

Astrology: art, science or illusion?

I am the person responsible for the title of the current Neapolitan Congress on astrology sponsored by the CIDA. You will understand my hesitancy as to exactly what themes to present to you. Ultimately, I have decided to simply jump into the guiding thread of the topic I have proposed for the purpose of clearing up right at the outset my thoughts on the presentations and on the contrasts that exist among the three questions I have posed in the title.

So, how would we define our much beloved (and perhaps betrayed) discipline? Art? Certainly, it is such, for it requires almost acrobatic skill to present, in a reasonable and balanced way, our suppositions, our suggestions, our hypotheses on whatever the future holds in store for the "astrologized". We thus need a profound knowledge of the material, and we need memory, patience, savoir-faire, intuition, confidence in the face of the reactions of those-never content-who consult us, and, finally, agility and a sense of assuredness about what we propose to a rash client.

I fear that, here, at these words, someone will be disappointed and ask: Isn't astrology, then, a science? Has it nothing to do with the almost mathematical certainty about future events?

In order to answer that, I should like, first of all, to make a necessary clarification about the word "science", looking not only at the precise meaning of the word that has been with us for centuries, filling us with certainty (they say!), but also, alas, at a recent transformation of the word.

It is precise in the extent to which man, for centuries has believed in a definite cause and a definite effect in whatever part of the infinite cosmos. For centuries, he has accepted, in principle-to paraphrase Fritjof Capra, author of the famous *The Tao of Physics*- the ability to foresee with absolute certainty the future of any part of the cosmos if the state of the cosmos, in all its particulars at a given moment, is known.

Those seem the words of an astrologer rather than a physicist, for experts of the stars, as well, presume to have the ability to ascertain with certainty, or near certainty, the future of an individual, if they hold rigorously to the state of the heavens at the time of birth and to all of the techniques of foresight that spring forth from their fertile minds, including prenatal Moons, Vertex point, asteroids, primary and secondary directions, direct, indirect-we use what we have, and the more the better!

But the scientific discovery that has most galvanized astrologers, and which is something I would call "the great illusion", is what they call Mach's Principle, or the connection between the great and small, thus the connection between the heavens and man. Paul Davies writes that the idea that there exists in the universe a non-causal, holistic order in the universe, did not, in fact, originate with modern physics. For example, he says that astrology is an attempt to discern a cosmic order in which the events and the destiny of the human being are reflected in the organization of the heavens. Psychoanalyst C.G. Jung and quantum physicist Wolfgang Pauli proposed a principle of connection they called "synchronicity".

Isn't that something! At this point, we all feel like close relatives of Einstein and his colleagues. But if continue to follow recent discoveries, we notice that the new physics has shaken the foundations

of not just what we have for centuries called "science" but also of astrology, itself; for, lest we forget, the great is the image of the small and vice versa, and physics has shown that at the subatomic level matter cannot be precisely located, but rather shows a tendency to be in a certain place and a tendency to occur.

Thus, astrology has to take into account the considerable difference between the possible and the probable, between tendencies to occur and real occurrences, differences that should cause reflection on the part of those who practice the art of astrology if they don't want to commit colossal blunders. Again, to quote Paul Davies, when we make a forecast, "we reduce a multidimensional reality to a three-dimensional reality," which can be traced back to our limited experience and understanding. In order not to fall into error, we necessarily have to yield to and embrace a vast number of possibilities. This physicist, whose recent discovery a few months had to do with the inconstancy of the speed of light (poor Einstein!) presses the point, saying "the quantum factor forces us to perceive the particle in relationship to the all." Once again, to draw an exact parallel with our discipline, the path of the individual and his probable future are in a precise and continuous relationship to other human beings and not just to the state of the heavens. Sic! Where is this going to lead us?

Are these ill words of doubt from one who has been active in the field of astrology for three decades? No. They are simply consequences of interdisciplinary studies and of honest considerations of the work I have always done. They are studies that involve the most recent discoveries of the new physics, which present us with evidence of not just a multidimensional reality, but a reality, even a human one, made up of energy fields and magnetic field that attract or repel one another because of specific affinities or incompatibilities.

These fields interfere with greater ones that come to us from space, including the stars and planets, and with the very real electromagnetic grid that surrounds the earth.

Here we touch upon the phenomenon of resonance. Although this is not the time to explore that point further, that is the pillar upon which the essence of our discipline rests.

So, let us acknowledge with some humility that the defect of man is to consider himself omnipotent and not to recognize his own limitations, particularly at the level of the mind. "The world is not what it seems," as Gary Zuka reminds us in his marvelous book, *The Dance of the Wu Li Masters*, "and our mind follows different rules than those of the real world." A rational mind bases its impressions on its own perspective, limited but apparently exact. We forget that the whole is the sum of the parts, and that the relationship between the whole and the individual parts is multidimensional; thus, forecasts may be considered but a simple proposal, open to radical changes because of the above-mentioned interferences or-given the interdependence between ourselves and others-from other parts of the whole, composed of the rest of humanity.

More to the point, it can only be in this way, then, that astrology is no longer an illusion-but it will become one unless we place it within a vaster totality. Let us concede, then, that we all too often fragment and cut up the whole, with its countless possibilities for expression, choosing only those that seem easier and more logical to our limited three-dimensional brains.

Thus, all the little rules that we try to apply to a birth chart, extrapolating from our favorite texts, are at quite the other extreme from another reality that indirectly involves even astrology: Not even two electrons of the same atom can be exactly equal. To use a trite example, the Moon in

VIII, the terror of some of my clients who thrive on astrology and who find that sign in the horoscope of their children, does not necessarily mean "precocious death of the mother" as they fear. That is the reason we must yield to an infinite number of possibilities and it would simply take a quick statistical check of twenty or so orphans to demonstrate that.

Coming back to my beloved physicists, Stephen Hawking notes that W. Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle has put an end to the idea of a completely deterministic universe, given that you can't predict future events with certainty if you can't even measure with precision the present state of the universe.

Thus, if we don't want to practice, to spread, to follow an illusion, we should keep these simple suggestions in mind; that is the only way to further the validity and the beauty of our discipline, which-let us not forget-concerns above all the events of the world and the universe and only secondarily those of any single individual. Let us reflect together on other key words of Gary Zukav. He says that quantum mechanics can tell us how a group of particles will behave, but the only thing it can tell us about a single particle is how it will probably behave. The group of particles may be compared to humanity and the single particle to the individual.

I urge you, then-if we really want to bear astrology back into the University, from which it was banished centuries ago-always to present it properly, joined with the modern science of today that, fortunately, is spreading and being rendered understandable to all, thanks to scholars and Nobel Prize winners, who have the gift of making themselves understood even to someone like me, who knows so little. Thus we may approach ever closer to the truth, which all have sought but none possessed.

Clara Negri