there is absolutely no scientific evidence that the chronometer at Greenwich sends out mysterious rays of influence to our watches, and therefore a belief that our watches can be relied on to tell us the time must necessarily be a mere erroneous superstition.

Prediction It has been said that “the stars impel but do not compel”, a dictum which commends itself because it concedes the free-will which compulsion denies, but on the other hand it can be objected to because the words, “the stars impel”, imply causation. Should it be desired to define the nature of astrology in a few words, an almost impossible task, I would suggest, “the planets in motion but do not compel us to conclusions”, or the word “inform” for “impel” or “compel” is more than a mere academic distinction because it defines the limits of astrological prediction.

The natal-chart informs us as to the native’s character; his innate desires, inclinations, potentialities etc; and as character can, to a great extent, influence his decisions and style of life, the chart is indirectly indicative of his destiny and, to that extent, astrology can be said to predict. However, granted free-will, the native may be able to resist his inclinations, or environmental conditions may frustrate his potentialities, and therefore astrology can never predict the inevitable but must deal with the possible or, in forceful charts, the probable. Nevertheless, we should not under-estimate the power of character on destiny. For example, nothing seems more divorced from character than accident, and yet psychology has proved that certain people are innately accident prone.

The Inanimate It is not irrational to claim that character can affect human destiny, but the question arises can we attribute character to inanimate objects and, if we can, what method must we use in interpreting the charts of their beginnings? I would answer that every inanimate object has its own inherent characteristics which condition its performance, and in interpreting its chart we must apply significances which, while necessarily being applicable to the type of object in question, are nevertheless closely analogous to the significances we use in natal astrology.

A REPLY FROM GEOFFREY CORNELIUS

Mr. de Gournay has made some perceptive comments which reveal questions of a fundamental nature about astrology. His criticism of my approach to the map that I have called ‘An Anti-Astrology Signature’ has two main threads. The first concerns the issue of predestination in Margaret Mayall’s choice of map. The second raises the issue of the validity of a map which is arbitrarily located ‘in time’ (and specifically, is not in any sense a ‘beginning’).

Predestination in Margaret Mayall’s Choice

Here I feel that any disagreement between me and Mr. de Gournay will prove to be more apparent than real. It was certainly not my intention to suggest that Mayall was ‘astologically compelled’ to choose this particular map. There must be innumerable similar maps she could choose which might present equally convincing symbolism of an attack on astrology. The inevitability to which I refer is the inevitability that, given that she has freely chosen a map, the astrological view of things allows us to infer that the nature of her choice, her attitudes and intentions, will become reflected in the symbolism of the map, possibly by an extension of what is sometimes called the ‘affinity effect’. Having said this, I would accept that the ‘astrological view of things’ is less simple and more ambiguous than I implied in the article.

To return to the theme of inevitability, in dealing with a natal horoscope one could say that the doctrine of astrology suggests that the life meaning of this person is ‘inevitably’ reflected in that horoscope; but one does not necessarily proceed from this to say that events in life are preordained. There are many occasions in astrology where the same issue arises. For example, most astrologers will expect a marriage horoscope to reflect both the general course of the marriage but also something of the psychology of the couple at that moment. Now although it may be ‘inevitable’ that such a reflection will occur, we do not necessarily suggest that the marriage is preordained for that moment. The problem of fate and free will is vast, and it continually presents itself in astrology; but I would suggest that it is relevant to Mayall’s choice only in so far as it is relevant in every astrological situation, and it should not be seen as a special factor in this case.

One rider that I would make here is that I am not at all sure that every single situation in life will yield an inevitable reflection. In the article I qualified the point by linking it with the idea of a ‘significant context’. Whether or not astrological meaning can be read in every ephemeral choice, it is nevertheless my experience, and the experience of many astrologers, that certain events and moments yield horoscopes of extraordinary meaningfulness. With the poetic and symbolic attitude that underlies astrology, one learns to recognise such moments. In the case of Mayall’s map, I felt that her choice might also yield significant meanings. I-backed that hunch—and since the map’s significance can be demonstrated
through rational astrological methods of interpretation, the hunch is shown to be justified.

The ‘Science of Beginnings’

Here we are close to the core of the objection. Mr. de Gournay argues that my treatment of the map must be incorrect *a priori*, since ‘every astrological chart is cast for the precise time and place of the beginning of that particular person or thing which the map exclusively signifies’. Stated as an absolute requirement for every valid astrological interpretation, this is unsound doctrine. The concept of the ‘Beginning’ is of immense significance, but it does not exhaust the possibilities of astrology. Amongst several examples that could be given I will mention the validity of the horoscope for the moment of death, as summarising life achievement and offering a basis for time measures backward to the main features of life. The ‘Ending’ may be in principle of equal status to the ‘Beginning’, and one may not be subsumed as merely a part of the other. The horary astrologer is frequently faced with the ‘Middle’, the critical point of a situation where its past development as well as the direction of the future is revealed in one map.

The Problem of Time

Undoubtedly the root of Mr. de Gournay’s objection will not have been answered by the preceding discussion, since Margaret Mayall’s chosen map does not have a temporal location at the beginning, middle, or end of an attack upon astrology. It has arisen apparently independently of the coincidence in objective time ordinarily inferred from the aphorism ‘as above, so below’.

Here it is relevant to note that this map was used as an introduction to the major theme raised in the 1978 Carter Memorial Lecture, “Old Lumps of Rock”. In this I attempted to shake one of the fundamental assumptions made by most astrologers. This assumption, which is nearly always taken for granted as obviously true and beyond question, is: that the ground for the coming-to-pass of astrological effects (however ‘caused’) in some type of correlation in objective time of the heavens above with events below (time lag for the passage from past cause to future effect can be contained within this assumption). The Anti-Astrology Signature emerges as one of many instances of the astrological phenomenon at work in a manner which breaches this fundamental assumption.

Back to the Map

I would respectfully request the potential critic temporarily to suspend *a priori* judgement as to whether or not such phenomena are ‘in theory’ possible, and instead apply his astrology to the map presented to see whether it does or does not in fact yield astrological significance.

In presenting this map as a key witness for my case against the usual view of time implicit in astrology, it was important to establish its significance carefully, in a manner which reduced to

the minimum possibilities of ambiguous or conflicting interpretation resulting from the subjective views of individual astrologers. This was a major factor in my choice of a clear-cut traditional horary approach to the basic delineation. The Progressions, in my opinion, firmly establish the map’s significance: they are sharp in timing and symbolically clear—to the point, I suggest, whereas if the map had in fact be a ‘beginning’ of the attack, most astrologers would regard this as a text-book example of astrology at work.

At stake here are the conceptual foundations of astrology. The questions raised as to how such phenomena come to pass are baffling; but we must avoid suppressing astrological phenomena simply because they embarrass our philosophical preconceptions. Astrology will have to review its foundations if it is to be regenerated, and if it is to withstand successfully the pressures imposed upon it by alien conceptual structures (especially that underlying the empirical sciences of the current age). For the present, I would suggest only that we return to the map as it presents itself: the single horoscope used as a pillory in a great attack upon astrology. That this map should astrologically declare its own context and usage is truly the gentle, poetic answer that astrology itself gives to its opponents.