Addey, John, *A New Study of Astrology*,
London: Urania Trust 1996

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM OF ASTROLOGY

John Addey only left an outline of what he intended to include in this chapter. The brief account which follows is based as closely as possible on his specific notes and my understanding of his intentions as expressed elsewhere in our numerous discussions over 20 years and his many lectures, summer school seminars and his earlier writings. References to the sources for each of the main points are given at the end of the chapter.

C. H. May 1996

To make astrology credible in the modern world two things are needed:

A) To show that it **is** true in the light of empirical, scientific criteria.

B) To show that, in terms of the soundest philosophical traditions, *i.e.* in terms of the higher reason, astrology **is** a thoroughly rational and intelligible subject.

Both of these approaches are needed. No scientific demonstration of the truth of astrology will be accepted without a coherent account of **how** and **why** it is true. Strictly speaking the "how and why" should come first but in these days science is not open to explanations in truly rational terms but must first be convinced in terms of empirical evidence that astrology appears to be valid.[2]

The problem of demonstrating empirically that astrology is true in essence, if not in every particular detail of its tradition, is complicated by the fact that the "building materials" of which traditional astrology is made up consists of a wealth of seemingly disparate constituent parts. Let us consider[3] some of our astrological building materials.

First and foremost we have signs and houses, planets and aspects; these are supported by such things as rulerships, mid-points, degree areas, etc.etc. and of course various sorts of directions and other predictive techniques.

I said "we have" these things - but have we? Before one can say that one "has" something one must be able to say what it is, describe it, define its limits and if it is made up of parts, say what the parts are.

What then are the **divisions of the ecliptic** - signs for example - are we happy about these? Do we know where we stand? Obviously not, for the Tropical-Sidereal controversy cuts deep; and if you feel no doubts on that score there are plenty of other problems. Our Indian friends, for example, whose testimony we cannot ignore. have numerous other ecliptic divisions, such as navamshas, Lunar Mansions, and so on. If these are valid we are missing something.

The **houses;** no need to labour the uncertainties here. There are plenty of problems about the Quadrant systems; plenty, too, about Equal Houses. What for example is the true difference between Equal Houses from the Ascendant and from the M. C.? And then why not Equal Houses from the Prime Vertical or the East-West Meridian? All must have their symbolism.

But this is only a start. What about cusps as boundaries or centres of houses? And again, Cyril Fagan and others assure us that there are really eight and not twelve houses, and so on.

Aspects seem at first to be definite enough, but they are not really so. Even putting aside the important question of "minor" aspects and glossing over the problem of "orbs" (for which we can do no better than propound quite arbitrary rules which seem "about right") we are still left with the whole problem of *interpreting* aspects. Our rough and ready divisions into "good or bad", or "hard or soft" or "harmonious or inharmonious", is really only serviceable for as long as one does not look too closely at it. In reality, just as each sign is not simply "good" or "bad" but embodies a definite *principle,* so too does each aspect embody a definite principle which can operate to our advantage (even a square) or disadvantage (even the trine). These principles are in need of clear delineation.

So one could go on. One could take each and every factor in use in present-day astrology and show it to be surrounded by a host of uncertainties.

Of course, those who practice astrology must make up their minds how they are going to deal with these uncertainties. They must, and do, adopt whatever plan of practical procedure seems best and most sensible to them and one admires them for this and is grateful that there are those who, despite the difficulties, manage to produce something really worthwhile and of value to their fellows out of this rather patchwork science.

Still, there is a time for taking stock of our deficiencies and for asking ourselves if there is to be found a means of *co-ordinating,*

simplifying and *unifying* some of our present heterogenous conceptions. This is surely the great need of astrology today. For before any science can be truly unfolded so as to realise its full potentialities, it **must be reduced to its fundamental concepts,** to the simple units of which it is really composed. A man who tries to build up a science without first finding the real units with which it is to be built is like a man who must try to build a house out of the rubble from other buildings. Every time he picks up a brick h finds part of another brick sticking to it and probably part of the original brick missing, too, The pieces are the wrong shape and mixed up with other, non-essential elements. They are not flexible enough; they help him but they hinder him at the same time.

As I have suggested in *Harmonics in Astrology*[4], there is reason to think that we are at last in sight of a solution. The evidence would suggest that, apart from the planets themselves. **all astrological effects, such as signs, houses, aspects, midpoints, degree areas, can be understood in terms of the harmonics of cosmic periods,** *i.e.* in terms of Circle, or cycle, and Number, and that these are the fundamental building blocks, with which, when understood, we can construct a systematic and intelligible science of astrology.

The following pages show, using the copious data supplied by the Gauquelins, how this harmonic approach offers a key to astrology as a whole and to unravelling the deeper significance of some of the details of the Gauquelins results in particular.

Prior to that, in the next chapter and again in Chapter Nine and in the text of *Astrology Reborn* (Appendix I) a ground work is set out for helping the reader understand that astrology is in fact a thoroughly rational and intelligible subject in terms of the soundest philosophical traditions, i.e.in terms of the higher reason.

CHAPTER I - NOTES

1. The following three paragraphs are based closely on Notes about the book sent to Neil F. Michelsen of Astro-Computing Services (now Astro-Communication Services) who, with his principle researcher Tom Shanks, had done so much to support John Addey's researches through computer and statistical expertise, and by helping John get to San Diego and housing him whilst he was there. John at that stage was hoping that Neil and his company might be interested in publishing the book.

2. *Astrology: Science or Superstition* by Hans Eysenck and David Nias, published Maurice Temple Smith 1982, appeared shortly almost simultaneously with John Addey's death and was reviewed by Nicholas Kollerstrom in the same Summer 1982 issue, Vol XXIV, No 3, pp 202-3 of the Astrological Association Journal which contained John Addey's obituary notices. Written by Britain's most eminent psychologist the Professor of Psychology at London University and a colleague, it concluded that the work of the Gauquelins had to be taken seriously. Perhaps because it was too recent and difficult to assess in a simple way, the book fails to give serious attention to Addey's work and harmonic theory of astrology, which was a pity. Its courageous, if guarded, stand put down a marker in the orthodox academic world, indicating that astrology should be taken seriously as a field for future study.

3. Most of what follows is adapted from John Addey and Peter Roberts paper, *The Basis of Astrology*, Part 1, Astrological Journal Vol VI, No 3, pp 8-17, Summer 1964, and reprinted in *An Astrological Anthology*, Vol One 195-1970, Edited by Zach Matthews, published by the Astrological Association, London 1995, ISBN 0 9502658 7 X.

4. *Harmonics in Astrology*, by John Addey, published in a new edition by the Urania Trust 1996.

CHAPTER II

Some Philosophical Considerations

A summary of a lecture delivered to the Astrological Association in London, 1 October '81

Only some brief notes survive for this chapter, but we do know that John Addey had intended to devote this section to some philosophical consideration regarding the nature of astrology. Central to this was to have been a presentation of the importance of an understanding of Aristotle's four causes. The following is a transcript with minor additions or John's notes for what was to be one of his last lectures to the Astrological Association in London on 1st October 1981. A fuller working out of these ideas and the philosophical basis of astrology is also given in Chapter IX and in *Astrology Reborn,* which is reproduced as Appendix II.

What is the cause of an astrological effect?

Causality

Aristotle defined four causes:-

1 **Final Cause** - The reason for a thing's existence; the purpose for which it exists, eg in the case of a book, the demand for it or to gratify one's own desire to see oneself in print.

2 **Formal Cause** - The idea behind or substanding a thing; that which makes it what it is. In the case of a book, this would be the subject matter which gives it its shape and content. To produce a "good" book, ie a book which fulfils the purpose for which it exists, the author would have to be thoroughly familiar with the Formal Cause. A sculptor who is commissioned to make a likeness of the god Venus would have to be imbued with the idea of Venus.

3 **Efficient Cause** - That which produces a thing. In the case of a book, the author, typesetter, printer etc.

4 **Material Cause** - In the case of a book, the material out of which it is made.

Each Cause may embody a series of subordinate causes; to take an example:-

Efficient Cause of a book - Author writes the book
The book is typed
The book is typeset
Printer prints it
Publisher markets it

Given that the steps which go to make up an Efficient Cause are in order, the highest step, upon which all the others necessarily depend, will require the most intelligence, and the lowest step will require the least.

It is the job of the Efficient Cause to look at the Formal Cause or unitive idea and split it up into parts so that it may be manifested.

Does a hierarchy of causes apply to the Macrocosm as well?

According to the great sages and philosophers, the same process is indeed evident in the production of the universe. There are always four Causes. The Final Cause can be seen as a Unity or One which expresses Itself through the Trinity of the Formal, Efficient and Material Causes. The One and the Three are evident in all things.

What is the Efficient Cause of the Macrocosm?

Most religions would say the "Divine Creative Intellect" or "Creator Lord". In Greek mythology, Jupiter represents the idea of Divine Creative Intellect. Hindus believe Brahma to be Divine Creative Intellect.

The One and the Three dominate the whole scheme of things; unities continually yield trinities.

From the point of view of Formal Causes, the whole of manifestation is a body of Ideas.

From the point of view of Efficient Causes, the universe is a body of lives and activities; a body of beings engaged in activities who are expressing ideas.

Astrology has retained an understanding of **Formal Causes** as well as Efficient Causes; thus astrologers can think about life in a more satisfactory way than can scientists. Currently, science concerns itself, almost exclusively, with Efficient and Material Causes, and consequently it sees only the tail end of things. For instance, scientists say that the origin of the universe was a "big bang" without bothering to ask themselves the Cause of the "big bang"! Astrology, however, uses a language of symbols designed to cover all aspects of life. It is concerned with expressing **Formal Causes**, which are always, in some sense, ideas.

The hierarchy of Formal Causes begins with the most all-embracing archetypal Ideas and works down to universal Ideas, thence to particular ideas and finally to matter. In a sense, the seeds in nature are the tail end of ideas which are "designed" to **inform** the different species. Every species grows into one of its own members simply because it has a Formal Cause which is absolutely consistent. If we understand Formal Causes, we are able to understand synchronicity.

In the Trinity, the Formal element should be feminine. An all-male Trinity is really disastrous. Such primary Ideas dominate whole civilizations, percolating down through every level of life. Conflict is caused because of the omission of the female element in the Trinity. (The Catholic faith, however, does place emphasis on the female element, ie Virgin Mary.)

The particular events in our lives, no matter how small, continually show us the outworkings of archetypal ideas as symbolized in our charts. Events and our reactions to them do, of course, differ because we are all individuals with particular characteristics and needs, but beyond individual circumstance can be seen the unity of archetypal ideas which the whole of humanity has in common.

In order to consider the action of Efficient Causes, we have to look at the doctrine of substance - the first principle of nature and very illuminating. That which has real being is independent and can act of itself and by itself. There are three substances:-

1 Divine.
2 Human.
3 Natural.

Each of these substances has its own characteristic mode of action.

What kind of substances are the planets?

Plato says in the *Laws* that we are not looking at "lumps of dirt" but spiritual existences of some sort. In order to make up our own minds, we have to ask ourselves with what kind of activity we think we are dealing.

Every kind of substance in the hierarchy of being has its own characteristic action. The natural substances are at the bottom of this hierarchy, ie atoms - compounds - vegetables and animals. As we ascend this scale of being, the ratio of activity to passivity becomes greater; for instance, a snail is passive compared to, say, a cat, but a snail is more active than a cabbage, and so on. The higher we ascend along the scale of being, the higher do we ascend on the scale of substance. The further we go in this chain, the more we see "being done" and the less "being done *to*" a thing.

Human substance

Again, the "higher" type of man has a much higher ratio of activity to passivity. He is a more integrated and diverse being. The "higher" man also has a greater unity of activity; his life is dominated by fewer and simpler ideas. This imparts a coherence to his life which will be notably missing from the life of the "less developed" individual who, on the contrary, has too many aims and objects, many of which are inconsistent with one another.

One of the great paradoxes of action seems to be that the more self contained and interior the activity, the more far reaching are its effects. An activity beginning and ending in the same substance without going outside of itself has a considerably more far reaching effect than one that goes outside of itself. For instance, if we point a gun at someone, we naturally influence them for as long as we continue to hold the gun, but afterwards when we drop the gun, we influence that person negatively, ie they don't like us! The formal activity we have used to influence them is very extrinsic - we have to go outside of ourselves. If we wish to truly influence that person, we are using the wrong method. This applies to the whole scale of human activity, eg a comedian's private interior sense of fun naturally communicates itself to his audience; he isn't forcibly trying to impress.

Taoist text

Shun cultivated the ground. When men had settled on the land at the end of the year, he gave them good land and fishing places. Shun didn't appear to direct the people, but held the principle of virtue firmly in his mind. The reformation of the people was spiritually achieved through his own unswerving state of mind. Certainly, as this goes to show, the power of example is very potent. The more a person acts within themselves, the more are they cultivating their own integrity of being and the more widespread their influence. Action, therefore, is not necessarily a physical thing. The contemplative life, for instance, is a life of action.

The more that substances act within themselves, the more do they become spiritualized. God is the highest substance of all; continually enacting; active in relation to everything; passive in relation to nothing. "He" never goes outside of "Himself" to act and yet sustains the whole universe. Necessarily, "He" has no unused powers. "His" acting begins and ends in "Himself" and is absolutely coincident with "His" very Being. Indeed, the higher the spiritual substance, the more do being and activity become one and the same thing.

The Planets - what kind of activity?

1 They stay within themselves and their influence is very widespread.

2 Are they active or passive in relation to things? Do they "influence" us or do we "influence" them? They "influence" us regardless of whether we are conscious of them or not.

3 Are they continuously enacting or do they run to a timetable? They are continuously enacting - Mars never looks at his watch and says "at 10.15 I'm squaring Jupiter"! They are in a continuous relationship with one another.

It seems correct to conclude from what we have already said that the planets cannot be mere "lumps of dirt". Indeed, if they were, their activity would be less than that of a cabbage, and we would obviously be mistaken in affirming this. The planets, then, are spiritual existences or substances and their influence is universal.