

Patrick Curry and the Advent of *Astrology, Science and Culture*:
A Segment of Astrology's History and Philosophy in Text and Biography

It seemed to epitomize everything that was good and special about astrology's return to the academy, following the stellar art's centuries-long banishment.¹ That is how, in the spring of 2004, the publication of Roy Willis and Patrick Curry's *Astrology, Science and Culture: Pulling Down the Moon*²(ASC) struck the students of Bath Spa's "MA Programme in Cultural Astronomy and Astrology". Less than three years earlier, the light and airy classroom of the Sophia Centre had been a dilapidated cow shed on the campus, now magically transformed through the largesse of a secret benefactress. The graduate students, most of them mature students as well as practicing astrologers, would spill out of the classroom following one of Dr. Curry's lectures and head over to "The Globe Inn (the nearest pub) to pursue friendly arguments about the nature of astrology and the universe generally."³ For many of the students, the appearance of ASC seemed like a significant event and provided them with a perhaps over-optimistic idea of what the academic astrology project just might amount to. Still, the book's self-assured erudition and sharp prose acted as a tonic and showed them what the heady combination of astrological awareness and sound scholarship could produce. Unfortunately, the lively give and take of the classroom did not last: Bath Spa decided to close the *Sophia Centre* in March 2006. While the "Cultural Astronomy and Astrology" programme continues to operate and indeed thrive, it now transpires primarily through online education.⁴ Regardless, Willis and Curry's book has retained its

¹ In the fall of 2002, in large part due to a grant from the *Sophia Trust*, a non-profit educational charity, Bath Spa University College opened the doors to its Sophia Centre, which housed the Cultural Astronomy and Astrology Programme. Since the University occupies land belonging to the Duchy of Cornwall, Prince Charles, the Duke of Cornwall mandated no new construction on the Newton Campus, out of his concern for the environment. He did allow the refurbishment of existing buildings, thus the transformed cow shed. When the Vice Chancellor Frank Morgan decided to close the *Sophia Centre* in March 2006, the reasons were not apparent, since the programme had quadrupled the number of students initially agreed upon by the *Sophia Trust* and the University. Most likely it was a strategic plan of the University all along, since it "was desperately short of space for classrooms and staff offices." See Michael York, "Postscript: The Rise and Fall of the Sophia Centre", *Journal for the Study of Religion, Nature and Culture*, Vol. 1 No. 2 June 2007, p. 261

² Roy Willis and Patrick Curry, *Astrology, Science and Culture: Pulling Down the Moon*, (Berg, Oxford, 2004) Here after ASC

³ Garry Phillipson, email, January 13, 2017. Garry was one of those students!

⁴ According to Nick Campion "There was a smooth transition of the entire programme to the University of Wales, Lampeter (as it was then), of some staff (me, plus Liz Greene moved from being a guest lecturer at Bath Spa to a part-time tutor at Lampeter), books, and curriculum with full agreement of both universities. I liaised with both the Vice Chancellor of Lampeter and the Director of Bath Spa, and the Lampeter VC then liaised with the Deputy Director at Bath. There was a hiatus in teaching only in Autumn 2006, between our last graduation in Bath in July 2006, and our first class in Lampeter in January 2007 (we set up the online programme in the Autumn). Even then, I still had PhD supervision at Bath Spa until 2009, there was an overlap there. In addition, applicants to Bath Spa transferred to Lampeter and one Bath Spa student used credit gained at Bath Spa to continue at Lampeter. So there was no closure of doors on the MA programme, which was continuous and continues to flourish, only of the physical centre." (email from NC to KL, February 20, 2017) As for Curry, in the fall of 2006, he was hired as a lecturer by the University of Kent, Canterbury for their MA Programme on the Cultural Study of Cosmology and Divination, where he stayed until 2009. He rejoined the Sophia Centre at Wales in the fall of 2009 and taught the History of Astrology module until 2011; since then, he has focused on PhD supervision, according to Nick Campion,

significance as a serious examination of astrology's epistemological status at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

The two chapters on offer on this site: "[Science and Astrology](#)" and "[The Big Picture](#)" are solely authored by Curry. Together, they represent the first attempt, in an academic context, to critically discuss scientific research into astrology and to frame astrology as divination. These twin claims require some qualification. Certainly, there were academics such as Hans Eysenck⁵ who had surveyed astrological research prior to the publication of *ASC*; others such as Peter Roberts⁶ and Percy Seymour⁷ had used the findings of astrological research to support their own theories of astrological causation. Still other academics, such as Suitbert Ertel⁸ have actively engaged in astrological research, in ongoing efforts to assess the scientific status of the massive statistical studies of the Gauquelins. Curry is after something else; his critique questions the role "Big Science" has arrogated for itself as the final arbiter of truth in contemporary society.

In similar fashion, Geoffrey Cornelius⁹ had formally framed judicial astrology as divination decades before Curry penned his chapter, but Cornelius was not addressing an academic audience. For his part, Curry has framed divination within the broader context of sociology---primarily Max Weber---and anthropology. In other words to see its essence as a human activity rooted in a specific time, place and culture. To see how Curry arrived at this stance, it is necessary to survey his intellectual preoccupations, especially since he describes himself as "incorrigibly intellectual"¹⁰. I shall also trace shifts in his philosophical outlook, since over the past fifteen years or so, Curry has placed his philosophical preoccupations---they were there from the beginning---in the foreground of his thinking.

Radical Eclectic

Patrick Curry's involvement with astrology has taken many forms over the past forty years---longer if you count his early days of study---as practitioner, advocate for 'astrology as science', critic of same, academic, independent scholar, social historian, and philosopher. What unites these various roles is a critical intelligence and fierce intellectual independence which has slight respect for the traditional boundaries between disciplines. He once described himself as a "radical eclectic", which is a fairly apt description of his wide ranging mind and predilection for the intellectual underdog. In addition to his work with astrology and divination, he has written extensively on Tolkien, Machiavelli, ecological ethics and enchantment. Here I must focus primarily on his involvement with astrology and divination. Even

who is currently the Director of the Sophia Centre for the Study of Cosmology in Culture, as well as the Programme Director of the MA in Cultural Astronomy and Astrology.

⁵ H. J. Eysenck & D. K. B. Nias, *Astrology: Science or Superstition?* (St. Martin's Press, New York, 1982) Geoffrey Dean's *Recent Advances in Natal Astrology: A Critical Review 1900-1976* (Analogic, Subiaco, 1977) was also not directed at an academic audience.

⁶ *The Message of Astrology: The New Vitalism and What It Means for Our Future*, (The Aquarian Press, Wellingborough, 1990)

⁷ *The Scientific Basis of Astrology: Tuning to the Music of the Planets*, (St. Martin's Press, New York, 1992)

⁸ See www.astrozero.co.uk Checked January 20, 2017

⁹ *The Moment of Astrology: Origins in Divination*, (2nd edition: The Wessex Astrologer, Bournemouth, 2003) (1st edition: Penguin/Arkana, London, 1994) His first formal presentation of astrology as divination would be his Olso paper in 1982, also posted on this website.

¹⁰ *ASC*, op. cit. p. 12

within that narrowed compass, Curry has cut a rather wide path through the more thoughtful end of modern astrology.

Curry's intellectual biography is marked by a restlessness and an impatience with received wisdom; he also has exhibited a pattern of seemingly abandoning certain intellectual territory, only to return to it, sometimes years later. As he explained in his first book, "I became interested (in astrology) at an early age. Since then, my attitude has changed radically several times: from partisan to sceptic, and finally to historian."¹¹ And it has continued to shift since he wrote those words in 1989. Curry is a passionate supporter of pluralism---he sees it as a fundamental characteristic of divination with its "effectively unlimited number of spirits"¹²---and correspondingly has an almost a visceral loathing of monism, be it Plato's philosophy of the One, all established religions which teach one God, or the universalist "one truth" ideal of modern science. Though he remains strongly committed to this creed, over time his stance regarding astrology has become more detached and his attitude more reflective. Over the past quarter of a century, he has become less concerned with rescuing astrology's reputation---which is perpetually low among the professional classes---and more concerned with changing how astrology is understood and used by the official interpreters of our culture: historians, sociologists, anthropologists, the scientific elite, as well as those Curry describes as "metropolitan intellectuals, especially literary and social critics..."¹³

Broadly speaking, from the late 1970's to the present, Curry has traced an arc of thought which has moved from an early support for the reform of astrology through empirical research, to a skepticism and eventual rejection of the whole scientific project as regards astrology.¹⁴ In its place, he has substituted a "rigorous Romanticism" which embodies a critique of modernity¹⁵ through a philosophically informed focus on a few overlapping concerns: astrology and divination, Middle Earth, ecological ethics and enchantment. In their various forms, these concerns provide a response to what Curry perceives as a significant cultural problem: an increasing sense of disenchantment---first identified as a problem by Max Weber---brought about by our increasingly technological society. In Curry's view, astrology and

¹¹ *Prophecy and Power: Astrology in Early Modern Europe*, (Polity Press, Cambridge, 1989), p. 1

¹² Patrick Curry, "Divination, Enchantment and Platonism", *The Imaginal Cosmos: Astrology, divination and the sacred*, Edited by Angela Voss and Jean Hinson Lall, (The University of Kent, Canterbury, 2007), p. 35

¹³ "Astrology: From Pagan to Postmodern", *The Astrological Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 1, January/February 1994, p. 70

¹⁴ In an interview by Darrelyn Gunzberg, he stated "Science in modern times has had more impact upon astrology than any other single discourse...for that reason, if for no other, it's important for astrologers to know something about science, to understand its strengths and weaknesses. I am sometimes dismayed by how naïve astrologers are about science. That naivety can take two forms: The first is that they are unremittingly hostile to science but in a way that shows they don't really understand what science is trying to do, and that's not very productive. The other form, which is perhaps more common, is placing their hopes for astrology on science, something like: 'Well, astrology is really scientific, and when science evolves sufficiently, they will understand this, and then everything will be fine, and we'll get admitted to the Club.' I think that's a big mistake. I don't think modern science will ever admit astrology to 'the Club', and I'm not sure this is a club we want to be members of, in any case." *The Mountain Astrologer*, Dec/Jan 2005, special section *Mercury Direct*, p. 17

¹⁵ "By modernity, I mean the triple rule of capital, technoscience and the state---big business, big science and Big Brother---whose banner reads, in various versions, 'One truth, One Way, One People. Or simply, 'Progress'" www.patrickcurry.co.uk. Date checked January 18, 2017

divination, along with his other abiding concerns provide an important counterpoint, or perhaps more accurately a haven from modernity's malaise of disenchantment.¹⁶

For the remainder of this essay, I focus on what I perceive to be the four primary stances Curry has adopted towards astrology over the past forty years: the empiricist, the deconstructionist, the historian, and the philosopher of divination. I hope to provide some context for the ideas expressed in these two chapters from *Astrology, Science and Culture*. I spend more time on the two earlier stances because they are less well known among astrologers and others who have taken an interest in his work. Also, because, in part, they set the terms and define the discourse he would develop as an historian and philosopher. In terms of time frames, these stances overlap somewhat; traces of earlier phases can be found in later ones and adumbrations of later ones can be found in earlier work. The broad outline of the path Curry has taken---moving from a proto-scientific conception to an embrace of astrology as divination---is one familiar to those of us who have arrived at a divinatory perspective. What is notable is the energy, passion and depth of thought he has invested at each of his stances to arrive at his current position.

The Empirical Years 1976-1982

Curry spent much of the 1970's divided between the United States and the United Kingdom. After spending a number of years in the UK, he returned to the US and completed his bachelor's degree in psychology from the University of California, Santa Cruz in 1978. "It seemed then to be the mainstream discipline most closely related to astrology." He now would choose anthropology.¹⁷ This suggests that he still saw astrology as his primary focus and subordinated his academic pursuits to improving its status. He returned to England and by 1980 had completed an MSc in Logic and Scientific Method from the University of London.¹⁸ His thesis concerned the scientific testing of astrology¹⁹. Later that year, it formed the basis for a paper he published in the *Journal of Geocosmic Research*.²⁰ He proposed the use of idiographic strategies, that is, a "concern with each person's relatively unique patterns of life (cognitive, emotional, etc.)"²¹ along with small sample sizes to assess astrological effects in terms of character traits. In essence, he treated astrology as a unique form of psychological theory. This is not a surprising focus, since Curry had informally studied astrology with Liz Greene---on her way to becoming the doyenne of psychological astrology---in the mid 1970's in London. His paper was both thoughtful and creative in its execution. Towards the end, he expressed this concern: "We might succeed in demonstrating not 'that astrology works but only that astrologers work' (Dean, 1977, p. 544). I assume

¹⁶ See ASC, op. cit. pp. 77-81 for Curry's view on this topic.

¹⁷ ASC, p.12 What appears to be his first astrological publication, prior to his immersion in scientific methodology suggests a more typical New Age position; "Case of Reincarnation Examined Astrologically", *The Astrological Journal*, 1976

¹⁸ He sometimes (see next footnote) states it is from the London School of Economics, or LSE, which is part of the University of London.

¹⁹ Curry, P. M., "Astrology as a Scientific Research Programme" (unpublished M. Sc. Thesis, London School of Economics, 1980) *Correlation*, 1, (June 1981) p. 10

²⁰ "Research in Natal Astrology: Issues and Strategies" *Journal of Geocosmic Research, Monograph No. 1.*, (San Francisco, 1980) pp. 30-40;

²¹ Ibid. p. 30

that Dr. (Geoffrey) Dean means that we should bypass astrologers and test for significance whatever astronomical correlates show up with terrestrial events.”²² He had that right.

In the early 1980’s, Curry was also part of a group of astrologer/researchers who named themselves Astrology in Research (AIR). Its members included Graham Douglas, Simon Best, Michael Startup and John Addey. They launched *Correlation: Journal of Research into Astrology* in June 1981; Curry contributed a paper “Astrology and Philosophy of Science” to its inaugural issue.²³ Here we see a shift away from his explicitly psychological formulation of the previous year to one more broadly astrological. After surveying “promising philosophies of science today”, Curry proposed “two astrological research programmes (ARP’s)” based on the work of philosopher of science Imre Lakatos²⁴. The first was a traditional ARP which “seeks what must be called a formal-cause or ‘symbolic’ (i.e., non-physical) explanation of astrology. By contrast, the ‘neo-ARP’ looks for a physicalist explanation of astrological effects.”²⁵ In essence, Curry had devised two research strategies to address the unique properties for what had again come to be known as the natural and judicial branches of astrology.²⁶ Since Curry mentioned this “distinction between natural and judicial astrology”²⁷ in a talk he gave a few months later, it would seem safe to assert that his research strategy reflected this knowledge. This distinction would become a key part of the reformulation of astrology as divination, with judicial astrology being conceived as divinatory, whilst natural astrology was ceded to the domain of science.

Curry reduced the traditional ARP to three propositions:

- (1) There exists a significant correlation between (i) the positions and movements of the planets, and (ii) entities and events on earth
- (2) This connection exists by virtue of a set of metaphysical principles, which systematically relate the members to both domains.
- (3) It can be discovered and interpreted, in principle, by examining the planetary positions and their subsequent movement at a time taken to be the beginning of an entity (or the occurrence of an event) in question.²⁸

²² Ibid. p. 37

²³ “Astrology and Philosophy of Science” *Correlation* 1 (June 1981) pp. 4-10; technically, it was a relaunch, since *Correlation* had existed from 1968-1970 in a less formal way through the *Astrological Association*.

²⁴ Lakatos (1922-1974) was a Hungarian mathematician and philosopher of science who fled to England following the Soviet invasion of Hungary in 1956. He taught for many years at the London School of Economics, alongside Karl Popper. Among other contributions, he put forth the notion of “research programmes”, which sought to bridge the gap between two major theories of how science progresses: Popper’s standard of falsification and Thomas Kuhn’s revolutionary structure of science. Lakatos insisted on a hard core of theoretical assumptions that cannot be abandoned without abandoning the programme altogether. See

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Imre_Lakatos#Research_programmes; dated checked 1/9/17

²⁵ “Astrology as a Scientific Research Programme”, op. cit., p. 8

²⁶ In discussing “an astrology of causes, objective, universal, regular and astrologer-independent, and an astrology of signs, which is participatory, context-specific and irregular”, Geoffrey Cornelius notes “This is, I believe, the very same distinction found since medieval times between natural and judicial astrology.” *Moment*, op. cit. p. 74

²⁷ “The Decline and Recovery of Astrology”, *The Astrologers’ Quarterly*, Vol. 56 No. 2 (Summer 1982) p. 60 His talk was delivered to the *Astrological Lodge of London* on September 14th, 1981.

²⁸ “Astrology as a Scientific Research Programme, op. cit., p. 8

Note that Curry was looking at correlation, not causation, however, this “planetary positions...at the time taken” formulation was the very one being challenged by Geoffrey Cornelius in his 1978 “Anti-Astrology Signature” paper and in regular meetings at the *Astrological Lodge of London* at this time. Curry was still under the sway of the *Astrological Association’s* more empirical approach advocated by Addey and Charles Harvey.

By July 1981, he had also completed a significant paper “Research on the Mars Effect”²⁹, which provided both a synopsis and a critique of the hatchet job being carried out by the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal (CSICOP) on the positive results generated by the massive statistical studies of Michel and Françoise Gauquelin.³⁰

To appreciate the significance of Curry’s paper, it is necessary to understand the importance of the Gauquelins’ studies for those who pinned their hopes on a truly scientific astrology, as Curry did at this juncture. For astrologers still staggering under the hammer blows delivered by the 1975 *Humanist* attack with its “Objections to Astrology” article endorsed by 186 scientists, including eighteen Noble laureates³¹, as well as by Geoffrey Dean’s *Recent Advances in Natal Astrology* (1977), it was essential to see that Gauquelin’s work was not undermined. In his lengthy “Mars Effect” paper, Curry leveled serious charges against CSICOP for deliberately mishandling their investigation. It is a tour de force of clear, analytic thinking, which reflected his significant immersion in the scientific literature of the protracted CSICOP/Gauquelin saga. He concluded “Their work could now best function as a model and a warning of how not to conduct such investigations.”³² And here is where Curry’s reading in the philosophy and sociology of science paid off. While he stopped short of accusing CSICOP of outright fraud, Curry noted that in some instances in the history of science a “sociological” explanation is called for:

This seems to be one. (Any new investigation) would have to take into account such considerations as: the nature of the claims being investigated; undue involvement of scientists with media and publicity, or perhaps conversely, unique (especially in America?) pressures of public relations on science; considerations of where power resides in such an organization, and how it is exercised (financially? publishing rights?); and lastly, how information circulates, or fails to circulate.³³

²⁹ *Zetetic Scholar* 9 (1982) pp. 34-53; 78-83

³⁰ In addition to Curry’s article, the reader may wish to consult *The Tenacious Mars Effect*, by Suitbert Ertel and Kenneth Irving, (Urania Trust, London, 1996), pp. KI 14-32; and John Anthony West’s *The Case for Astrology*, Arkana/Penguin, London, 1992), which fully discusses the long drawn out affair between CSICOP and the Gauquelins, including Curry’s role. See pp. 232-318; pp. 289, 291-3 for Curry.

³¹ Indeed in the first issue of *Correlation*, published five years after the *Humanist* attack, the editors felt it was important to reprint the “Scientific Support for the Investigation of Astrology” signed by 187 “Scientists and Astrologers” published in the May/June 1976 issue of *Astrology ’76: The New Aquarian Agent, Vol. 4, No. 12 (ASI, New York)*. In retrospect, it looks rather juvenile that astrologers felt it necessary to outdo the scientists by adding one more person to their side of the roster. Add to that, many of the undersigned were not scientists, but had degrees in “Romance Lang., Elem. Educ., Journalism and Bus. Admin.” *Correlation*, 1 (June 1981) pp. 2-3

³² *Zetetic Scholar*, 9 (1982) p. 49

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 49

Though these remarks were delivered in the context of an ostensibly scientific paper, they signal a shift in Curry's thinking towards the politics and sociology of science, which would come to predominate in his writing about astrology over the next decade.

On September 14, 1981, Curry delivered a talk at the *Astrological Lodge* entitled "The Decline and Recovery of Astrology". This coincided with the start of his doctoral studies in 17th century English astrology, which would become the basis for his first book *Prophecy and Power* in 1989. The renewed interest among *Lodge* members in 17th century astrology, especially William Lilly and his horary techniques made this an ideal venue for his lecture, however, some of the audience was apparently put off by his pro-science stance, if the post talk Q/A is any indication.³⁴ Regarding his historical studies, he acknowledged three recent studies, two books: Keith Thomas' *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (1971) and Bernard Capp's *Astrology and the Popular Press* (1979) and an unpublished PhD thesis completed in 1974: Mary Ellen Bowden's "The Scientific Revolution in Astrology: The English Reformers, 1558-1685". This latter reference explores the failed attempt by English astrologers to reform their science along Baconian lines. Curry saw Bowden's explanation for their failure: "there's nothing really in astrology, there's nothing there to discover" as "quite mistaken" since he knew there was something to astrology. However, for him, "what shows it to be so is (mainly) the work of the Gauquelins."³⁵

Curry discussed the launching of *Correlation: Journal of Research into Astrology*, whose inaugural issue carried Curry's "Astrology and Philosophy" paper.³⁶ He also informed them about *Fate* magazine and "the more academic *Zetetic Scholar*"³⁷ which would publish his "Mars Effect" paper the following year. These remarks suggest that Curry hoped a rebooted research program for astrology could succeed where Gadbury, Goad and Childrey had failed in the 17th century.

In keeping with this hope, Curry developed a close working relationship with John Addey, the chief theoretician of harmonics theory in astrology, who saw harmonics as a conceptual framework which could be used to explain the efficacy (or not) of other astrological factors, such as planets, signs, houses and aspects.³⁸ At this stage, Addey was at work on what would be his final book, *A New Study of Astrology*³⁹ which was not published until 1996, fourteen years after his death. He was an indefatigable researcher who was attempting to use his theory to explain the wave patterns of the Gauquelin's

³⁴ Q: "Is it not possible that it was actually the efforts of these Baconian astrologers, who...rejected the very grounds that astrology stood on (the supernatural, etc.), that resulted in the undermining of astrology that led to its decline? And are not you and Gauquelin flirting with the same thing? A: "I'm not claiming that statistics are the prime...That's extravagant." Q: "So the signs are out?" A: "Well, it doesn't mean they are absolutely out; it means that his best efforts to locate them have not succeeded. It will take the efforts of others and considerable ingenuity in thinking up where he might have gone wrong and testing that...There's no cut and dried final verdict, although the picture does build up in this way." It is notable that this critique took place at the *Lodge*, headquarters of the divinatory camp. "The Decline and Recovery of Astrology", op. cit. p. 66

³⁵ "The Decline and Recovery of Astrology", op. cit., p. 63 In the Q/A he stated "Gauquelin has corroborated it--- traditional astrology. Mars with athletes and aggression, Jupiter with extraversion..." p. 66 In Lakatos' sense, Curry was upholding the Gauquelin studies as an example of what Lakatos would have termed a "hard core theoretical assumption" for his astrological "research programme".

³⁶ Curry was on the list of "Consulting Editors" from its inception, initially listing his specialties as "Psychology, Philosophy of Science" and later substituting "History" for "Psychology". His name remained on the list as of 2014.

³⁷ *Fate* had carried Dennis Rawlin's STARBABY article critical of CISCOP. "The Decline and Recovery of Astrology" op. cit. p. 59

³⁸ His foundational text is *Harmonics in Astrology*, (Cambridge Circle, Green Bay, 1976)

³⁹ *A New Study of Astrology*, (The Urania Trust, London, 1996)

statistical studies of planets and professions. *New Study* contains a significant discussion of the Gauquelin material “which centres upon the idea of the harmonics of cosmic periods.”⁴⁰ In brief, Addey looked at the Gauquelin zones in terms of combinations of certain harmonics, primarily the third and fourth harmonics. His research methods and assumptions were seemingly quite consonant with Lakatos’ “research programme” approach, though there is no evidence Addey explicitly employed it.

Addey’s death in late March 1982 seems to have ended Curry’s active involvement with astrological research. During the late winter of 1982, he helped Addey complete his final published paper “Divination and Astrology”⁴¹ a significant critique of the emerging divinatory perspective. In addition to expressing his strong reservations about astrology as divination, Addey stressed the importance of empirical support for astrology. Somewhat ironically, at the very time Curry was helping Addey confront the upstart divinatory astrologers, he was himself having doubts about what he was soon to term “scientific astrology”. As he later admitted it was during this period that he was “starting to get to grips with a. as divination...”⁴²

Helping him ‘get to grips’ were two of his newer astrological friends, Geoffrey Cornelius and Maggie Hyde. Most likely, he had encountered them at the *Astrological Lodge*, perhaps following his lecture the previous fall. Their reformulation of astrology as a form of divination, along with their rejection of the naïve empiricism of most astrologers, apparently contributed to Curry’s re-evaluation of the viability, or perhaps more importantly, the significance of astrological research for judicial astrology. As he later noted “Instead of trying to narrow astrology down and shut out mystery which, since it cannot be done, only deadens the former and turns the latter bad, (Geoffrey and Maggie) contextualized astrology as a kind of divination, a dialogue with the unknown, which opens it up and enlivens it.”⁴³ Still, he was not ready to “uncritically sign up” for the divinatory bandwagon. Whether it was his new preoccupation with astrological history or the impact of Cornelius and Hyde, something during this period left him unsatisfied with his project to reform astrology on a purely scientific basis.

Deconstructing Astrology 1982-1984

Concurrent with his historical research for his doctorate, Curry became involved with other thoughtful outsiders, namely Martin Budd, Graham Douglas and Bernie Jaye who, along with Curry constituted the “Radical Astrology Group” (RAG). Inspired by the insights and analytic tools of structuralism, phenomenology, hermeneutics, sociology, and psychoanalysis, collectively they turned their attention to the faction riven astrology scene in London and found much to dissect and analyze. By May of 1983, they had issued a tentative group of papers⁴⁴ looking for feedback, perhaps with the hope of becoming a book. The only public feedback they received was a withering critique from Geoffrey Dean, who was put off by the abstruse theoretical musings of the group. He made one partial exception: Curry’s paper “An Aporia for Astrology”.⁴⁵ No doubt, Dean was aware of Curry’s critique of CSICOP in the *Zetetic Scholar*

⁴⁰ *New Study*, op. cit., p. 85, For his discussion of the Gauquelin work, see Chapters Three and Four, pp. 11-72

⁴¹ *The Astrologers’ Quarterly*, Vol. 56 No. 2 (Summer 1982) The last page of the essay stated “Taken down by P. Curry, 1st March, 1982; amended and approved by JMA, 8th March, 1982”, p. 44. Available at: http://www.cosmocritic.com/pdfs/Addey_John_Astrology_as_Divination.pdf

⁴² Email exchange between Curry and Cornelius, November 5, 2005

⁴³ *Astrology, Science and Culture*, op. cit. p.12

⁴⁴ *Radical Astrology: A Set of Discussion Papers: Astrology and Theory*, M. Budd, G. Douglas, P. Curry, and B. Jaye Prepublication Xerox, 1983 Radical Astrology Group, Glanville Road, London SW18 5SB; it never became a book.

⁴⁵ http://www.cosmocritic.com/pdfs/Curry_Patrick_Aporia.pdf

and perhaps hoped to rescue him from the clutches of postmodernism. Fat chance. Still Dean gave only faint praise to Curry's paper, which he described as "the least unreadable and most rewarding of the six". As for the rest, he warned potential readers to "wait for the translation."⁴⁶

Curry's "An Aporia for Astrology" marks a significant point of intellectual self-awareness for modern astrology, since he had succeeded in devising an extremely useful taxonomy of astrological theory and practice. Its very title suggests Curry had been in a bit of a quandary of late regarding astrology, since an "Aporia is a figure whereby the speaker sheweth that he doubteth, either where to begin for the multitude of the matter, or what to say in some strange ambiguous thing. (1657)"⁴⁷ Using five "rough-hewn conceptual dimensions"⁴⁸, he construed four "attitudes" he found in the contemporary UK astrology world: Hermeneutic Astrology, Psychological Astrology, Scientific Astrology and Structuralist Astrology. His conceptual dimensions have received less attention than the attitudes, however, they indicate how sociologically informed Curry had become. He also exhibited a post-Marxian political edge as evidenced by his sources and his *raison d'être* for the essay, which was to answer his own question: "what is a relatively progressive (as opposed to reactionary) way to be involved with astrology?" If just a year earlier he had placed his hopes on providing better research strategies, now (May 1983) he questioned whether it was enough to clean out the "Augean stables. That was the state I saw astrology to be in. Now matters seem rather more complicated...But it remains a point of difference (among others) between myself and the other authors in these Papers; that while I think the study of astrology has much to offer, I also think it needs radicalizing more than it presently stands to radicalize."⁴⁹ This self-distancing was typical for Curry. To paraphrase Groucho Marx, Curry seemingly did not wish to become part of any group who would have him as a member.⁵⁰ Certainly, his capacity to stand outside his milieu, stood him in good stead for this essay.

Aporia provided both a description and a critique of the four "attitudes". As regards Hermeneutic Astrology (HA), which encompassed divinatory astrology, Curry's critique was in some ways even more damning than Addey's "Divination and Astrology" article had been the previous year. Using the five conceptual dimensions, he labeled HA as conservative, socially marginal, elitist, philosophically idealist and explicit in the extent to which its rules of interpretation are adhered to. He was quick to point out that "HA is not necessarily typical of the bulk of *Lodge* members, many of whom still practice primarily natal astrology and have never heard of Heidegger. Nonetheless it is the kind of astrology unceasingly practiced, and preached, by the *Lodge* leaders."⁵¹ He was, of course, referring to Cornelius, Hyde, and

⁴⁶ *Correlation*, Vol. 3 No. 2 (November 1983) p.45

⁴⁷ *RA*, op. cit., p. 5.1

⁴⁸ They are "1) Radical/conservative (in a non-normative sense) toward astrology; a part of this consideration is the extent to which the person's beliefs about astrology are in/corrigible by 'outside' evidence; 2) Social marginality, in relation to the overall social context; 3) Elitist/populist; 4) Philosophically materialist/idealist; 5) Explicit/implicit, i.e. the extent to which rules of astrological interpretation are specified and adhered to;" *RA*, op. cit., p. 5.1

⁴⁹ *RA*, p. 5.1

⁵⁰ Indeed, it is not clear how long his affiliation lasted. In a letter to the *New Scientist* on March 28, 1985, the Radical Astrology Group objected to the NS portrayal of astrology, the undersigned were Martin Budd and Graham Douglas.

⁵¹ *RA*, op. cit. p. 5.2

Gordon Watson, who along with Derek Appleby were all practicing and preaching the virtues of horary astrology and who (sans Appleby) openly embraced astrology as a form of divination.⁵²

HA's conservatism is seen in its preference for "older, traditional astrology" which Curry thought protects it "against all but the most insistent 'outside' empirical evidence; the only testimony permitted epistemological weight is the attitude and the astrological competence of the testifier"⁵³. As for HA's social marginality and elitism, Curry saw them as two side of the same coin: ""the marginalizing beliefs probably become charged with greater-than-usual significance; consequently they become both individualizing and precious and must be protected...HA is elitist or esoteric; the Way is narrow and many (or in this case, a few) are called, but few (even fewer) are chosen."⁵⁴ This somewhat harsh assessment is borne out by developments later that year and beyond: the formation of the *Company of Astrologers* in November 1983 first as a teaching body for the *Lodge* and then as an independent carrier for astrology as divination, where it has remained an important voice on the periphery of UK astrology for decades.

But Curry's strongest words concerned HA's adherence to the teachings of their "hero" Martin Heidegger. He described him as "a powerfully obscure thinker, turned towards 'Being' and away from social trivia, or indeed humanness as most of us know it; an uncompromisingly anti-scientific traditionalist and Romantic; the clearing in the Forest...(or Twickenham, at a pinch)."⁵⁵ This last was a sly reference to that part of London Cornelius and Hyde called home. Most troubling for Curry was Heidegger's "philosophy in relation to Nazism...Heidegger acted as Rector of Freiberg University in 1933-34 under the Nazi regime." After questioning whether his involvement was "reluctant and undertaken in the hope of 'stemming the tide'," he noted that "Heidegger never, in the forty odd years up to his death in 1976, undertook to clarify, justify or explain his position."⁵⁶

However, the historian in Curry did acknowledge "the roots of modern fascism partly (lie) in Romanticism (which 'had always been rather keen on das Daemonische, which excites in a way that reason cannot')" and noted "the short-lived Romantic irrationalism in pre-war Germany and again in the late 1960's and early 1970's (both times accompanied by a renewal of interest in occultism and astrology)."⁵⁷ While Curry made it clear that he "was not identifying any persons (or groups) with extremism", his astute analysis undoubtedly hurt a few feelings. However, by his apt moniker, Hermeneutic Astrology, Curry identified the enduring centrality of the power (and problematic aspects) of interpretation for the proponents of divinatory astrology, which remains true thirty-five years later.

His *Aporia* served up similar analytic dissections of the other three "attitudes", however, he seemed to go the easiest on Psychological Astrology (PA), one of whose "heroes" was identified as Liz Greene,

⁵² In a letter written to *The Astrologers' Quarterly* the following spring, Curry defended "what is clearly a new conceptual programme in astrology", but was quick to add "It is not, as it happens, my programme". He also suggested "it still needs to be clarified just how natal astrology might be (understood as) a kind of horary phenomenon; at least, that is not clear to me." Vol. 58 No. 1, p. 48

⁵³ RA, op. cit., p. 5.2

⁵⁴ Ibid. p. 5.2

⁵⁵ Ibid. p. 5.2

⁵⁶ Ibid. pp. 5.2-5.3 The publication of Heidegger's "black notebooks" in 2014 and a series of letters to family members in 2016 have erased any doubts about the depth of his anti-Semitic tendencies. This still leaves open the question to what extent these views circumscribe or invalidate his philosophical writings.

⁵⁷ Ibid. p. 5.3

Patrick's erstwhile tutor. Along the conceptual dimensions, PA was identified as "hardly radical" perhaps liberal, "socially somewhat less marginal", philosophically idealistic "(viz. the primacy of spiritual principles)", and populist (witness the crowds at the Liz Greene seminars).⁵⁸ He identified the PA view as "broadly true and practically helpful or therapeutic", but also noted the "helpful/true distinction here pinpoints a key dilemma for PA...an assumption here, which usually goes unexamined, is that there is a close relationship between what is true and what is found helpful." Unfortunately, the proponents of PA "invariably infer the empirical truth of astrology from its being found personally helpful." Curry was too well schooled in scientific method to accept this at face value. But his chief reservation about PA was more political than scientific: its "programme of 'individual fulfillment'", with its implicit "adaption to modern ideology".⁵⁹ This overtly political viewpoint regarding something as marginal as astrology now seems almost quaint. If, as Curry proposed, "astrology was in need of radicalizing", one might reasonably ask whether such a transformed astrology would result in astrologers counseling their clients to overturn the existing social order? Such prescriptions would hardly have been welcome news to most practicing astrologers, who by the 1980's were hoping to become an accepted part of the helping professions. Simply announcing oneself as an astrologer was a pretty radical act in the mid 1980's, or anytime really.⁶⁰

Curry's remarks on Scientific Astrology (ScA) indicate how much he had moved past his 'reform of astrological research' stage of 1980-82. Certainly, in terms of its conceptual dimensions, ScA had much to recommend it: he found it to be radical ("beliefs are open to being disconfirmed by evidence and criticism"), the least socially marginal of the four attitudes ("the number of academic degrees points to at least some measure of integration into the intellectual community"), elitist ("a scientific or academic training is hard-won, and not available...to many"), philosophically materialist, and naturally explicit in its rules of interpretation.⁶¹ He identified John Addey as one of ScA's "heroes" and noted "That the theory of harmonics tries to connect ScA and PA is both its importance and problem. It tends to be distrusted as too scientific by PA astrologers and too mystical by ScA researchers! Whether or not harmonics will bear out their early promise, chances don't look good."⁶² This incisive judgment has largely been borne out; few contemporary astrologers seem to be pursuing it as a research programme⁶³ and its techniques do not seem very popular with current astrologers.

The fourth attitude, Structuralist Astrology (StA) Curry identified as "by far the newest and numerically smallest position". That it was dignified as a separate attitude at all appears to be due to the presence of its two most prominent (and perhaps only) members, Martin Budd and Graham Douglas, who were

⁵⁸ Ibid. p. 5.4

⁵⁹ Ibid. pp. 5.4-5.5 His critique should be placed in context. During the late 1960's and 1970's, radical critics in the fields of psychology and psychiatry questioned whether those in the helping professions should be assisting people in distress to conform to a "sick" system, which had helped to create the various malady they were treating.

⁶⁰ Twenty years later, he had dialed back his expectations. In a talk he delivered on the 400th anniversary of William Lilly's birth, he noted "Clearly, it is not the job of the astrologers to take on the mainstream by main force...they tried that in the 17th century, and even with some heavyweight allies got hammered." "Address to the Astrologer's Feast" given on 11 May 2002, Walton-on-Thames, *Company of Astrologers Bulletin*, No. 39, 26 May 2002

⁶¹ Ibid. p. 5.6

⁶² Ibid. p. 5.7

⁶³ The American astrologer David Cochrane has shown a keen interest in harmonics as a research tool.

part of the Radical Astrology Group.⁶⁴ Along its conceptual dimensions, it was seen as conservative (“more interested in analyzing (astrology) as it is, than in changing or improving it”), socially more marginal than ScA, but less than HA, elitist, since “its concepts and terminology are not easily mastered”, philosophically all over the map (“structuralism stretches from the critically materialist eye of Barthes⁶⁵ to the almost pure idealism—disguised as materialism—of Althusser”⁶⁶). Curry pondered whether “the limits of a purely structuralist analysis coincide with where a number of possible other kinds of analyses begin, e.g. 1) the realist claims of Gauquelin and others; 2) a historical, diachronic study, aiming to recover the past as it is concealed in astrology, and thereby illuminate the present; even 3) a more muscular sociological study of astrology, the class/status/power aspects of its adherents and so on.” He noted that without undertaking these approaches, “I can see no way that astrology can appear to StA as other than one, probably bourgeois, social construct among many.”⁶⁷

Curry concluded his survey of the four attitudes by almost reluctantly admitting “I am afraid that I still tax them with being more part of the problem than part of the solution” and prescribing the “development of a critically humanist attitude within whatever your attitude is or has been”. He also saw the need for “a decent introduction to and history of astrology—one that is neither simplistic propaganda nor polemical debunking, nor a narrow consideration of just the ‘scientific evidence’—but a history (or histories, more likely) that gives astrology back to the people.”⁶⁸ That, of course, was just the course Curry was embarking upon.

The Historian: 1981-2009

Patrick Curry is perhaps best known to most astrologers as a historian of astrology. His activities in this realm fall into two phases. The first phase (1981-1992) is primarily marked by his activities as a new type of academic historian for this “wretched subject”⁶⁹: one with a deep familiarity with and sensitivity to the astrologer’s world. This is no small achievement and must be set against over a century of overt hostility expressed by academics who wrote about astrology. During this first phase, Curry edited a

⁶⁴ It should be noted that when Curry updated the different astrological schools in “Varieties of Astrological Experience” in *ASC*, he dropped Structuralist Astrology as a separate attitude or stance.

⁶⁵ Roland Barthes (1915-1980) explored the fields of semiotics and structuralism during the 1960’s and “challenged traditional academic views of literary criticism”. Some of his insights gained through semiotics “brought Barthes in line with Marxist theory”, while “his structuralist theorizing became another exercise in his ongoing attempts to dissect and expose the misleading mechanisms of bourgeois culture.” <https://wikipedia.org/wiki/Barthes> (checked January 12, 2017)

⁶⁶ “Louis Althusser (1918-1990) “the French Communist Party’s leading theoretician, an internationally known expert on Marxism...built his professional reputation and passing fame upon the claim to have constructed a firewall between a ‘young’ Hegelian Marx and the ‘mature’ materialist Marx. Only the later writings, he insisted, were scientific and thus properly Marxist.” Tony Judt, *Postwar: A History of Europe since 1945*, (Penguin Books, London, 2005) p. 404

⁶⁷ RAG, op. cit., p. 5.9 In broad form, his three suggestions have been followed, at least in part, by those who have taken up the academic study of astrology.

⁶⁸ Ibid. p. 5.11

⁶⁹ “The History of Wretched Subjects” was a “classic statement of the importance of the history of astrology in the history of ideas” written by Otto Neugebauer, a Professor of the History of Mathematics at Brown University. Initially published in *Isis*, Vol. 42 June 1951. It was republished in the *Culture and Cosmos*, Vol. 1 No. 2, Winter/Autumn 1997. Neugebauer was responding to George Sarton’s characterization of “the Mandaean ‘Book of the Zodiac’ ...as ‘a wretched collection of omens, debased astrology and miscellaneous nonsense’”. *C & C*, p. 3

book of academic essays and wrote two books *Prophecy and Power*⁷⁰ and *A Confusion of Prophets*⁷¹, which cemented his reputation among both academics and astrologers. In the latter two books, although he acknowledged some past involvement with astrology, his tone suggested this was behind him; also he omitted any mention of his early efforts on behalf of the scientific testing of astrology, most likely because he was now potentially addressing an academic readership.⁷²

In the midst of his research for his PhD, Curry convened (along with Jacques Halbronn) the first conference on the history of medieval and Renaissance astrology at London's Warburg Institute in London on March 30th /31st, 1984. According to Nick Campion, it "brought academics from all over the world and galvanized interest in the history of astrology in London."⁷³ Curry subsequently edited the conference papers, which were published as his first book, *Astrology, Science and Society*⁷⁴ in 1987. By this time, Curry had completed his PhD thesis "The Decline of Astrology in Early Modern England, 1642-1800", which became the basis of his second book *Prophecy and Power* in 1989.⁷⁵

Curry's historical writing has made a significant impact among academics; a web search indicates that *Prophecy and Power* has been more frequently cited than Anthony Grafton's *Cardano's Cosmos*.⁷⁶ Since their publication, his first three books, along with his monographs have become staples in the bibliographies of scholars writing about astrology's past.⁷⁷ A measure of his authority on astrology may also be seen in his contributions to various publications such as the *Oxford Dictionary of Biography*⁷⁸ and the *Encyclopedia of Historians and Historical Writing*⁷⁹. Harder to measure has been the influence of his critique of older historical studies of astrology, especially for their scientism and positivist bias. Without a doubt, the past twenty-five years has witnessed a marked improvement in the quality of historical

⁷⁰ *Prophecy and Power: Astrology in Early Modern England*, (Polity Press, Cambridge, 1989)

⁷¹ *A Confusion of Prophets: Victorian and Edwardian Astrology*, (Collins and Brown, London, 1992)

⁷² Certainly, such an admission would have prevented him from being hired by most universities at that time. In *Confusion of Prophets*, op. cit., he answered the self-posed question "Do you believe in it? I would be foolish to accept its terms by answering either yes or no. At best, the question is *mal posée*; 'belief' is at once too broad and too weak a term. At worst, and more usually, it is a crude attempt to identify you with one side or the other of a fruitless and boring game, played between self-styled defenders of science-and-reason on the one hand and of esoteric spirituality on the other." p. 16

⁷³ According to Nick Campion, this conference was based on an original proposal by Curry and Jacques Halbronn. "The Traditional Revival in Modern Astrology: A Preliminary History" *Astrologers' Quarterly*, 74 (1) Winter 2003, p. 31. In the "Acknowledgements" in *Astrology, Science and Society*, Curry gives full credit to Jacques Halbronn. p. viii. According to Anabella Kitson, to the surprise of many of the academics in attendance, this conference was also well attended by many astrologers.

⁷⁴ *Astrology, Science and Society: Historical Essays*, edited by Patrick Curry, (The Boydell Press, Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1987), Long out of print, this volume acts as a sort of holy grail for certain astrological scholars, including this writer, who spent the better part of a decade searching, before being able to locate a copy.

⁷⁵ *Prophecy and Power: Astrology in Early Modern England*, op. cit.

⁷⁶ Princeton University Press website, accessed January 26, 2017

⁷⁷ He has been cited in both popular surveys, such as Peter Whitfield's *Astrology: A History*, (The British Library, London, 2001) and Benson Bobrick's *The Fated Sky: Astrology in History*, (Simon and Schuster, New York, 2005), as well as more scholarly studies such as Monica Azzolini's *The Duke and the Stars: Astrology and Politics in Renaissance Milan*, (Harvard University Press, Cambridge and London, 2013) and P. G. Maxwell-Stuart's *Astrology: From Ancient Babylon to the Present*, (Amberly, Stroud, 2010). We should not fail to mention countless academic theses produced over the past fifteen years.

⁷⁸ Oxford University Press, 2004

⁷⁹ Kelly Boyd, (ed.) (Fitzroy Dearborn, London, 1999)

writing about astrology, which has moved beyond the “simplistic propaganda” and “polemical debunking” he railed against in *Aporia*.

Despite, or perhaps because of his involvement in academia during this early phase, Curry retained an allegiance to the London astrological community. In the spring of 1985, in the midst of his doctoral research, he took time out to write the “Afterword” and “Bibliographical Appendix” for the first complete modern reprint of William Lilly’s *Christian Astrology*⁸⁰, done in collaboration with various astrologers, including Olivia Barclay, Geoffrey Cornelius and Maggie Hyde. Eager to share what he had learned in the course of his studies, Curry gave a lecture at the *Astrological Lodge* in March 1986 to counter what he perceived as an ahistorical mindset among many astrologers. “In my view, it is far too easy for modern astrologers to *feel* that their subject (despite its antiquity) sprang into existence only recently—coterminously, in fact, with their own interest in it...and to think that the way astrology is practised and situated and arranged could be easily changed, really...if only people would be reasonable.”⁸¹ He followed these remarks with a brief historical survey of English astrology since Lilly’s day. More important than any specific information Curry conveyed was his example. Years before astrology re-entered the academy, Curry acted as a credible bridge between serious academics and those astrologers he had so skillfully surveyed in his *Aporia* a few years earlier.

The second phase of Curry’s historical activities (1993-2009) was interspersed with his other intellectual concerns, namely writing and speaking about Tolkien, Machiavelli and ecological ethics. During the early to mid-1990’s, Curry wrote a number of papers for both scholarly and astrological journals,⁸² where he developed a remarkably consistent critique of how historians have been bedeviled by the specter of positivism “that whispers, ‘Astrology is really just rubbish, now and always.’”⁸³ He cautioned them “to suspend any too firm opinions about what is really ‘rational’; to avoid loaded and simplistic pejoratives like ‘irrational’; and to take a closer look instead at the historical processes whereby certain human behaviors and beliefs came to be taken, by and large, as either one or the other.”⁸⁴

Nowhere are his views on the cultural misconceptions of astrology more cogently expressed than in his 1994 “Foreword” to Cornelius’ *Moment of Astrology*.⁸⁵ Here, he sketched the terms of astrology’s ostracism from the domains of “serious thought” by noting that its critics and cultural enemies, be they “the Christian Church; modern science and its apologists; and professional intellectuals taking their mandate from the Enlightenment...reveal their profound common ground: namely, monism.”⁸⁶ Not surprisingly, he found an analogous monism among the beliefs of many astrologers, whose “own

⁸⁰ *Christian Astrology: Modestly Treated of in three Books*, (Regulus, London, 1985, facsimile reprint of 1659 edition) This was the first full reprinting of this book in over three hundred years. It came about due to the efforts of astrologers, not the academics, who had no interest at this juncture in the ‘texts’ of historical astrology from the pre-modern era.

⁸¹ “Astrology Past: A Mirror for the Present?” A talk given at the Astrological Lodge of London, 3 March 1986, *Astrologers’ Quarterly*, Vol. 60 No. 1 (Spring 1986) p. 4

⁸² “Astrology in early modern England: the making of a vulgar knowledge”, from S. Pumfrey, P. L. Rossi, and M. Slavinsky (eds.) *Science, Culture and Popular Belief in Renaissance Europe*, (Manchester University Press, 1991); “Astrology: From Pagan to Postmodern” was published in *The Astrological Journal*, January/February 1994, Vol. 36 No. 1 pp. 69-75;

⁸³ “Astrology in early modern England” op. cit., p. 288;

⁸⁴ “Pagan to Postmodern”, op. cit., p. 69

⁸⁵ *Moment*, op. cit., pp. xi-xv

⁸⁶ *Ibid.* p. xiii

practice too has long been constrained by one universal and effectively divine Order.”⁸⁷ Naturally, he did not shy away from expressing such thoughts to the book’s intended readers.

During this period, he continued to be an intermittent presence at various astrological conferences and gatherings.⁸⁸ In addition to his continued scholarly activities,⁸⁹ he served as a book reviewer,⁹⁰ and a sharp eyed critic of the missteps taken by professional historians, especially those who write with assurance about astrology, while lacking even a basic familiarity with its methods and techniques. Similarly, Curry has chastised those historians who have a tin ear for astrological discourse, coupled with no idea of how astrologers think or what they actually do. Several of his published papers outline his core beliefs about how professional historians, sociologists and anthropologists should proceed when writing about astrology. Thus, what sets him apart from other historical scholars are his own previous experiences as an astrologer, researcher and thinker about astrology’s epistemological problems, which have enabled him to alight upon a unique perch as a “doctor” prescribing what ails the academy.⁹¹ These experiences have predisposed him to write a different kind of astrological history than his academic predecessors such as Keith Thomas, or his non-astrologer historian peers, such as Anthony Grafton.

It is against this background, that *Astrology, Science and Culture* must be understood. Curry had re-entered academia in the fall of 2002 at Bath Spa’s new program. Following a lengthy absence from academia, he was determined use his position to advocate for a different kind of understanding.⁹² As he noted, “The exclusion of astrology from the general cultural conversation of our society has resulted not only in its impoverishment but also the loss of what it has to offer.”⁹³ He certainly knew the pitfalls and was aware astrology’s return to the academy evoked wide disdain in other academics. Thus, ASC was written in conjunction with an established academic anthropologist to address a significant void in the

⁸⁷ Ibid. p. xiv

⁸⁸ For example, Lilly Day, July 29, 1995; “The Astrologers’ Feast” talk in May 2002 given on the 400th anniversary of William Lilly’s birth, *Company of Astrologers Bulletin*, No. 39, 26 May 2002; The Carter Memorial Lecture given at the *Astrological Association’s* annual convention in September 2004.

⁸⁹ He has written twenty-two entries for the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, as well as entries on astrology for two handbooks for professional historians.

⁹⁰ Most notably, “The Messages of the Stars” in *The Times Literary Supplement*, (4 August 1995) his review essay of three recent astrology books, Ann Geneva’s *Astrology and the Seventeenth Century Mind*, Tamsyn Barton’s *Knowledge and Power*, and Nick Campion’s *The Great Year*. Even in this bastion of the literary establishment, Curry did not shy away from expressing his critique of modernity’s thralldom to scientism, nor in expressing satisfaction with certain developments within the small world of astrology, such as *Project Hindsight* and even mentioning the publication of Cornelius’ *The Moment of Astrology*.

⁹¹ While some of the ideas were first broached in his chapter “Astrology in early modern England: the making of a vulgar knowledge”, from S. Pumfrey, P. L. Rossi, and M. Slavinsky (eds.) *Science, Culture and Popular Belief in Renaissance Europe*, (Manchester University Press, 1991), he sharpened his critique in three further essays: “Historical Approaches to Astrology”, *Culture and Cosmos*, Vol. 4 No. 1 Spring/Summer 2000, “Astrology on Trial, and its Historians: Reflections on the Historiography of ‘Superstition’”, *Culture and Cosmos*, Vol. 4, No. 2, Autumn/Winter 2000; and “The Historiography of Astrology: A Diagnosis and A Prescription”, a paper in K. von Stuckrad, G. Oestmann and D. Rutkin (eds.) *Horoscopes and History*, (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York, 2005), pp. 261-274

⁹² He had played a significant role as one of the few astrologers with a PhD in helping midwife astrology’s birth as an academic subject during the 1999-2002 period.

⁹³ Patrick Curry, Foreword to *Astrology and the Academy: Papers from the Inaugural Conference of the Sophia Centre, Bath Spa University College, 13-14 June 2003* (Cinnabar Books, Bristol, 2003) p. xiv

literature: a thoughtful, carefully documented, wide ranging discussion of astrology's epistemological status. What his academic readers would *not* get is the usual treatment of astrology "as purely a failed version of something else: an ersatz religion, or pseudo-science, or vulgar rather than educated belief."⁹⁴ Though ASC is not a history per se, in its pages Curry's views on the role of ideology, scientism and progress enable the reader to understand his philosophy of history.

Philosopher of Divination

In this final section, I will give a brief overview of Curry's work on the philosophy of divination---a subject that is covered intensely in *ASC*, but about which he has said considerably more. As I noted at the outset, there was always a strong philosophical undercurrent in Curry's views of astrology. Even during his early empirical phase, Curry understood the importance of examining the philosophical assumptions of astrology. His immersion in post-modern thinking during his deconstructive phase placed philosophical considerations to the fore and enabled him to use the insights of such thinkers to better understand the divisions he found within the London astrological scene in the early 1980's. Though, at that time, he maintained a distance from the hermeneutical "divinatory" camp of Cornelius, there is no question that his involvement with this group enabled him to come to grips with the idea of astrology as divination. Furthermore, his continued historical studies showed him that philosophical differences had always divided astrologers and that it made sense, both historically and philosophically, to link similar groups across time. While these perspectives contribute to his mature philosophy of divination, it is also necessary to examine the connections he makes between astrology and his non-astrological concerns, primarily enchantment, but also his studies on Tolkien and ecology.

Curry's 2007 essay "Divination, Enchantment and Platonism"⁹⁵ brings together several significant strands of his mature philosophy: the articulation of his key characteristics of divination; the manner in which astrology as divination embodies Max Weber's concept of enchantment; and how Platonism provides an inhospitable philosophical environment for astrology and other forms of divination. A second essay from that year "Grounding Astrology: Towards an Ecological Astrology" extends these themes and posits "a conception of astrology in which nature---not a modernist Cartesian nature but the living and sensuous natural world---is central."⁹⁶ In other writings and talks, both before and after these two essays, he has elaborated on some of these themes and added others, such as the importance of myth and the use of comparative anthropological studies to understand the process of divination.

Curry's four key characteristics of what he describes as "aboriginal or indigenous divination" are that it is pluralist, local, sensuous and metic. Each term requires a bit of unpacking. As noted, Curry is an avowed proponent of pluralism, or "the belief that no single explanatory system or view of reality can account for all the phenomena of life."⁹⁷ In terms of divination, he notes "in the 'West', at least, there is a rough historical progression from divination in the context of animism---an effectively unlimited

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. xiii

⁹⁵ "Divination, Enchantment and Platonism", *The Imaginal Cosmos*, Edited by Angela Voss and Jean Hinson Lall, (University of Kent, Canterbury, 2007) pp. 35-46; this out-of-print work is appearing in a new edition through Rubedo Press in 2017.

⁹⁶ "Grounding the Stars: Towards an Ecological Astrology", *Journal for the Study of Religion and Culture*, Vol. 1 No. 2 June 2007, p. 210 The essay's title invokes one of Curry's early mentors: Gregory Bateson, whose 1972 book *Steps To an Ecology of Mind* was an influential text for the young Curry.

⁹⁷ *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, (Houghton Mifflin, New York, 1971) p. 1009

number of spirits---through polytheism, with a large but limited pantheon, to monotheism.”⁹⁸ This could be viewed historically in terms of decline, but Curry adds “that in order to flourish---as distinct from merely survive---divination ideally requires a fully spiritual nature, or natural spirituality, for which animism (shorn, of course, of its original pejorative and teleological assumptions) remains the best short description.”⁹⁹ While those assumptions remain unnamed, elsewhere, Curry alludes to “the residues of unresolved positivism...(in which) secularism is an integral part of the modernist historical programme, cut from the same cloth, with the added twist of having seminally defined itself against ‘magic’, including astrology.”¹⁰⁰ He noted that “ambitious astrologers” were often caught up in their own “rationalizing efforts...to present astrology in terms of natural science...”¹⁰¹ Clearly, grasping what is essential about divination would encounter resistance all around.

How a pluralist astrology would work out in practice is suggested by Curry’s discussion in *ASC* of James Hillman’s influential contribution to archetypal astrology where “each planetary deity would receive its due without any attempt---virtually a reflex, among astrologers, no less than anyone else---to arrive at an overarching meta-principle which would magically accommodate all differences and reconcile all conflicts...”¹⁰² How this would square with an astrological tradition of consistent meanings for planets, signs, houses, etc. remains an open question.

The characteristic of being local, Curry notes, is a corollary of pluralism. It follows then, if there are no overarching principles or truths, the insights of divination must also be understood as being circumscribed by place, as well as time. Thus, rather than representing a universal language, astrology, or more correctly “astrologies” are the various adaptations to the spiritual and cultural idiosyncrasies of a particular environment or locale. This stance moves beyond understanding astrology as merely a social manifestation modified by the beliefs of a certain culture or religious tradition. Here Curry invokes Sean Kane’s ideas on myth, where “wisdom heard and told in animated pattern...(is) rendered in such a way as to preserve a place whole and sacred, safe from human meddling...the sanctity of place is vital.” Curry notes the “spirits...were spirits of particular natural places: what (Roy) Willis calls ‘ecological spirits’”.¹⁰³ Or as he stated in his 2004 Carter Memorial Lecture: “Note, not Spirit, as universal abstraction that is everywhere and always the same...this is a living spiritual nature, and it only comes in actual places and moments...As for the Earth---which translates, in practice as particular places---astrologers seem to have forgotten all about that.”¹⁰⁴ Whilst practitioners of locality astrology may beg to differ, his point is valid, that most astrologers see no need to confine their insights to their immediate environment.

Sensuous is not a term most astrologers would feel describes something essential about their way of seeing the world. This may be due in part, Curry suggests, to our remove from any actual observation of the night skies and our “experience of the cosmos (as) largely mediated by pixels and pieces of

⁹⁸ “Divination, Enchantment and Platonism” op. cit., p. 35

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 35

¹⁰⁰ “The Historiography of Astrology”, op. cit., p. 10

¹⁰¹ Ibid. p. 10

¹⁰² *ASC*, op. cit., p. 75

¹⁰³ “Divination, Enchantment and Platonism”, op. cit., p. 35

¹⁰⁴ www.skyscript.co.uk/enchantment.html (checked February 6, 2017) Among current academics of astrology, there appears to be widespread acceptance that astrology does not represent a singular world view or methodology. This must be set against a significant symbolic continuity for much of the astrological tradition.

paper...¹⁰⁵ In short, his use of sensuous would seem to imply felt experience. Here and elsewhere, Curry is moved by David Abram's work, especially his *The Spell of the Sensuous: Perception and Language in a More-than-Human World*¹⁰⁶ where he states "each place has its own mind, its own personality, its own intelligence."¹⁰⁷ His conjoining of pluralism and localism, results, Curry believes in "a radical immanence, which being effectively inexhaustible, leaves nothing (so to speak) for transcendence to do."¹⁰⁸ While he does not specify whether such immanence exists wholly within nature or is a purely subjective state of mind for every diviner, he seems to think it partakes of both. His modified animism would suggest the former, whilst elsewhere he notes "If you really want to understand a divinatory form of life, you will have to open up to it in a way that 'allow(s) the material to touch the observer as truth for the observer.'"¹⁰⁹ This phenomenological experiencing of divination---at odds with the usual distancing which takes place in academic study--- is important to Curry and goes hand in hand with divination's unique, idiosyncratic qualities. It also suggests why astrology as divination makes such a poor subject for scientific scrutiny.

For his fourth characteristic of divination, Curry turned to John Heaton, a London psychotherapist and philosopher, whose 1989 talk "Metis: Divination, Psychotherapy and Cunning Intelligence"¹¹⁰ he had attended.¹¹¹ In "Divination, Enchantment and Platonism" Curry renewed a definition he had discussed in *ASC*: "Metic, that is the mode of being (living, acting, thinking, etc.) characterized as 'cunning wisdom', in contrast, for example to both Platonic episteme (abstract truth) and Aristotelian phronesis (practical skill)."¹¹² To be clear, in his 1989 talk, Heaton had not contrasted metis with either episteme or phronesis; mostly, he discussed the Greek myths in which Metis played a part. Indeed, Heaton had discovered the significance of the god Metis through an earlier book, Detienne and Verdant's *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*.¹¹³

For his part, Curry saw that metic knowing constituted a third way between the monist variations expressed by Plato and Aristotle. He quoted with approval Detienne and Verdant's notion that "metic

¹⁰⁵ "Grounding the Stars", op. cit., p. 217

¹⁰⁶ Random House, New York, 1996

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 182

¹⁰⁸ "Divination, Enchantment and Platonism", op. cit., p. 36

¹⁰⁹ *Divination: Perspectives for a New Millennium*, op. cit., p. 4; the end of the quote is from Geoffrey Cornelius' "Verity and the Question of Primary and Secondary Scholarship in Astrology", *Astrology and the Academy: Papers from the Inaugural Conference of the Sophia Centre, Bath Spa University College 13-14 June 2003*, (Cinnabar Books, Bristol, 2003) p. 108. This singular paper represents a challenge to the academy put forth by Cornelius at almost the outset of astrology's return to higher education. Is astrology capable of making primary truth claims, or must the academy be confined to studying it as "some sort of belief-system, to be sympathetically annotated, dissected and put up for comparison with other belief-systems.?" (p. 108) Cornelius' penetrating question remains largely unanswered by those within the academy.

¹¹⁰ Hosted by the Company of Astrologers on 21 March 1989, a transcript of the talk was published by them the following year as *Metis: Divination, Psychotherapy and Cunning Intelligence* (Company of Astrologers, London, 1990) In the preface, it states "Amongst the active participants in the seminar were Barbara Latham, Sue Rose, Geoffrey Cornelius, Patrick Curry, Joe Friedman and Gordon Watson." p. 1

¹¹¹ Attended and subsequently forgotten. In the Introduction to *ASC*, Curry sheepishly acknowledged "I discovered and wrote about *metis* as the mode appropriate to divination, only for someone to gently point out that I had attended a seminar (led by John Heaton) on that very subject a few years earlier." p. 13

¹¹² "Divination, Enchantment and Platonism", op. cit. p. 36

¹¹³ Marcel Detienne & Jean Pierre Verdant, *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*, trans. Janet Lloyd, (Humanities Press, Atlantic Highlands, NJ, 1978)

divination entails a ‘future where nothing is fixed in advance, in which those consulting the gods must know how to time their questions opportunely, accepting or rejecting the oracle and even turning into their own advantage an answer given by the god in favor of their adversary.’”¹¹⁴ Of course, this reading of metis fits more easily into horary astrology, but Curry thought it could also apply to natal astrology. As he had noted in his Carter Lecture, “Above all, divinatory astrology involves not prediction but advice, in a way that is as true of nativities as horary: advice concerning a particular relationship, or particular career, or whatever, in as exact a way as possible. This also implies that the quality of an astrological session will depend just as much on the quality of questions the client brings to it as on your skill as an astrologer.”¹¹⁵ Still, it is the cunning wisdom of the astrologer which makes the act of divination possible.

Having established divination as pluralist, local, sensuous and metic, Curry turns to how astrology is an example *par excellence* of Max Weber’s notion of enchantment, which is a second major aspect of his philosophy of divination. While Curry had been open to sociological interpretations of astrological phenomena at least since his *Aporia* essay, he did not discover the importance of Weber, it would seem, until he began writing *ASC*.¹¹⁶ For Curry, Weber’s sense of enchantment “is always both material and spiritual, precise and mysterious, limited and unfathomable.”¹¹⁷ These qualities of enchantment could also act as a description of astrology. Indeed, in Curry’s view, the importance of astrology and other forms of divination for contemporary culture is that they provide a significant counter narrative to modernity’s monoculture of disenchantment. However, it was Weber’s definition of enchantment as ‘concrete magic’, which enabled Curry to re-examine why the reform of astrology in the late 17th century failed:

¹¹⁴ “Divination, Enchantment and Platonism”, op. cit., p. 36

¹¹⁵ www.skyscript.co.uk/enchantment.html (checked February 6, 2017) In her myth laden *The Astrology of Fate* (Weiser, York Beach, 1984) Liz Greene notes that astrological symbols cannot be grasped by intellect alone and admits that “to the undoubted frustration of the more pragmatic reader, astrological interpretations are hopelessly mixed herein with fairy tales, myths, dreams and other oddities”, (p. 14) however, she makes no mention of Metis.

¹¹⁶ “More recently, I had the exhilarating, if unnerving experience of reading the essence of all my hard-won insights and conclusions about astrology, as delivered in lectures nearly a century ago by Max Weber.” *ASC*, op. cit., p. 13. I have not found any references to Weber in any of Curry’s pre-*ASC* writing. In any event, Curry seems to be the first academic to recognize Weber’s significance for understanding astrology’s current historical and epistemological status. The only other references to Weber in recent astrological literature that I have come across are fleeting mentions of him in Nick Campion’s *The Great Year: Astrology, Millenarianism and History in the Western Tradition* (Penguin/Arkana, London, 1994), where there is no discussion of enchantment. In *The Dawn of Astrology: The Ancient and Classical Worlds*, (Continuum Books, London, 2008) in a discussion of Mesopotamian (!) astrology, Campion points to “the tendency to codification of all possibilities in the universe (as) a clear indication of what the sociologist Max Weber calls disenchantment.” (p. 60) This assessment seems odd, at best. Does Campion think the Mesopotamians were already becoming disenchanted? Perhaps. Certainly none of Weber’s historical conditions obtained. While Curry’s “Divination, Enchantment and Platonism” appears in the bibliography, it is not referenced for this passage. *A History of Western Astrology: The Medieval and Modern Worlds, Vol. II* (Continuum Books, London, 2009) contains a number of references to Weber’s enchantment theme. Although Campion’s bibliography lists a number of Curry’s works, it omits *ASC*. Given their past working relationship at Bath Spa during the writing and publication of *ASC*, it would seem reasonable to assume Campion learned of Weber’s importance from Curry.

¹¹⁷ “The Third Road: Faerie in Hypermodernity”, *The Handbook of Animism*, Graham Harvey, editor, (Acumen, Durham, 2013) p. 469

The split between subject/spirit and object/matter---the dualism which actually comprises 'two vying monisms'---had momentous consequences for astrology and all such discourses...Perforce, astrologers from the late seventeenth century onward aligned themselves with either the 'scientific' or 'spiritual' side. The former itself divided into neo-Aristotelians and Baconian-style empiricists, while the latter became increasingly caught up in supernaturalist magic and occultism...both options left unquestioned the assumptive split itself; and neither left any room for concrete magic.¹¹⁸

Not surprisingly, the 17th century reformers, intent on aligning astrology with the emerging principles of natural philosophy had not grasped astrology's essentially metric nature, but Curry had. Lest the reader be misled by Weber's use of 'concrete', he clarified "Just as concrete magic is necessarily plural---the 'concrete' here is decidedly not modern scientific matter or quantity, but precisely the sensuous particularities that the seventeenth-century scientific revolution banished as 'secondary' epiphenomena---disenchanted belief requires a master principle by which, and in relation to which, all things can be ordered."¹¹⁹

Curry's wariness regarding any such disenchanting master principles is why he rejects both Platonic and Neo-Platonic forms of astrology, as well as the empirical programme of the neo-Aristotelians; they are variations on a monist theme. Curry's embrace of divination as a form of Weber's concrete magic provides his answer to where one turns if neither the neo-Aristotelian/Baconian empiricists (Gauquelin, Dean, the Scientific Astrologers, et. al.), nor the spiritual/supernaturalist/occult astrologers (Alan Leo, Dane Rudhyar and their psychological progeny) provide a satisfactory answer to the question: How does one defend astrology in a disenchanted world? The short answer is to redefine it as an expression of divination and to engage in practices which show modernity's sense of the world to be partial or limited.

A contemporary philosopher who has expressed significant reservations about modernity's achievements is Bruno Latour¹²⁰, one of Curry's epistemological bedmates. There is significant overlap in their skeptical views of historical progress and the achievements of science. Curry has long held in contempt the "Whig" view of history as a record of unending progress, whilst Latour has questioned just how great the difference is between modern humans and our Stone Age ancestors. This cultural apprehension is reflected in the title of his best known book, *We Have Never Been Modern*.¹²¹ In short, Latour senses something profoundly "primitive" lurking within

¹¹⁸ ASC, op. cit., pp. 60-61

¹¹⁹ "Divination, Enchantment and Platonism", op. cit., p. 37

¹²⁰ Bruno Latour (1947-Present) is a French philosopher, anthropologist and sociologist of science who has "undertaken an ambitious analysis and reinterpretation of modernity, and has challenged fundamental concepts such as the distinction between modern and pre-modern, nature and society, human and not-human." In *We Have Never Been Modern*, he argues that "minor differences alone separate Westerners now from other collectives...(and that Post moderns have) accepted the modernistic abstractions as if they were real." Latour has also propounded a social constructionist interpretation of science, which has advanced the notion that "the objects of scientific study are socially constructed within the laboratory---that they cannot be attributed to an existence outside of the instruments that measure them and the minds that interpret them." In short, he views "scientific activity as a system of beliefs, oral traditions and culturally specific practices..."

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Latour> (checked February 6, 2017)

¹²¹ Latour, Bruno, *We Have Never Been Modern*, (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 2006 {1991})

each of us: a capacity and desire for a simpler, more direct experience of the world. Like Curry, Latour's critique of modernity has been based on an interdisciplinary approach and a willingness to challenge established pieties. Both men have exploited the insights of anthropology and the sociology of science to undercut the claims of modern science. While Latour seems more broadly secular than Curry, he has clearly perceived the importance of the night skies to address humanity's universal sense of hope and angst: "No one has ever heard of a collective that did not mobilize heaven and earth in its composition, along with bodies and souls, property and law, gods and ancestors, powers and beliefs, beast and fictional beings...Such is the ancient anthropological matrix, the one we have never abandoned."¹²²

In addition to postmodern scholars like Latour, Curry also appreciates "the prescience of anti-modernists like Tolkien, if not necessarily their prescriptions."¹²³ For Tolkien, some kind of enchantment is "as necessary for the health and complete functioning of the Human as is sunlight for physical life."¹²⁴ For his part, Curry takes "*wonder* to be a hallmark, and the most important one, of enchantment; and *will* its distinguishing contrary. (I have found Tolkien to be an unimpeachable guide concerning enchantment.)"¹²⁵ The link with divination is made by traversing what Curry calls "the ambiguous 'third' road to Faerie."¹²⁶

Somewhat paradoxically, Curry's way forward---a time honored path of romantics---is a return to nature, spirits and some form of animism. These are all precursors to the rationality of Greek philosophy, and have become important aspects of his program of re-enchantment. As he noted in a recent paper, "The upshot is that animism, faerie and enchantment share profound common ground. Faerie is the place where living perspectives meet, animism is the generic term for that dynamic, and enchantment accompanies the meeting... As Tolkien says, 'Faerie contains many things besides elves and fays...it holds the seas, the sun, the moon, the sky; and the earth and all the things that are in it: tree and bird, water and stone, wine and bread, and ourselves...when we are enchanted.'¹²⁷ This embrace of nature is central to his philosophy of divination.

The concept of nature also links two of Curry's other longstanding intellectual commitments, each of which contributes something to his philosophy of divination: postmodern social thought and his work in the area of ecological ethics. He makes clear, however, that "it is no longer defensible to assume that nature can be defined exhaustively or essentially in opposition to culture, reserving subjectivity and agency for the latter while attributing objectivity and passivity to the former." Instead, Curry proposes "that nature can involve just as much agency and subjectivity as the human species' claimed burden, namely culture. Conversely, culture is fully natural. The latter word should not be understood as naturalized, however; what we are left with is rather as Bruno Latour puts it, 'nature-cultures'"¹²⁸ In other words, nature-culture is

¹²² *We Have Never Been Modern*, op. cit., p. 107

¹²³ "The Third Road", op. cit., p. 8

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 7

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 2

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 3

¹²⁷ "The Third Road", op. cit., p. 3; he is quoting Tolkien from *Tree and Leaf*, (Unwin Hyman, London, 1988) p. 18

¹²⁸ "Grounding the Stars", op. cit., p. 211

reimagined as a metanatural process, which is an “active participant in determining what happens.”¹²⁹ Divination is both natural and cultural.

These then are aspects of his “rigorous romanticism”, which attempts “to negotiate the untenable extremes of both ‘established materialism’ and ‘romantic supernaturalism’ by locating the human *modus vivendi* as a middle way which partakes of both matter and spirit/mind but is reducible to neither.”¹³⁰ Divination, then is that “Middle Way” bridging those extremes. At the same time, it retains certain timeless qualities and remains a familiar experience whenever and wherever it is found. In the words of two recent anthropologists Filip de Boeck and Rene Divisch: “divination does not mimic or model a world but ‘rather makes a world...Attention should be devoted to divination as act rather than fact.’”¹³¹ For Patrick Curry, divination and astrology, its most popular expression in the West, manifest qualities which must be taken on their own terms and cannot be reduced to something else. One might add, the same thing is true of the man himself.

Kirk Little

Gorham, Maine

March 1, 2017

Downloaded from: www.cosmocritic.com

¹²⁹ Introduction to *Divination: Perspectives for a New Millennium*, op. cit., p. 7

¹³⁰ Ibid pp. 1-2, The Middle Way is a nod to Buddhism; he has been a practicing Buddhist for decades.

¹³¹ Quoted in Curry’s Introduction to *Divination: Perspectives for a New Millennium*, op. cit. p. 7