

**Prophecy, Cosmology and the New Age Movement
The Extent and Nature of Contemporary Belief in Astrology**

Part 3

Chapter 9

Astrology, Religion and Belief

Chapter Description

The discussion of astrology as a matter of belief is closely associated with the proposition that it is a religion. This chapter considers astrologers' responses to the definition of astrology as a religion, and continues the discussion in chapter 8 concerning astrologers' responses to the word 'belief'. It also considers whether astrology is necessarily a rival to Christianity.

Astrology as Religion

Modern astrology is frequently defined as a religion both by its evangelical (Reachout Trust) and scientific critics. According to the astronomer scientist George Abell, 'astrology is the polytheistic religion of ancient Babylonia and Greece and is based in symbolism - a magical correspondence between the gods and the planets that bear the same names' (Abell 1981: 73). Eliade (1976: 61) calls it 'parareligious'. Even some astrologers, critical of what they see as deficiencies in the general condition of modern astrology, call it a 'substitute religion' (Koch 1959: 81). Hunt (2003: 173), argues that astrology is popular religion and, following Stark and Bainbridge (1985), that those 'committed' to it constitute a 'cultist' movement. There is general agreement within the academic literature that contemporary astrology may be characterised as a 'new religious movement' (Bruce 1995: 105; Hexham and Poewe 1997: 85-6, 104; Melton 2001a: 53), although Barker (2001: 18; see also Holm 2001: 103) more cautiously says that some such new religious movements merely draw on astrology which is, therefore, itself not necessarily religious.

Definitions of Religion

There is no single accepted definition of religion. As Herbrechtsmeier (1993: 1) wrote, 'The definition of religion continues to be a matter of dispute among scholars. And I suspect that disagreement about the topic will persist so long as religion is studied in academic circles'. A useful distinction between different theories of religion was provided by Zinnbauer *et al.* (1997: 550), who distinguished the 'substantive' approach, which focuses on 'beliefs, emotions, practices, and relationships of individuals in relation to a higher power or divine being', from the 'functional', which emphasizes 'the function that religiousness serves in the life of the individual [and] how they are used in dealing with the fundamental problems of existence such as life, death, suffering and injustice'.

The arguments concern such matters as whether belief in spiritual beings is necessary, as Tylor argued (1873: 491), whether all that is required is a sense of the numinous, of something greater and sacred outside one's self (Otto 1958: 47) or whether social function is vital (Durkheim 1995: 41, 206-8). The latter position leads naturally to the proposition that ideologies which have no supernatural component, such as science or Marxism, may be considered religions (Yinger 1979: 11-12, 196-200). In their response, though, Stark and Bainbridge (1985: 5; see also Berger 1969: 177) point out that such inclusive definitions inevitably make it difficult to establish conceptual tools for the study of religion.

Nevertheless, inclusive approaches such as Luckmann's (1967) and Yinger's (1969: 89) may be seen as a necessary response to the previous attitude that religion is expressed primarily through Christianity or the church, and allow the study of wider forms of religiosity in society. Thus for Luckmann (1967: 44) religions generate 'symbolic universes [which] are objectivated meaning-systems that relate the experiences of everyday life to a 'transcendent layer of reality'.

Yinger's solution (1969: 90) is a useful one: to treat as religions ' those phenomena labelled religious by the individuals or societies in question' , yet to recognise that ' some groups labelled religious, may deny the appellation' . Herbrechtsmeier pursued this problem in his discussion of the controversial issue, for Buddhists, as to whether Buddhism may legitimately be defined as a religion. He raised the dual problem of western emic definitions of eastern Buddhism, and hence of its western version, as a ' philosophy' , and of academic definition of it as either a philosophy or a religion, depending on its various etic perspectives. He observed that,

A primary methodological issue to be decided in attempting to establish a definition of religion is whether and how any specific *etic* concept can allow for a sympathetic nondistortional understanding of the various *emic* religious phenomena within the universe of human cultures (Herbrechtsmeier 1993: 1)

He added that, even though, since Durkheim, it has not been considered essential that reverence for superhuman beings is a universal trait of religion, there is still a widespread tendency in the west to argue that this should be so. Such definitions are ' exclusivist' (Herbrechtsmeier 1993: 2), excluding as they do systems which may not include such a reverence, such as Theravada Buddhism. Durkheim's inclusivist position therefore allows for a wider definition of religion. Thus, the very fact that astrology is labelled a religion means that, from an etic perspective, it may be considered one for sociological purposes, yet the emic statements of astrologers themselves must also be taken into account.

The Origins of Astrology in Religion

The origins of astrology as an ' adjunct' (Ness 1998: 81) to the Mesopotamian religion of the third to second millennia BCE are not in doubt (Cumont 1960: 12-21; Baigent 1994: 78-92). Weber (1993: 22) argued that astrology was a consequence of astral religion while Cumont (1912:16) proposed the reverse, claiming that the development as astral

religion in the sixth-century BCE was instead a consequence of the rise of astrology. According to modern scholarship, the Babylonians saw the stars as 'the writing of heaven' (Gadd 1945: 57), the means by which divine wishes were expressed, and it is thus commonly understood that Mesopotamian astrology should be categorised as divination (Rochberg-Halton 1988a, Swerdlow 1999, Koch-Westonholz 1995). In turn, Babylonian astrology was imported into the Greek world (Rochberg-Halton 1988s; Jones 1977, 1993, 1996) where it was to be intimately linked to Hellenistic astral theology, mainly through Hermeticism (Martin 1987: 146-50), and was closely tied to Gnostic beliefs (Jonas 1963: 254-260; Yates 1978: 22). Astrology's ancient religious connections are used by evangelical Christians as evidence for their argument that it remains a pagan practice (Strohmer 1988: 15-26), yet having religious origins does not mean that modern astrology is necessarily a religion any more than modern science's descent from magic (Webster 1982) means that it is itself necessarily magic.

Astrology as a Substitute for religion

It is widely argued that, if not a religion, astrology may be a substitute religion (Kanitscheider 1991: 259-260), or what Hill (1979: 247) considered a 'God of the Gaps', that is, one of many popular responses to the 'disenchantment', or loss of sacred character, of the modern world. That this argument follows naturally from popular accounts of secularisation theory is indicated by the related media reports. For example, in an article by Derek Draper (2001: 3) in *The Times*, the question was posed, 'as religious belief dies in Britain, is it being replaced with a tendency towards superstition, magic or obscure cults?' Nigella Lawson (1996: 17), citing the 1996 Church of England report, *The Search for Faith*, argued that 'star signs' and 'the cult of the clairvoyant' are replacing the Church as 'the new religion', a view echoed in the sceptical literature (Grossman 2002: 7). The prevailing hypothesis is therefore that religious and classical paranormal beliefs should be negatively correlated, because they are naturally competing sets of beliefs. Plug (1975: 176-7), Wuthnow (1978: 58-9) Gill (1999: 42,

51) and Hunt (2003: 17) all found support for this, confirming that belief in astrology correlates inversely with church attendance (see also Persinger and Makarec 1990).

However, Stark and Bainbridge (1985: 384-6) point to a more complex position suggesting that, while 'traditional religious affiliation' may inhibit 'the acceptance of occult practices and cult movements' including astrology, those which claim no religious affiliation are not secular rationalists, but show a high acceptance of occultism and cults and hence of astrology. Thus, modernity, as discussed in chapter 8, proceeds via a shift in the forms of religiosity rather than a decline. The notion of a rivalry between astrology and traditional religion, is, though, retained in such a model.

An alternative proposition, one that is not necessarily incompatible with the notion of a rivalry between astrology and Christianity, is that religiosity and belief in astrology might actually be positively correlated on the grounds that they both appeal to anti-scientific sentiments. Williams, Taylor and Hintze (1987: 356-8) found support for the latter hypothesis, concluding that strong belief in the paranormal, including astrology, is likely to correlate with strong belief in either religion or science, or both. In other words, the unifying principle is belief and that object of belief may be irrelevant.

Rice (2003: 101; see also 105) argued, though, that 'there are many belief patterns', and that attempts to distinguish religion, science and the paranormal as if they are mutually exclusive categories are therefore deeply flawed. Supporting evidence for this proposition was found by Sparks (2001) in a recent survey of two hundred randomly selected individuals. He found that there was no relationship between belief in astrology and religious belief, a conclusion which receives backing from Gallup Polls (1978: I.574; 1979: 184), which found that there is no relationship between either church-going or Christian belief and belief in astrology in the USA.

Astrology as a Cult

The typology of church, sect and cult has been widely debated and the definitions of each seriously challenged, particularly in view of the pejorative associations attached to 'cult' as opposed to 'church' (Hill 1973: 147; Stark and Bainbridge (1987: 157-168) have summarised those models of cults which define them as inherently deviant or pathological. However, within the literature on the sociology of religion the term cult can have a more neutral meaning than in more popular understanding. Hill (1973: 63) cites Troeltsch's opinion that, to be a member, it is not necessary actually to join a cult, making a declaration of adherence to a set of dogma and secure the consent of the other members, but merely to accept particular theories or follow certain practices. The individual therefore remains at the centre of his or her own personal cosmos, a condition typical of the modern secular world. Examples relevant to the position of New Age astrology included Theosophy, Spiritualism and 'a variety of "pseud Hinduisms"' imported to the west by various Indian sages. What links all these practices and further differentiates a cult from a sect or a church is the supposed break they represent with the religious traditions of the host society (Becker 1950; Hill 1973: 81). However, such an argument depends on the narrow definitions of religion as broadly identical with Christianity. Looser models indicate quite clearly that Theosophy and Spiritualism have profound roots in the European spiritual identity (Faivre 1994; 2000; Faivre and Needleman 1998).

Notably Stark and Bainbridge include discussion of astrology in their influential work *The Future of Religion* and define it and its organisations as 'cults'. For example, they state that 'Personalized horoscopes cast for specific clients represent pure cult activity; impersonal mass media horoscopes are pure audience cult communications' (1985:227). Given Stark and Bainbridge's description of cults it has to be doubtful whether their assessment is correct. They state that cults are 'deviant religious bodies- that is, they are in a state of relatively high tension with their surrounding sociocultural

environment' (1985:25). Indeed, in their opinion, ' astrology is most commonly a limited client or audience phenomenon' (1985:227): the typical audience cult,

most closely resembles a very loose lecture circuit. Persons with a cult doctrine to offer rely on ads, publicity, and direct mail to assemble an audience to hear their lectures. Efforts almost invariably are made at these lectures to sell their ancillary materials – books, magazines, souvenirs and the like – but no significant efforts are made to organize the audience.

' Visiting an astrologer or actually being one' , meanwhile, ' is a public cult activity rather than a private belief' (Stark and Bainbridge 1985:230). A client cult is defined as a ' service and therapy occupation' , and, Scientology, rolfing and psychoanalysis are given as examples. The weakness of Stark and Bainbridge's typology, though, is that anything can be defined as a cult; if a visit to a therapist is a cult activity, then so must be a visit to a doctor for reassurance. The National Health Service may then be a cult organisation. In other words, Stark and Bainbridge's inclusive typology can be applied to almost any public activity. If every form of public behaviour can be cultic then the argument about what is or is not a cult breaks down.

Astrology as a Religion

The question of whether astrology is a religion depends on the definition of religion. When William Lilly (1647), in his 'Epistle to the Student in ASTROLOGY', published in 1647, defined astrology as 'this heavenly knowledge of the Stars, wherein the great and admirable works of the invisible and al-glorious God are so manifestly apparent', or Barclay (1999: 30) states that the rules of astrology come from God, is astrology then an ' adjunct to religion' (Ness 1998: 81) actually religious? Alan Leo was convinced that astrology was itself a religion. By the end of the twentieth century, he predicted, ' Astrology (will) once again (be) established as a bright facet in the diamond of the coming World Religion (Leo 1911: 8.8.311). In the meantime, Leo claimed that the subscribers to *Modern Astrology*, his ' true friends' and ' valued supporters' , backed his

view that ' Astrology was a religion and a hope for the betterment of human life' (Leo 1911: 8.8.311).

However, there is currently a strong rhetorical resistance amongst astrologers to astrology' s categorisation as a religion. For example, in his discussion of belief in astrology, former *Observer* astrological columnist Neil Spencer considers that ' Astrology is not a religion- as we have seen, attempts to turn it into one annoy even astrologers' . This is so in spite of the fact that, he adds, they often regard it as having a high spiritual value (2000: 245). Demetra George, author of a number of influential astrological texts, argues that ' most astrologers today would deny that astrology is a religion' , even though she personally considers that it has religious origins (2001a). There is, then, amongst astrologers, a profound antipathy to its categorisation as a religion. According to James Holden,

horoscopic astrology itself has little or nothing to do with religion. It was not "revealed" in remote antiquity to priests of a particular religion or to leaders of mystical societies by divinities or "transcendental masters." It is not "occult" in the usual sense of the word. It is a clear-cut empirical science that was invented by human beings and that operates on the basis of definite rules that have been established by experience...It is independent of religion and independent of philosophy (Holden 1996: 261 and n.1),

However, while Holden separates astrology from religion on accounts of its origins, his argument is partly based on astrology' s cultural context. In India, he adds, where there is no conflict between religion and astrology, there is no need to make the distinction (1996: 261 n.2).

Is astrology incompatible with Christianity?

Astrology is frequently identified as a rival to Christianity by both fundamentalist Christians, who regard it as overtly Satanic - ' If God condemns astrology then we are left with no alternative but to conclude that this power is from the demonic realm'

(Reachout Trust: 5) - and Christian commentators on Christianity' s current sociological and political status, whose opinion is less harsh, though still hostile (*The Search for Faith* 1996: 85-6). The report's problem with astrology is not that it is actively anti-Christian but only that it makes a sin of omission by failing to acknowledge the primacy of Christ in all matters. The Roman Catholic catechism of 1994 is unequivocal in its condemnation of astrology on the grounds that it is a form of divination:

2116 All forms of divination are to be rejected: recourse to Satan or demons, conjuring up the dead or other practices falsely supposed to "unveil" the future. Consulting horoscopes, astrology, palm reading, interpretation of omens and lots, the phenomena of clairvoyance, and recourse to mediums all conceal a desire for power over time, history, and, in the last analysis, other human beings, as well as a wish to conciliate hidden powers. They contradict the honor, respect, and loving fear that we owe to God alone (Catechism 1994).

It is precisely the definition of astrology as divination which prompted the Independent Television commission to investigate its possible dangers (Sancho 2001). The notion that astrology as a divinatory practice or a religious belief is in direct competition with Christianity is also automatically assumed by academic authorities such as Robin Gill, Michael Ramsey Professor of Modern Theology at the University of Kent at Canterbury, in his seminal survey of contemporary religious statistics (1999). However, this orthodox view is an etic one, formulated by those who have no particular knowledge of, or involvement in, astrology, and have done no fieldwork amongst either its users or practitioners. As discussed in chapter 10, such research has instead been based on potentially flawed questionnaire surveys of the general public, or on a cursory examination of astrological literature.

However, as far as astrology' s possible New Age identity is concerned, there are serious questions. This proposition is actually a central part of the religious ideology of the New Age *sensu stricto*. For example, although Dane Rudhyar' s theosophy owed more to Alice Bailey' s esoteric Christianity than to Blavatsky' s ~~anti~~ericalism, he strongly

supported the argument that the coming of the Age of Aquarius will see the eclipse of the traditional churches by the new theosophical Christianity. In this sense Rudhyar saw astrology and the established churches in direct competition. In his opinion,

Men question the stars because they [men] are in chaos, in darkness, in a bewildering fog. Astrology must answer for men the question of the existence of order. The known order of the earth and of human society is shattered. Souls that are dark and anguished turn to the stars - others turn to God and his supposed representatives among men (Rudhyar 1975b: 23).

Theosophical Christianity

Blavatsky's profound hostility to the Christian church was noted in chapter 4, as was the fact that her respect for Christ was based only on his identity as one of a series of great teachers, along with Krishna and Buddha. However, it was also noted that in the 1890s there was a split in theosophy between the 'easterners' and the 'westerners', the latter group adherents of existing traditions of Christian esotericism. Amongst theosophists the leading westerners were to be Alice Bailey and Rudolf Steiner, both of whom placed a huge emphasis on the coming of the 'Christ' at the beginning of the Aquarian Age (Hanegraaff 1996: 189-194). Rudhyar followed in this tradition, being a friend and student of Alice Bailey. Rudhyar (1963: 11) believed that the established Christian church was incapable of satisfying the spiritual hunger that resulted from the historical crisis of the post-war world. What was needed, he argued, was a new, revitalised Christianity which might generally manifest the 'Christimpulse' and end its stale obsession with Jesus the man and the worn out institutions, dogma and rituals of the church. Thus, in a curious anticipation of evangelical Christian attacks on the New Age (see Cumbeý 1983), Rudhyar argued that the coming of the New Age was actually necessary if the eastern religions were to be prevented from overwhelming western civilisation. He argued that,

The challenge we must meet goes far deeper than to be merely 'good Christians' in the usual taken-for-granted manner. What one takes for granted, that one loses spiritually. One does not create a new world, a new society, with values taken for granted; with images, idols, or ideas worn thin and pale by familiarity and an unquestioning,

unthinking sense of superiority. One does not thus create a new world; but we *are* challenged to create a new world, or at least to try, and to lead in the attempt...The revival of old forms is not creation. Creative leadership is a dynamic process of projection of values. These values must have the freshness of mystery of a superconscious, God-inspired, spirit releasing origin if they are to arouse and impel to action. They must be of the now. They must be warm with the feel and immediacy of personal experience if they are to convince and transform...no one can truly and dynamically be a *Christian* leader who has not experienced in some measure the reality of the Christ (Rudhyar 1963: 8-9).

Rudhyar' s words are a profound statement of Christian faith. That their context is his Gnostic emphasis on the Christ-within, as noted in chapter 6, does not detract from their Christianity. They are a direct continuation of that first century CE ' Christian Gnosticism [which] emerged as a reaffirmation, though in somewhat different terms, of the original stance of transcendence central to the very beginnings of Christianity' (Robinson 1988: 4). The key, then to evangelical Christianity' s hostility to the New Age is, as was noted in chapter 4, its Gnosticism. The clash between the two, when the western theosophical tradition is considered, is not one of Christianity versus anti-Christianity, but of the competition between two Christianities.

Astrology and Belief

There is also a debate amongst some mainstream Christians, who question the definition of astrology as a matter of belief. Father Lawrence Cassidy, Professor of Philosophy and teacher of astrology at Saint Peter' s Jesuit College in New Jersey, is one of the most prominent. In response to the new Roman Catholic Catechism' s criticism of astrology in 1994, he considered whether,

one [can] really be a believing Christian and, at the same time, conscientiously accept the principles of astrological art/science? To put this baldly, the only possible answer must be "yes," but with distinctions. Just what they are will depend, naturally, on how you understand the two general names, Christianity and astrology. (1994: 3)

In other words, it can be misleading to make simple assumptions about the beliefs and practices of either Christians or astrologers, let alone the relationship between them,

without carefully defining the terms. Cassidy also concluded that orthodox Christian hostility to astrology, at least from Catholic priests, is less a consequence of theology than of 'scientific reason' and adherence to the positivist, evolutionist view of religion. Discussing astrology's religious critics, he writes that,

In this, they follow the consensus of the contemporary academic community who consider it to be an outmoded myth of medieval man. On the other hand, there are few indeed who consider the study of astrology any more a matter for ecclesiastical disapproval than they would one's interest in flying saucers or the flat earth society. They do not ignore astrology because it offends their faith, but because it seems to contradict what they believe to be their scientific reason (1994: 9).

Cassidy is clearly keen to remove astrology from the religious sphere. He talks of the 'believing' Christian, but of 'accepting the principles' of astrology rather than 'belief' in astrology. Indeed, the use of the word 'belief' suggests that the object of belief is automatically religious in nature, an assumption which provokes resistance from astrologers to the categorisation of astrology as religion. In other words he frees himself from the burden of the Catechism by disputing its definition of astrology as divination.

The Pursuit of Meaning

While there is a deep antipathy to presumed connections between astrology and religion, there is a strong support for the idea that astrology provides a sense of meaning, particularly from astrologers within a New Age milieu. According to Mircea Eliade (1976: 61),

the discovery that your life is related to astral phenomena does confer a new meaning on your existence. You are no longer merely the anonymous individual described by Heidegger and Sartre, a stranger thrown into an absurd and meaningless world, condemned to be free, as Sartre used to say, with a freedom confined to your situation and conditioned by your historical moment. Rather, the horoscope reveals to you a new dignity: it shows how intimately you are related to the entire universe. It is true that your life is determined by the movements of the stars, but at least this determinant has an incomparable grandeur.

The function of astrology according to Hill (2000: 247) is 'to keep the world sacred' (Hill 2000: 247).² James R. Lewis (1990: Introduction) summarised the problem of modern life: 'To understand the attraction of astrology and astrology's world view for the typical citizen of an industrialized society, one has to see that, even for many "believers", ordinary, everyday life - the world as it is experienced on a day-to-day basis - appears to be empty of significance'. As astrological columnist Neil Spencer (2000: 245) wrote, 'For astrology's many followers, the appeal of physics ultimately doesn't matter. For all the tremendous successes and insights of physics, biology and the other branches of science, they remain unable to supply the answer to the questions that hang over numerous heads: "What am I doing here? What is my life for?"'

Yet the reality can be mundane, as Gerald Pitchforth, who practiced continuously from the 1930s until the present day, stated in respect of his experiences in the 1930s, 'astrology gave clues that you got nowhere else, it told you things that you knew nothing about' (Akhtar and Humphries 1999: 112). In this sense, Dane Rudhyar's explanation of astrology's appeal may be seen as primarily pragmatic. While he conceded the appeal of an astrology presented in a technical, scientific manner, he argued that astrology's current popularity rested on a profound need for self understanding, to provide a means to 'assist individuals in the solution of the personal and inter-personal problems, and especially in actualising more fully their birth potential' (1970: xi). Young people in the 1960s and 70s, he argued, 'hope to find in astrology not only answers to their poignant personal problems but even more some sort of inner security' (1970: ix). He continues,

Many of them, having broken away from their family traditions and refusing to participate in a culture increasingly dominated by a de-humanised and de-natured approach to knowledge, to social organisation, and to interpersonal relationships, long to discover their place and function in a more-than-human, universal or cosmic order. They want to know where they "belong", what they "really are" when the ego games are played out.

Thus, when Jane Ridder-Patrick (2000d) stated that, ' If I have any belief in relation to astrology it is that life is meaningful and purposeful, and that astrology has a part to play in illuminating this meaning and purpose' , she may be pointing to astrology' s ability to satisfy a need which is essentially and unavoidably human. For Stephen Arroyo (1975: xv-xvi), this was the key to astrology' s contemporary popularity. He wrote that,

I have often been asked why astrology has witnessed such renewed popularity in recent years. I think part of the answer lies in the fact that Western culture no longer has any viable mythology to sustain it. Myth always serves as a vitalizing force in any culture by showing man' s relationship to a larger, more universal reality. People have always needed a pattern of order to guide their collective lives and to infuse their individual experience with meaning. In this sense astrology comprises within itself an entire mythological framework.

For Greene and Sasportas (1987: xiii), it is this very ability of astrology to provide a framework of meaning that allows it to replace the role once played by the church. They do not claim that astrology has undermined church attendance though, but that the decline in traditional religious affiliation created a vacuum which astrology, and similar world-views, have filled. The issue, then, is not one of rivalry between the two, but of astrology compensating for mainstream Christianity' s failings.

Chapter Summary

Astrology may quite clearly be defined as a religion if an inclusivist definition is applied, but so may science, belief in progress and various political ideologies. The problem then, is that the categorisation of astrology as religion reveals no new information about its cultural identity or its relationship with Christianity. There are additional complications. If, for example, it is defined as magic, as discussed in chapter 8 then, in Durkheim' s view it cannot be religion. Neither does it have a church: if the schools and societies that comprise astrology' s institutional structure are regarded as churches then so may every other school and society. Stark and Bainbridge' s categorisation of astrology as a cult is likewise flawed by their excessively broad

definition of what constitutes a cult. Nevertheless astrology is widely regarded as a religion by etic commentators, and frequently condemned for this very reason.

Therefore, astrology' s own emic statements should be considered. It is clear then, that New Age astrology *sensu stricto*, as defined by Leo and Rudhyar (see chapter 6) rests in a world view which may be considered religious. It relies on a deep numinous awe of the universe and posits a cosmos which is primarily spiritual in nature and is populated by invisible supernatural beings. However, such notions are based on a combination of the Neoplatonic and Hermetic traditions in the west, and Hindu and Buddhist ideas from the east. As Herbrechtsmeier observed, the unresolved problem is whether one may make an etic judgement that these world views are religions, or respect the emic opinions of those who say they are not. The question of whether astrology is or is not a religion, then, is primarily a semantic one which may add nothing new to an understanding of either its content or relationship with New Age culture and Christianity. It has already been noted that Alan Leo' s opinion was that astrology is the coming religion of the New Age. Chapters 11-13 will consider the emic perspective, examining statements first by members of the public and then by astrologers concerning their own attitudes to religion and astrology.

Notes

1. Troeltsch, Ernst, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, 2 Vols., London: George Allen and Unwin 1931.

2. Citing Driver, Christopher, ' Bibles and bazookas' *The Guardian*, 17 May 1969.