

A SCIENTIFIC RIGOR FOR ASTROLOGICAL RESEARCH AND METHODOLOGY.

Copyright © 1983, 2012 by Karl Hans Welz. All Rights Reserved. No portion of this book may be used without expressed written consent of the author.

Claims that astrology is a science is as old as claims that science is a science while astrology is not. The times when astrology was a serious discipline of the universities (graduate schools) belong to the past. We know that powerful vested interests were the reason that astrology got "expelled" from the university, while other human-behavior related disciplines with much less factual basis than astrology were not. Some of the sciences ceded to be based on mere speculation, such as physics, chemistry, etc. Other "accepted" sciences abound in speculation, such as medicine and psychology. Some astrologers claim that astrology is an "art" more than a science. They compare it to psychology and medicine. We leave it to the reader to decide.

This publication should by no means be understood as an attempt to bring astrology back into the university. In fact, this I personally consider as one of the most stupid things than could happen to astrology. Vested interests and the stupidity of many "academians" on which those vested interests thrive, combined with

greed, will very likely prevent such a return successfully, and this is good so! This is so, because personally, I consider a platform consisting of people who consistently close their eyes to obvious facts (I am talking about universities) not a desirable place for astrology. All I intend to do with this publication is to attempt to create a scientific language of astrology that fits the observable, known and proven facts (or the factual basis) of astrology. The factual basis and the astrological methods that are derived from it are to be reformulated according to principles of general semantics, which are adjusted to the factual basis of this science. Such an attempt may (but needs not to) lead to a better understanding of the phenomena that many call "occult, ESP, etc." (Meanwhile I did exactly this with my theories concerning life force, which too allowed me to explain the reason why there is a statistical correlation between georelative ("geocentric") planetary positions and Solar eruptions). Those phenomena that we think as belonging to a hyperphysical universe of which the relativistically structured space-time-universe of modern physics is nothing but the assumed structure of one of its many sub-spaces.

The human search for structure of what we perceive as phenomena is a never ending process. By this we mean that, regardless what structure, or mapping, you develop in order to explain

a set of phenomena, there will always be found some new discoveries that do not fit your structure, regardless of how nicely it is formulated. Those newly discovered phenomena will point to something beyond that which is familiar to you. A new theory has to be developed, new technologies emerge, and this is one of the mechanisms of progress. Obviously, it is very useful and a prerequisite to true progress if we do not disregard, explain away, or force into known structures new discoveries that do not fit our preconceived structures. In fact, a useful theory should be formulated in such a way that it does lead to new phenomena that do not fit it originally.

Also: Regardless how many structures/mappings are developed for a specific set of facts ("science"), there will always be more mappings that can be found!

Since the attempt to create a scientific language reflects some of my own bias, as well as it emphasizes much of the present-day astrological methods, it is far from being complete. In fact, as we shall see later on, such an attempt can never be complete. The creation of any scientific language should be geared towards the discovery of new basic facts, and certainly not towards the creation of some "absolute truth." Or, if we use a picture that general semantics is using

extensively: our attempt is to create a linguistic map that matches optimally the territory of astrological facts, methods, etc., and which leaves space for continuous adjustments, refinements, changes, “blow-ups” for details, etc., according to the new basic facts that are discovered or the specific field that the map is to describe.

By no means should the creation of such a map be seen as some intellectualistic game. We intend to devise a useful tool that can help us to find new and efficient astrological methods without much creative effort; and that will help us to examine existing methods more efficiently. In brief, such a language should provide us with the benefits that a truly scientific approach can offer.

STATEMENTS ABOUT ASTROLOGY

Note: Update with hand-written notes. Could not read. P. 3

1. By “astrology” we mean a set of methods that have the purpose of describing phenomena and trends on the objective, unspeakable levels; those methods are based on structures of horoscopes, which in turn are based on observable conditions of the planets, Sun, Moon and stars.

2. Therefore, when we practice astrology, we are dealing with several levels of abstractions which should not and cannot be confused with each other:

The observable astronomical structures (planets as observable in the sky in relation to fixed stars, tropical zodiac, place of observation, time of birth or event, etc.)

The mapping of those astronomical observations on a two-dimensional chart, in which mapping is based on methods derived from observed correlations.

The structuring of the mapping. This structuring (aspects, houses, midpoints, etc.) is based on astrological methods.

The process of deriving statements from the structures represented in the horoscope.

The statements made about the event, trend, characteristics of the individual, etc. for which the horoscope is drawn.

The trends, characteristics, etc. as perceived by us on the unspeakable, objective levels.

3. Both the cosmos (2.1) and the trends, characteristics, event, etc., (2.6) are phenomena on the unspeakable, objective levels. Astrological methods are based on correlation between "mappings" of those systems(2.1) and (2.6) which correlation is established by statistical means.
4. Consequently, statements that are derived astrologically (by astrological methods) are formulated in a language of probability and statistical averages.
5. Any confusion of levels of abstraction is to be avoided if we want to avoid the formulating of inadequate methods. The cosmos is not the horoscope; the horoscope is not identical with the astrological method, nor with the event it describes, nor is the cosmos man. All of this seems very obvious, yet those identities

are too often taught blatantly or silently assumed. The statement "what is above is what is below" cannot be understood as an identity, as is often done. At best, it can be considered an operation which may lead us into realms beyond what we perceive as time-space.

6. Astrological methods consist of several mutually dependent structures or mappings. Most important:

the mapping of astronomical data into a horoscopic structure that is useful for the deriving of statements, and

the formulating of statements concerning potentials or trends of individuals/events by use of horoscopic structures. This second mapping is linguistic.

7. Therefore, the main task of the science of astrology is to:

find appropriate and efficient methods of structuring horoscopes, and to

find efficient methods of translating such horoscopic structures into statements that are in a language which is an acceptable "mapping" of the trends, events, individual characteristics, etc.

8. The goal of any astrological method is maximum statistical probability of the statements derived. We have to be aware that, regardless how much we describe events on the unspeakable, objective levels, there will always be characteristics left out. The statistical average of accuracy of statements and the complexity of the method employed should be in a justifiable relation.

9. The purpose of the statements derived by astrological methods is to help the individual by describing trends and characteristics in a way that makes fullest use of such knowledge to the benefit of the individual as possible.

10. A set of statements derived astrologically is comparable to a map for the individual designed to help find the way to go, the path of least resistance, or viable alternatives, in the struggle of life. It is to help prevent potential pitfalls and / or recognize and seize potential opportunities.

11. The statements derived from horoscopes by astrological methods of interpretation are comparable to the general solution of a differential equation (in mathematics). However, while in mathematics, the furnishing of sufficient boundary-values may

lead to a well-defined solution of the differential equation, in astrology we have only the possibility of successively merely approaching what we intend to describe. This process is inherently infinite, since, regardless of how much detail our description may offer, there will always be characteristics left out that our description does not account for. Descriptions, perceived "reality", and the objective, unspeakable levels constitute three different levels of abstraction.

12. In a more commonly understood language: With a statement that we derive from a chart, we describe the potential "process" of a trend. The more we know about the person for whom we describe the trend, the more "content" we are capable of putting into our descriptions of the trend.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT METHODS AND THEORIES.

OR: CAN ASTROLOGY BE SCIENTIFIC?

1. On the one hand, we have "astronomical" structures on the objective, unspeakable levels, as perceived by humans; on the other hand, we have individuals, their characteristics, trends, events, etc., equally on the objective, unspeakable levels, as we perceive (and label) them. Astrology consists of sets of methods that allow us to correlate those two sets of perceived structures. Those methods of correlation allow us to form statements about individuals and their characteristics, trends, events, etc.

In a similar way, for example, nuclear physics proceeds: the perceived sets are there, for instance, observed "macro-cosmic" phenomena, such as the generation of heat in a reactor, and on the other hand, observed phenomena in condensation chambers and other devices that were developed to measure phenomena on sub-atomic levels. Those two sets of perceived structure are brought in relation with each other. Methods of correlation are called "theories". The main criterion of such a theory is

usefulness, i.e. whether it leads to new basic facts and to technologies that can be applied on the “macro-cosmic” levels of human technology. A theory is considered a picture, or map, that has to be continuously adjusted and readjusted to new discoveries. Notions of space-time become irrelevant in the realms of the sub-atomic. Those notions are sometimes regarded as statistical averages resulting from the sub-atomic “events” on the objective, unspeakable levels. We do not know of any method or theory, scientific or otherwise, that would not be based on statistical averages and a language of probability, if such a theory is created to correlate between different sets of perceived structures.

Some mathematical methods, where no claim is made of interrelation between sets of perceived structures, appear as exceptions. Whenever stratification of levels of abstraction (see “Statements About Astrology”; 2.1 to 2.6) is an essential part of the methods, then we have necessarily to deal with statistical averages and a language of probability and uncertainty. We do not know of any abstraction that would not leave characteristics out.

From astrological methods we expect the possibility of making statements about trends, events, individual characteristics, etc., with a very high degree of probability, but accepting the fact that we cannot reach 100% accuracy in our statements. (In a later part of this publication we will talk about the principles of uncertainty.)

2. We do not know of any valid method that would not be derived from a large enough factual basis. In our case of astrology, the factual basis for its methods consists of proven methods of structuring horoscopes in such a way that statements can be derived which are 80% above accurate.
3. Methods that offer less accuracy have in general to make place for methods that offer higher accuracy.
4. The usefulness of a method is generally determined by the needs, structures, characteristics, etc. of a society, culture, time span, epoch, and how the method can meet those needs successfully. Consequently, astrological methods undergo a continuous change, shift, etc., which depends largely on the technical needs, structures, etc., of the societies in question, as

well as the technical means available.

5. This is one of the reasons why discussions and arguments about which one of the astrological methods is the "correct" and "true" one are utterly sterile, irrelevant and nonsensical. Especially will this be the case if such arguments and discussions are based on "papers": verbalisms without content and without backing by experience.

We do not worry too much about "considerations in principle", "according to logic", etc. concerning the correctness of a method. Rather, we are concerned about how we can reach an optimum of accuracy of our statements with a minimum of work involved to derive those statements by astrological means. Any new method should fulfill these criteria according to a method-related scientific rigor, which used random-sampling, not "after-the-fact" proving of the method.

6. In our case of developing astrological methods, the theories that we develop are primarily concerning those methods and how they are tested and formulated. Only of secondary importance are theories about astrology-related structures of what we may

call "universe", or of the space of our human perceptions, in which our everyday life takes place.

7. Any theory that we develop has to relate to its factual basis like the apex of a pyramid to its basis; certainly not the other way around. (Read some 50% of the books peddled by the American Federation of Astrologers and you will know what I mean!)

Furthermore, we expect from a theory that it naturally leads to new basic facts. Consequently, a theory that is only designed to "explain" details of already well known facts does not meet the criteria of usefulness. An astrological theory should contain methods to formulate new methods.

8. When we formulate theories we work with descriptions for what we perceive of the objective, unspeakable levels. Regardless of how much we describe, there will always be characteristics left out. Consequently, we can regard the set of descriptions (which serves us to formulate a theory) as an under-defined system of equations. To the mathematician, a system of equations which is under-defined is a system of equations where there are more unknown factors than there are equations. In our case, there will always be less descriptions than "unknowns" (characteristics left

out). A mathematical system of equations which is under-defined offers infinite possibilities of solutions. At best, we have a set of mutual relations between the various unknowns. In our case, we can formulate an infinite amount of theories, all of which will meet our criteria of usefulness.

9. We can view what we call "objectivity" as the subjectivity of a body or group of persons that have a set of thought-patterns in common which set relates this "objectivity". A group in this meaning may be a scientific body, a sociological body, a church or, at its lowest and most general level, what we call "the masses". Since neuro-linguistic environments are to be viewed as environments (you perceive what you label, and according to how you label it you will "objectively" describe it) we can distinguish between several strata and qualities of "environment" which depend on the various bodies of people relating to it, perceiving it, describing it, etc. Consequently, and infinite amount of "objectivities" may be constructed.

Objectivity is often understood as something "absolute" or "absolutely logical", which follows from what has just been said. Since we have an infinite number of available ways of forming

theories, we do not know of any way to formulate something "absolute", something "absolutely logical", "absolutely true". "Absolute" in relation to what? All too often, a scientific, clerical, political, juridical, etc. body prescribes what is to be accepted as "objective reality". They play "guardian of the absolute". Generally, such bodies show very little inclination to accept facts that for some reason do not match their "objectivity", unless forced to do so. They are equally reluctant to tolerate the objectivities of other groups. Their group-subjective consciousness does not want to be upset by such "illogical thought". Blackmail, legalizing and holy wars seem more "logical" to them.

10. Institutionalized religions is "objective" to brainless masses whose linguistic structures (neuro-linguistic environment) is at such a primitive level that it precludes any higher degree of mass- (group-) subjectivity.
11. The primitive levels of linguistic structures of masses explain why mystified astrology has such a great amount of followers, no matter how primitive the teachings of such an "astrology" actually are. The better such astrology will be

accepted, the more it adjusts to the structures and implications of our everyday language, which are reflecting primitive-made metaphysics of approximately 300 B.C.

12. The better such an astrology adjusts to the Judeo-Christian thinking, which itself is structured similar to our linguistic structures (of everyday language), the more "logical" and "objective" such (adjusted) astrology will appear to the simple-minded person who grew up in a Judeo-Christian (linguistic) environment.

13. The scientist, on the other hand (the scientist which is sanctioned by "academia"), who loves to disparage anything that does not fit his narrow scientific logic, who loves to put down everything that threatens to allow a glimpse beyond his narrow pictures of the world (and beyond the neurotic environment of the university), this scientist loves to measure astrology at its lowest level, and his judgment about astrology will be accordingly. Such stupidity compares to saying our days: "Since Leonardo da Vinci failed when trying to fly, aeronautics is impossible, and the cranks that try to cross the ocean in aeroplanes are suffering under illusions. Those persons are

victims of a hoax.”

14. In order to become more familiar with the problems of mystified astrology and to prevent its pitfalls as well as we can do, it will be useful to give a short account of how astrological methods have develop and also an account of how mystifications could sneak in.

We may assume with reasonable probability that first some rhythms in nature were observed. The seasons are obviously in relation to the position of the Sun and to the sky as it is seen at night. Then, also quite obvious are the tides in relation to the Moon. Growth of plants depended on the seasons, hence on the Sun. Further observation may have led to a correlation between the Moon and the growth of plants, maybe a precursor of our moon-sign planting. Obvious was the connection between the Moon and the menstrual cycle.

Also obvious must have been changes in mood depending on the phases of the Moon. To a person with hardly any artificial light, a Full Moon night appears much more different to a New Moon night than it would to a person from our times. Those persons

who watched the sky, the nightly sky, soon noticed that some of the stars are moving in relation to the other stars. Those were the planets. Could their position in the sky indicate something too? Growth of plants? Character of humans? Fate of nations? Yes, they did indeed.

A useful method of prediction evolved. All you needed to know were the cycles of the celestial bodies, and you were capable of telling what may happen. However, soon began a process that is too familiar to humans: Human imagination speculated way beyond the observable and provable methods. What the first astrologers saw they formulated in their language, whose structure necessarily reflected the metaphysical system of their times. Theories were created which were based on identification, confusion of orders of abstraction, elementalistic structures, etc. Cyclic recurrences in planetary movements soon found a counterpart in – purely imaginary – “cycles” on the human level (still used by quite a few of the “sanctioned” astrologers!); planets were personified, Gods were created, and the cult of the stars became a viable source of income. Nowadays, the indiscriminately used term “energy” stands for the old gods. On the other hand, planetary spirit-worlds are keeping many minds

busy. (We talk about the primitive concepts of that kind.)

15. We should not forget that speculations of such a kind are primarily based on a deficient linguistic mapping of the perceived objective levels. Such language is structured according to insufficient knowledge, distorted human perception, gross generalizations, and the socio-economic backgrounds of the humans who “developed” the language, or, better, in whose society the language evolved into what it is nowadays.

16. Consequently, speculations that are derived from a factual basis which is described by and squeezed into a primitive-made linguistic mapping (linguistic structures) will necessarily carry the implications which are contained in such a mapping.

17. The modern astrologer, therefore, has to learn to create a linguistic structure that matches the factual basis of astrology – not the other way around, as has been done and is still done. The forming of this linguistic structure that adjusts to the facts had to follow a scientific rigor comparable to the scientific rigor in other sciences. Old metaphysics will then be discarded as soon

as the newer methods produce better results.

18. In creating an appropriate linguistic structure for astrological methods, as well as in formulating astrological theories, we have to be extremely careful. Existing astrological theories, explanations, methodology, etc., abound of speculations that are in the main based on primitive metaphysics and that are often derived from implications of inadequate linguistic structures. Since such speculations are in the main based on the use of the tool of everyday language, those speculations appear as utterly "logical", and objective, especially for those person who are not aware of the impact that the linguistic structures have on their perception and sense of what is supposed to be objective. Speculations of that kind have a similar impact as religious doctrines that are based on similar structures.

19. Modern knowledge and science proved any such "objectivity" as described above obsolete and plainly misleading. We know that the "objective", similarly the "absolute", is unreachable, and we question the validity of the term itself: We do not know of any "proof" of the "absolute" or some

“objectivity” outside or besides the proofs that are brought forward and which are based on misleading linguistic structures. On the other hand, we do not know of any objectivity that would be valid outside the factual basis, structural framework, etc. that builds its basis and outside the theories that are connected with that specific objectivity, and outside of the specific group of individuals that developed such objectivity. Objectivity can be regarded as a statistical average or a tool for people who are interested to have a common ground of some sort, be it scientific research, vested interests, political power, clerical power, or any other common base.

20. The astrologer, in this situation, has the choice of either developing his own objectivity that matches the scientific goals for himself and other astrologers whose aim is to develop the science as far as they are capable as human beings; or he may accept without criticism any ideas, “system”, and what not brought forward, as long as the promoter of such a system abides by some social “taboos” laid down by some groups of vested interests, as long as he shows some (usually after-the-fact) “explanation”, and as long as he just repeats “astrology is good”. This is precisely the position of most “professional” bodies

of astrologers, such as the AFA. It's amusing how those same people then cry that blues because there are so many people who, rightfully, say that such an "astrology" is not a science.

The modern astrologer may stay stuck with all of the rigidified, mystified, obsolete, "modern", and what not methods that are still somewhat useful; or he may decide to create a scientific astrological language that takes into account the factual basis that astrology has to offer (a very large one, indeed), to formulate this factual basis properly and to adjust the newly created astrological language to the facts that it describes – and by no means the other way around.

21. We have already pointed out, and we find it useful to repeat it again right here in this connection, that only a language that is adjusted to the factual basis can be basis for a theory that fulfills the criteria of usefulness, to lead effortlessly to new basic facts and methods. The author had proof of this on several occasions. If, on the other hand, we disregard scientific rigor and adjust the facts to the existing linguistic structures, then "popularized" concepts of "modern science" find an easy entry in those astrological methods, explanations of how it works, etc.

Astrology then can be viewed as explained in past-century scientific concepts, and all of that is “logical and objective” to the average collegian who is not capable of thinking in more advanced terms. For others there is the whole array of “mystical” explanations that satisfy those persons’ intellectual structures. As nice as such pictures are, and as readily as these methods are accepted by most astrologers, I do not know of any instance where such a general attitude lead to significant innovations.

22. Here we see that it is not “objectivity” nor any “mystical insights” or what not that is responsible for the incredible mess of pseudo-esotericisms, half-truths, misled systems, etc. that are choking any scientific attempt in astrology nowadays. The basis of this dilemma are linguistic implications, structures, “system-functions” that are based on socio-economic conditions, pre-scientific thought and metaphysics of approximately 500 B.C.

The fact that scientifically totally untrained persons are writers, promoters, representatives, “researchers”, etc. of astrology does

not help that unfortunate situation one bit.

23. As long as the neuro-linguistic environments and linguistic structures of the “history-making” groups (those who have the de-facto power of decision) are not adjusted to a modern factual basis; as long as those linguistic structures are not scientific in a present-day meaning of the word, and as long as those linguistic structures stay rigidified by the shackles of an antiquated language; this long we have to expect failure of any and all attempts to reform socio-economic structures, any attempt of true reform of scientific method (beyond reforming what’s useful for greed), and any attempt of introducing an all-pervading humanism. Even when the basic theories of such an attempt may be formulated usefully, those theories will soon be taken over by persons whose thinking is still structured in antiquated ways. New theories will be re-adjusted to the old linguistic structures, consequently accepted by a broader segment of the population, fall from its original reformist, innovative state. The final result will be some “technical” progress, a shift within the old structure, no progress. A paralinguistic attitude and theory is to develop that is capable to encompass as many linguistic structures as possible. It has to be developed, since none of the

“old linguistic structures” or “objectivities” take into account their own difference from each other. I do not know of any of those structures that would not have included some kind of scientific (or other, similarly structured) positivism, finalism, causalism, and many other untenable implications.

24. We see a potential of developing a para-linguistic attitude in a scientifically developed and formulated astrology.
25. The neuro-linguistic environments can be regarded as a result of socio-economic conditions. On the other hand, the neuro-linguistic environments have impact upon the character of a person in the sense that a person “sees or perceives what he or she has labels for”, which labels in turn are in accordance with the neuro-linguistic structures. This includes as well illusionary logical systems, even illusions. The structure of character and neuro-linguistic structures in turn accept as “logical”, “objective”, and what not, the socio-economic conditions and situations from which those structures developed in the first place. If there are definite problems within those socio-economic conditions, then some “minor adjustments” are generally believed to make everything work again just fine. A generally accepted error (or

“truth”) that started many failed reforms, even revolutions; a generally accepted attempt of a solution that in no case known (historically) produced any significant results.

26. It may be interesting to mention that the implications of those socio-economic conditions as reflected in linguistic structures and neuro-linguistic environments (whether perceived or unperceived) are “logically” pervading even the most evolved scientific terminologies that we know. Even methodological structures are reflecting those socio-economic conditions in a similar way as they are reflected in the religious belief-systems, dogmas, etc. (which, of course, are on a more primitive linguistic level than the scientific ones). Whenever the socio-economic conditions change, very soon linguistic structures change, and with it there will be a shift in scientific formulation-processes, methodology; and in religious belief-systems, all of which adjust very soon to the new conditions. A careful, para-linguistic study of history will bring hundreds of examples: in science as well as in the every shifting doctrines, dogmas, beliefs, practices, etc. of even the most “traditional” ones of the religions. We have to point out here that we talk only of minor shifts within every similar basic structures of language. If shifts take place due to

such minor changes, you may anticipate much more significant shifts when a major linguistic change should occur (and change in socio-economic conditions); maybe a reason why there is so much antagonism against anything new.

27. When we use astrological methods, then we have the goal of describing individual characteristics, trends, potentials of events, etc. Similar to the perceived characteristics, trends, etc., the descriptions show an infinite dimensionality. Regardless of how many descriptions we can derive about an individual, for instance, we will always find new things to describe about this individual. The process of deriving descriptions by astrological means is not exhaustive. In this process, we attempt to narrow down the description of every dimension (characteristic) of what we describe (the individual) to a "useful interval". By "useful interval" we mean an amount of description of some characteristic that we can work with. Usefulness in this context has to do with the relation of such a description to the organism as a whole, as well as it has to do with a certain field that we want to describe. Take an example: Say we have a conjunction of Mars and Saturn. Tempted to say "you have a very strong, marked, evil will, cruelty, and show extraordinary effort in

achieving what you want to achieve..." Answer of your client's wife: "How can you say that? My husband is quite gentle, nice, likes beautiful things, etc..."

Where is Mars conjunct Saturn? Sixth house: Well, then it counts mainly in connection with services given and received, capability of hard work, and perhaps a "slave-driver". Statements have to be related to their proper context within the organism as a whole. It may even be that your client has a period of being very meek. Relating such statements to the time-factor (or dimension of time) is utterly helpful. You will then find the times when a certain characteristic is more – or less – pronounced.

28. If you consider this dimensional relatedness within the organism as a whole, in which context statements make sense. Especially if you consider this relatedness in connection with the dimension of time (by relating statements to time-intervals), then the advantage of astrology over any other discipline that has as a goal to describe human characteristics, becomes quite obvious. Not only can you describe certain characteristics, but you can as well relate them to the dimension of various – well determinable – time intervals. Relating those characteristics to

definite time-intervals shows those characteristics in their various intensities and mutual interaction with other characteristics, all of which is shifting depending on the time-interval to which it is related.

29. Therefore, whenever you want to describe certain characteristics of an individual valid for the "present" (in which you are advising the individual), you take not only into account the "birth-chart", which gives the more general, overall structures of the individual, but you have as well a chart for this "present" time, which gives you the prevailing characteristic at this present time-interval. Psychological, and other, methods are capable of that, too. Astrological methods are ahead of those other methods due to the fact that potential developments of trends can be predicted, since astrological methods can determine horoscopic structures (from which statements are derived) for any given interval of time. Not only will, if astrological methods are used, a prognosis of the development or outcome of, say, a psychological treatment of a person be more within reach than when merely using the guesswork available to psychologists; but it is also possible to determine the trends that are favorable to the treatment (and can be used

to enhance it), and those trends that may be detrimental to the treatments (and should be dealt with in advance, so the outcome of the treatment will not be jeopardized).

30. Since the "organism-as-a-whole" concept of astrology includes the dimension of time, and since it relates the description of characteristic, trends, potential events, etc. to well-defined intervals of time, astrology has the potential of adjusting to reality better than any other science that we know of, which as the goal of describing similar human characteristics.

In order to be scientific, astrology has to employ a language of statistical averages and (maximally reachable) probabilities. It is unfortunate, but true, that astrologers will only employ such a language when forced to do so. In this respect they act similar to the representatives of other, less efficient, representatives of "humanistic sciences", such as psychologists, etc. The difference lies in the fact that most astrologers do not have any formal training in scientific method, while most psychologists, and others, think that they do. Since astrology includes (successfully!) the dimension of time in the statements that are derived by its methods, it is necessarily much more reality-

adjusted, hence efficient and scientific, than any other science that attempts to describe characteristics of humans.

Consequently, it is easy to understand why such a host of vested interests is (successfully in some respect) attempting to prevent astrology from being accepted more “officially” – regardless of its enormous factual basis. Any dumb person can become a psychologist, provided he or she spends the money for tuition and time is not important, either. Eventually those persons for whom time and money are no obstacles receive a “paper” that allows them to do their “job”, regardless what. Not so for the astrologer whom they persecute (with good reason). If he fails, he has no “paper” that tells that he is good, no “academic credentials” of any kind. If he fails, he has no “paper” that tells that he is good, no “academic credentials” of any kind. If he fails, he is out of the scene. He loses his customers.

31. Knowing of his incapability to include the factor of time in a satisfactory manner, the “academic psychologist” has no other means but to lobby against a potential competitor whose methods will prove superior. Since a host of other vested interests, such as churches, socio-economic mechanisms of suppression, the medical profession, politics, and others are

"helpful", "academia" is successful over reason and scientific evidence.

32. Even though we may be justified in assuming that astrological structures may someday be used in order to reach new basic facts of ancillary sciences, such as psychology, the present day state of the science justifies in no way such guesses. Astrological structures are not yet mapping sufficiently other sciences, nor is astrology itself sufficiently mapped linguistically (if it was, we would not write a book about it). If there is inadequate mapping, then any deduction concerning those other sciences by means of astrology would be misleading. That some astrologers succeeded in incorporating psychological findings into their astrological system, and to use it with a certain amount of success is not "proof" that "everything is found in the structure of the cosmos", and it is especially not reason to squeeze "cosmic structures" into psychological methods. I do not know of cases where those new deductions proved to be useful. I know of several cases where those new methods proved not useful, and the author simply claimed his deductions "esoteric", "more advanced", etc. in order to escape statistical testing. Using "cosmic structures" in the way described here, i.e. to "logicize"

new psychological systems, is similar to using an antiquated linguistic logic in order to describe phenomena of modern physics.

33. However, if a horoscopic structure is sufficiently adjusted to a factual basis relating to a useful field of psychology, such structures may constitute a "mapping" of this factual basis, from which there may be the potential to develop some kind of "horoscopic theory" as a method to reach new ways of interpreting in the context of that psychological field, as well as a method to discover new basic facts. Such a "horoscopic theory" based on proper "horoscopic mappings" may then have a similar function as linguistic formulations, mapping, and theories have. Once such mappings are developed, then more mutual assistance between astrology and the science in question may develop. Astrology serves then as a method to develop "linguistic mappings and theories" of the sciences in question. Such an attempt has been successfully made in correlating sun-spot activities as they are perceived by humans in correlation with geocentric, tropical-zodiac-based, astrological structures.

34. At present, the claim of some astrologers that “all of modern psychology is written in the cosmos”, and “that the ancients laying out the cosmos knew already all about modern astrology”, and similar claims can only be regarded as gross generalizations that prove nothing but utter ignorance of facts by the persons uttering such nonsense.

35. For those astrologers it may be much more useful to actually learn first some of those sciences (truly learning, not on the level of popularized “college-science”), then adjust the readings to those new facts, and then gradually develop a horoscopic mapping based on correct horoscopic formulating. You adjust the horoscopic structures to the new scientific findings, not the other way around. To adjust the new scientific findings to primitive-made horoscopic structures, that, like everyday language, reflect implications, belief structures, etc. of the times in which those structures developed.

36. Under this aspect it becomes evident that we have to reject presently existing attempts of seeing in “the cosmos” (in this kind of statements the level of abstraction “cosmos” – on the unspeakable, objective levels – is confused with what we

perceive as cosmos, and, ultimately, with the horoscopic structured into which we are mapping our perception of the cosmos, which, itself, is oriented toward the statements we want to derive (we have to do with three different levels of abstraction – at least – which are all identified) some kind of “world formula”. If we say that horoscopic structures – as used today – reflect socio-economic circumstances and metaphysics (of a primitive kind) of the time when they were developed and belonging to the person and cultural background of that person who developed them, then we can say that we can find such socio-economic structures in those structures, and that whatever we deduct when we use such horoscopic structures as linguistic mapping, will necessarily be in accordance with the metaphysical, socio-economic, etc. implications inherent in those structures. It is not surprising, then, that the “world-formulas” derived from horoscopic structures, naturally lead to an antiquated world-view, which proves utterly useless in a more advanced time. Horoscopic structures, as mappings, neither offer “world-formulas” nor “formulas that describe the individual”. Horoscopic structures are mapped according to what we know about the world, about individuals. Many characteristics had to be left out in those mappings due to criteria of efficiency or

simply because those characteristics were unknown or not formulated at the time and to the persons who developed such structures. To assume "world formulas" or "individual formulas" in horoscopic structures is very similar to assume that by merely "organizing the words of our language, studying the words and structure of our language, etc. you reach all of the facts of modern physics, chemistry, medicine, and what not... and all without the need of experiments, without the need of creating new scientific languages that adjust to new facts that experiments yield without readjusting or even dropping old linguistic structures... philosophers have made such attempts – for millennia – with no achievement, while experimental science is achieving. Even though philosophers are continuously using new scientific achievements, they still consider their way of word-juggling for "world-formulas" as appropriate. "Progress" in philosophy is usually happening after progress in experimental sciences. It's merely an adjusting of the "philosophical hunting for the snark". Philosophy of this kind can be regarded as a result of identification of the unspeakable, objective levels with the perceived levels with the linguistic levels. Within the framework of such identification, experiments and search for new basic facts appear "logically" (of course!) useless and

unnecessary. There are quite a few “philosophers” among modern astrological authors. Some of them strongly promoted by the “professional body” of the AFA.

37. Horoscopic structures are designed to make possible the delineation of descriptions of potentials of events, trends, characteristics of individuals, etc. according to the structures which were the basis for the development of those horoscopic structures. As we point out, horoscopic structures are representing the socio-economic circumstances, the “metaphysics” (closely connected and mostly derived from the socio-economic circumstances), the linguistic structures, religious background (actual/official and hidden religion), etc. Those structures, in brief, are reflecting “the world” (or society) in which they were created. In order to become modern and scientific, we have to assume a “paralinguistic attitude” with respect to horoscopic structures and astrological methods, and adjust those structures and languages to modern facts. Many of the generally accepted methods of delineation, structuring of horoscopes, methods, etc. may need revision: especially those which obviously are still stuck in primitive metaphysical concepts, and similar linguistic structures as implied by our

everyday language.

38. Attempting this, there will be the problem that astrology as it is seems "logical" to the person who is used to everyday language and its silent assumptions, implications, identifications, elementalism, etc.; in brief, astrology as it is is "logical" to most practicing astrologers, just as much as church teachings are more "logical" to the unsophisticated person that has the neuro-linguistic environment of a primitive-made language structure than any scientific method that is based on more advanced linguistic structure. Primitive language is what preachers are thriving on. Primitive linguistic structures are also what astrological quacks (including their "professional" societies" are thriving on. Since they are incapable of thinking in other logics, they necessarily hate whatever is beyond their narrow objectivities.

39. It becomes quite obvious now that astrological methods have to undergo some very important and radical structural changes if astrology is to become a science in the meaning of the word valid in our times.

40. At present, I do not know of any astrological theory, method, etc. that would not grossly violate scientific rigor in many essential points. This happens much more so than in so-called "accepted" sciences, since most astrologers lack scientific training. They are hopelessly stuck within their own linguistic structures (of a language that is based on 2000-years-Old metaphysical assumptions) , and, consequently, in a similar neuro-linguistic environment, which is their "objectivity". The "professional bodies" and "associations" representing those astrologers are composed of similarly untrained people. If you have to deal with the problem of stupidity in more sophisticated, "academic" association, you may well imagine what will meet you at professional associations composed of people who hardly have any scientific training at all, just "good practice" ... Many astrologers are novelists, mystics, or just "good practitioners with routine". No wonder that less scientific trends (generally the theory relates to its factual basis, like the basis of a pyramid to its apex) have such a tight grip on astrological methods and theories. The present scientific situation of astrology would well compare to talking about "demons" when talking about energies in the realm of modern physics.

41. If astrology is to become a science, then the first step towards it is to be made by the astrologers themselves. Waiting till "academia" or some other vested interest group "gets enough insight" to accept astrology is obviously futile. Astrology has to develop a viable methodology and scientific structure without the dead weight of transcendentalistic nonsense that emanates from primitive made linguistic structures.

42. However, here it is necessary to stress the fact that even in the case of "classical" astrology we have a very powerful method of describing trends, events, characteristics of person, etc. The methods are still working, just a similar way as in order to build some mechanical device you do not necessarily need to be knowledgeable in modern physics. (It would help, so, in many instances!) Sometimes you hear people say that astrology is nonsense. A method, or a tool, is not nonsense. People talking disparagingly about astrology generally blind themselves to any facts. They either have some vested interest (sometimes unconsciously) that does not allow them to accept astrology (such as psychologists), or they are brainwashed and conditioned by some religious interests, or by "academia"; or they have some serious problems of a psychological nature that

forces them to blind themselves to facts, or they are plain stupid, and, being intellectual morons, do not really know what they say. It may be interesting to mention that there are still people around who think that man never landed on the Moon, and all the TV reports are a well pulled-off hoax. There are others around who believe in "creationism" against any fossil evidence, and some more...

Principles of General Semantics Applied in Astrology.

1. We have demonstrated that the main goal of astrological research is to develop methods of finding descriptions of characteristics, trends, potential events, etc. of individuals.
2. Therefore, the principle criterion concerning astrological methods (and astrology as a science) is its usefulness, which is measured on the accuracy of the descriptions, predictions, etc. derived by means of astrological methods. Whether astrological methods, their use, or astrology as a whole fit the various objectivities of groups, professional associations, churches, vested interests, etc. is completely irrelevant. Likewise, irrelevant is any "proof" or "disproof" of astrological methods which is based on anything else but usefulness. Just remember, there have been times when "honorable scientists" who knew nothing but "papers" written within the neurotic atmosphere of "academia" disregarded any evidence and kept disproving the possibility of aviation, trains, meteorites, and what not. They disproved on "logical principles" rather than based on raw experience. Even though their successors of our present times are riding trains, driving

cars, flying airplanes and what not, their blindness and stupidity did not change much. It merely shifted. Soon, those people will need to use computers so they will be in a better position to keep up with everything that they have to “disprove”. “...beware of scientists whose main goal is to disprove the creations of others rather than producing their own...”

3. Since we have many methods in astrology that proved useful, it will be good to find a common structure that encompasses as many of those methods as possible; furthermore, to find appropriate processes of developing new methods and a rigor for checking newly developed methods.

4. Our aim, to develop a scientific language for astrology following the principles of general semantics, has the obvious advantage that, perhaps for the first time in the history of astrology, the attempt is made to create a “map of the science” (language describing the factual basis and methods of astrology) that optimally approximates the “territory” of established facts and useful methods.

5. The language used to formulate the factual basis should contain a minimum of silent assumptions, implications, structures of primitive metaphysics, etc. For this reason, the existing language with its grammar, syntax, etc., all of which is based on primitive metaphysical structures, is unsuited as long as it is not modified for the purpose.
6. Optimally, the language used should simply describe what is to describe. However, we have to be aware that such “congruence” of map and territory cannot be reached – it would imply an identity of the two, which, of course, is non-existent.
7. However, we can continuously adjust the scientific language that we are creating to the facts as they are established. Such a continuous adjustment of the “map” of language to the “territory” of factual basis can be built into the language as a (formative) characteristic.
8. Such adjustment will once and for all prevent the mapping process “the other way around” – as it happens in many sciences nowadays – we will, therefore, no longer be tempted

to force the facts into an existing, deficient language. Such a process would eventually yield completely distorted speculations as we have demonstrated already elsewhere.

9. If new characteristics, basic facts, etc. of the "territory" are used to expand the structural characteristics of the "map", we will also no longer be tempted anymore to simply ignore new basic facts simply because they do not fit our existing linguistic mapping, hence, are necessarily seen as "not logical" within the framework of this mapping of language – a mechanism that happens very often with most scientific innovations.

10. If we are in possession of such a linguistic mapping – or tool of research – then we will reduce to a very minimum the primitive methods of "trial and error". In addition, the creating of such a scientific language that is based on the known facts, is the surest way out of most moralistic, religious, etc. implications which are embedded within the existing linguistic structures, but which have no relation to modern scientific objectiveness.

11. In our search for astrological methods we are evaluating the factual basis that is available. This factual basis consists in the main of statistical correlations between horoscopic structures and descriptions of characteristics, events, trends, etc.
12. In general, we are formulating the factual bases as much as we can with undeniable negative premises. From those undeniable negative premises we then can deduct generally valid laws – and methods.
13. The undefined term “order” (understood as an in-between-ness) is extremely important in astrology, and in the formulation of astrological methods, principles, facts, etc. Meaningful methodology is as unthinkable without “order” as is meaningful interpretation according to one or the other of the astrological methods.
14. The multi-ordinality is apparent in horoscopic structures (and the creation of those) as well as it is of extreme importance when statements are formulated in connection with the various fields of life experience that are examined.

The multi-ordinality of the horoscopic factors (planets, aspects, etc.) by far exceeds the multi-ordinality of general linguistic terms (words) used in the formation of statements. Appropriate relating of multi-ordinate terms is a skill in astrology to be achieved.

15. Similar to any other science, in astrology too we try to get by with a very minimum of undefined terms, and not with a maximum of them such as in metaphysics of "philosophy". Those undefined terms we have to state explicitly. Therefore, when formulating an astrological methodology, we will not begin with "define your terms", but with "state your undefined terms". Those terms should be the simplest of our experience (such as "order", which is understood as in-between-ness). We expect from a theory that it accounts for all the known relevant facts, and that it can constitute the linguistic basis (logical-linguistic basis) that leads to new basic facts. Such new basic facts then can be verified by scientific rigor, experimentation, statistical evaluation, etc.

16. Undefined terms have to do with assumed structures, which constitute the "metaphysics" of the system. Undefined

terms cannot be viewed as “axioms” in the convenient meaning of the word. Existing languages contain undefined terms. Those, too, constitute the “metaphysics” of the system. If more people were aware of this fact, they would also be aware that the ‘metaphysics” implied by the undefined terms of everyday language are those of approximately 500 B.C. Consequently, operating with such a linguistic structure will necessarily yield results whose structure is more in accordance with “mappings” of reality belonging to the metaphysics, scientology, etc. of approximately 500 B.C., which constitute a significantly different objectivity than the objectivities of modern science.

17. Any kind of elementalism (“space and time”, “body and soul and spirit”, etc.) also belongs to objectivities of antiquated linguistic structures that came from deficient (more deficient than nowadays) pictures/mappings of the world, which are rigidified in our everyday languages. Such linguistic elementalism implies splits which cannot be observed anywhere. Those splits may have been developed on a distorted socio-economic-biological background, and ensuing unhealthy neuro-linguistic environments. It would go

beyond the scopes of this publication to go more into detail about those mechanisms. However, we will bring the example of the elementalistic split of "space" and "time". Those terms are still widely used (in their elementalistic connotation) by the general public, and, alas, astrologers, most of whom are simply lacking the scientific background to know better. For those groups the terms "space" and "time" – elementalistically understood – constitute part of their neuro-linguistic environment, hence "objectivity". When astrologers make "philosophical" speculations based on their "science", then they necessarily use those terms elementalistically, and reach quite "remarkable" results in terms of "akashic records", "karma", "cause and effect", etc. Now, let's look at the science of physics. Minkowski clearly recognized that "space" and "time" never have been observed separately. Hence, he created the term "space-time" which reflects reality non-elementalistically. Once this term was introduced, a new generation of physicists was capable of making tremendous breakthroughs and up to then unheard of advances within a relatively short period of time. With this term space-time, new implications developed which reflected the objective

levels considerably better than the old elementalistic terms.

18. With our leaning towards the "old" linguistic structures, we are inclined to make non-elementalistic terms into elementalistic ones, or at least to understand them in an elementalistic way. At the same time, as a new generation of physicists made significant breakthroughs, not only writers of "popularized" science attempting to "explain" then new science to a broader public using elementalistic terms basically, often not understanding the new structures themselves, but a whole new generation of others arose: philosophers, astrologers, occultists, psychologists, etc. All of them preyed on the new terms. They began to use the new, non-elementalistic terms in an elementalistic way.

The successes of physics helped them to "add credibility" as soon as they used the well-known terminology. They added a new element to their speculations which were still stuck within the framework of obsolete linguistic structures, regardless of how "modern" the newly used terms appeared. The past 50 years brought a lot of "four-dimensional" nonsense within the realm of the occult, philosophy,

psychology, etc.

19. Whenever implied limits of a science begin to show up, then the used non-elementalistic should be replaced with new ones which are more adjusted to the new circumstances and facts, or the existing non-elementalistic terms should be expanded (if replacement with new terms is not needed). This grammatical-syntactical adjustment (of a scientific language) can be achieved by means of certain technical means of notation. This notation makes apparent the multi-ordinality of those non-elementalistic terms, and refers them to the shifting circumstances in the course of the development of a science.

20. In old times, we assumed that statistical laws were laws with exceptions. Such an assumption was conditioned by our handling of macroscopic events and perceived structures within the space-time-limits of "direct" perception. Nowadays we analyze such macrocosmic events, trends, correlations, etc. in terms of microscopic and sub-microscopic events (perceived structures). The statistical laws become accurate laws, not for individuals but for groups of individuals. Since

we are abstracting in different orders, we deal only with statistical data, mass-effects of various "packages" ("packets") of nervous stimulation, which may be best illustrated by the different limits of stimulation in different nervous tissues.

The processes of the higher centers, which are more remote from the exterior world, deal with a specific material. No longer with statistical data of packages of average values, but with what we use to call inferences, inductions, etc.

21. But, as we have already demonstrated, probability became a fully developed mathematical discipline, which did definitely not have much affect on our primitive-made macrocosmic metaphysics and language (linguistic structures). In this content we have to mention that the highest activities of our nervous centers are based on statistical data (statistical averages) which are furnished by the lower centers. So we see that, to the best of our present knowledge and the world around us, a modern structural and semantic outlook on science and life has to be based on statistical averages and a language of probability. Any one of the "old", more rigid

outlooks proved to be misleading – in methodology as well as in practical results of methods.

22. From the previously mentioned follows that there are no possible “absolute” meanings of “space” and “time” beyond the relations which are established by measurements. Since those measurements are necessarily based on statistical averages, any postulate of “the absolute” becomes meaningless.

23. “Action-by-contact” may be regarded as an undefined term based on our own structural results of measurements. Such measurements are mostly understood and evaluated in a “more-or-less” anthropomorphical manner. If there is apparently any action which was “not produced by contact”, we will fall back to the fact that, up to now, we know of nothing that would not imply “action by contact”. Based on this, we will then find new structures of space, new methods of measuring, new models of space, whenever such action by contact is not immediately apparent. Action by contact seems an anthropomorphic structuring that is more basic than concepts of space-time. New models of space-time, when

becoming necessary, will then point to realms beyond the "relativistic" space-time-continuum, which mechanism is corroborated by our sunspot activity research.

24. The establishing by the principles of "action-by-contact" as more basic than conceptual structures of "space-time", the establishing of an infinite-valued determinism understood as an expanded principle of cause-effect which then becomes non-elementalistic, the establishing of a language of statistical averages that operates with the principles of uncertainty, etc. may ultimately lead to a structuring of astrological methods in the direction of a modified form of "theories of planetary influences". However, such theories will necessarily remain without the up-to-now postulated astrological determinism in its stricter sense. The goal of establishing such theories will not be rigidification of method, but expanding the usefulness of new methods that will be found on the basis of such theories.

25. The "astronomical" phenomena as well as characteristics of person, events, trends, etc. and the methods of correlating them, are part of the unspeakable, objective levels. In the

astrological process (methods) a limited, yet indefinite amount of characteristics is described. The choice of which one is to be described is based on usefulness and importance for human beings. It is an arbitrary choice which, however, will later on be more determined by whatever (in the beginning not necessarily known) connections and characteristics will be found to be most relevant to the initially made arbitrary choice. The correlation between the unspeakable, objective levels (astronomical trends, characteristics, etc.) is found by a process of structuring the processes of horoscope-drawing, interpreting, etc.

26. Therefore, the structuring of horoscopes becomes a statistical process, whereby originally the assumption of some form of some influence was the beginning. After some results proved to be correct and useful, primitive logic saw in this proof of "gods", while modern logic, which is more adjusted to popularized concepts of physics rather than "gods", find in such results the "absolute proof of energies at work".

27. Since this kind of primitive logic is unaware of the different levels of abstraction of horoscopic structures, basic

assumptions of how methods may work, astronomical phenomena, etc. since those levels of abstraction are too often identified by this kind of logic, there is no linguistic obstacle to any and all of the transcendentalistic and mystical nonsense that continuously is deducted from linguistic misinterpretation of astrology and its misconceptions. Since those deductions are apparently very "logical" to the "philosopher" who creates them (they are logical, since they are based on structures of language: insufficient mapping, incorrect mapping, is taken face-value), the lack of any factual basis for those "philosophical considerations" is hardly ever perceived. Some scanty facts were squeezed into a primitive-made linguistic mapping, which then was the only tool available for further logical speculations.

28. We have to be aware that, as soon as we verbalize in any form, mathematize, etc., then we work necessarily with some form of mapping, where (essential and non-essential, depending on relevance to our point of departure) characteristics are left out. This is analogous to working with an underdetermined (under defined) system of equations: a system of equations of the kind where there are more

unknown entities than equations – mathematically speaking. This under-defined-ness we have to regard as a principle, or basic characteristic of processes of mapping. There is no mapping known (of perceived things on the objective, unspeakable levels), which would not have that characteristic. Therefore, scientific positivism is necessarily a fallacy which is based on a silently assumed/implicit identity of the unspeakable objective levels with levels of perception with higher and higher levels of abstraction, ultimately to the linguistic system. The impossibility of a scientific positivism can be viewed (in its description above) as a third principle of uncertainty (besides the two existing ones which were – historically speaking – derived from observed phenomena of atomic physics). A description is not what it describes. An assumption of “identity of the observer, the observed, and the process of observing” constitutes a (often professed) fallacy which is based on elementalism, identity of levels of abstraction, etc. Whatever descriptions we make, there are always characteristics left out. Whatever the process of abstraction, whether linguistic or “mystically-perceived”, non-linguistic, there is no instance known where no characteristics were left out.

Determinism versus Indeterminism.

The Principles of Uncertainty. Cause-effect, "Infinity", Linearity, Quanta-Methods versus Continuity, etc.

Specifics of General Semantics as Applied to Astrology

For millennia there have been questions that attracted the most powerful human minds. Questions that were much discussed about. One of them was whether we are exposed to a blind fate (which would contradict our raw experience of being capable of making decisions), or whether we enjoy what we may call a "free will" (which would contradict assumptions of a generalized law of cause-effect). Like the never ending quest for the "absolute", the search for an "end-point of all evolution", or the introduction of "the infinite", "the en-soph", etc. many of those arguments turned out to be utterly fruitless; such arguments are all too often based on terms and the use of terms that have no relevance to what we may term "reality" (perceived, inferred, linguistically structured, etc. phenomena on the objective, unspeakable levels). Before we get into more detail, let's consider the following: assume some term ("word") that has no equivalent on the objective levels (or what we

perceive thereof). Such a term is generally discussed about by means of linguistic structures that neither have much correspondence to the "territory" that they describe (or are considered mappings of). However most human beings are trained to accept face-value and linguistically-based "logic". Therefore, the linguistic structure that we are using is providing us with the illusion of a reality, that actually is non-existent. (Not the "world" is "an illusion" as some philosophers who utterly confuse levels of abstraction being ignorant of those levels, but our – and especially their – methods of labeling and linguistic structuring provides the framework of such "illusion".) Once such an illusionary term is introduced, then the "handling" of this term follows not only logics, but certain "rules of conduct" imposed upon the person discussing. Hence, the term appears to be reflecting something real. The ensuing discussion is then performed within the framework of obsolete linguistic structured of a language that was formed according to metaphysics, silent assumptions, etc. which were prevailing at the time of formation of this language, sometimes around 500 B.C. or earlier. The illusionary term then is juggled according to such "objective logics" as found in the misleading and defective, often outright wrong, mapping of such language. When such juggling happens

according to linguistically-based "logics", then there is much soil for sterile discussion, especially due to the fact that the generally used language is structurally not representing the territory it attempts to describe. If experience contradicts the outcome of "discussion", then this experience is either (most times successfully) quashed in some way, or some new set of specific assumptions is added to the existing linguistic structures, which then is only valid for this specific new experience. Generally, there is simply no intention at all to adjust the linguistic structures to the new facts, which would eliminate automatically terms that have no correlation to the actual mapping. If you add to this dilemma the often overlooked fact that what we call "objectivity" is a form of "subjectivity" (of a group of people in correlation with some set of assumed – existing or non-existing/illusionary – structures), and that there are literally millions of objectivities, each of which operated according to a specifically set-up linguistic pattern/mapping, and that most representatives are not aware of this fact but believe that their objectivity is the only existing one; then you will understand much better why there is so much fruitless arguing about empty terms, or about terms that do not belong to the "territory" a linguistic mapping is supposed to describe. Terms which are too

often simply deduced from deficient linguistic structures/mappings or logistics. Terms whose only “conclusive proof” is made within the framework of its linguistic structures from which this term emanated. Such terms, many of which are around, are most of the terms generally used in “philosophy”, as we will demonstrate later. As far as I can think back in history, there is not any philosopher known to me that was not a good linguist, or a good maneuverer of his language. Very few of them were inclined to use scientific methods since their linguistic structuring provided them with “conclusive proof” anyway... Maybe in this fact lies the reason why during the course of history science is capable of showing continuous success in the establishing of useful methods, while “philosophy” shows a continuous series of failure. It almost invariably was limping somewhat behind scientific findings of new facts, and it was never ashamed of incorporating newly discovered scientific concepts in “new systems of philosophy”, invariably after duly distorting those new facts on the Procrustes-bed of primitive-made linguistic structures.

Now, let’s return to the example given: For a long, long time there has been the big argument among astrologers: Is

man exposed to a blind fate, in other words: is everything determined; or does man have free will? There would never have arisen such an argument if astrology had been regarded right from its beginnings as a scientific method of making statements about characteristics of individuals, trends, events, etc. If such a method had been kept within its scientific limits, then those practicing astrology would have been aware of the stratification of levels of abstraction and the non-identity of those levels of abstraction. The astrologers would then have been aware of the fact that, whenever there is a process of abstraction (in the meaning of a mapping of one level into another: unspeakable, objective levels, levels of perception, levels of labeling perceptions, linguistic levels of structuring labels, etc.) there will be infinitely many characteristics left out. The astrologer who is aware of this process of abstraction and its implications, characteristics, processes mechanics, etc. would soon be aware that such an argument has not relevance to the actual levels that it tries to encompass: "cause-effect", "determinism", "indeterminism", etc. will then soon appear as constructs of inadequate and misleading linguistic mappings, derived from those mappings with no counterpart in the levels of abstraction where those constructs are assumed to be valid (due to the

specific antiquates structures of the language that describes those levels of abstraction).

Determinism in its astrological meaning translates more or less into “everything is written in the stars”. Now, let’s ask: what is mean by “everything”? Maybe the movement of every atom in our bodies? If such “writing” in this stars does not go to this extent – and even beyond – then there would always be “something” that is not exactly as the stars indicate. To the Hindoo-astrologer who claims that astrology can predict “everything” down to the most minute fraction of a second (he has the means to it with his Dasa-System of directing events), even such a detailing (into atoms) may be acceptable. However, I have yet to meet the astrologer who actually is capable of demonstrating such descriptions of split-seconds exactly, etc. I am talking about a demonstration which would constitute part of a corroborating experience, not about some kind of – linguistically-based – “proof”. To most Westerners, who meanwhile became acquainted (at least in some popularized version of the science) with the concepts and workings of quanta-mechanics, a detailing and exact predicting down to the atom, within the most minute parts of seconds, out of a rather macro-cosmic horoscopic structure, is no longer something to

expect. However, most Westerners are still inclined to accept such an assumption based on “philosophical” considerations, which type of considerations is closer to his linguistic patterns than the purely scientific ones. Therefore, most of the Western astrologers suffer some kind of schizophrenia. From their practice and experience they are aware of the limitations of their systems. They know, then, the more they are attempting to make detailed statements, the more they are subjected to inaccuracies and failures. On the other hand, due to the implications of the linguistic structures in which they are stuck, they are led to believe that inaccuracies of their statements are either a result of their own lack of knowledge or because astrology is not yet “completely developed to its fullest potential” (as if such a term which implies that there is a “final point of the knowledge of astrology which is all-encompassing” had any relevance to what we may call reality; such a term with its implications reminds us very much of the belief-structures of the scientific positivist of the past century: a believe-structure about what he called “science”). Such thinking can only develop as a result of gross generalizations of methods into a linguistically-implied “allness”: Astrological methods can deliver astonishing results as far as correspondences (based on horoscopic

structures) are concerned between statements that are derived by means of astrological methods and the characteristics, events, trends, etc. that those statements are made to describe; which correspondence we generally term "statistical accuracy" of the method. Such astonishing results, however, justify by no means that someone can now come and claim that "all things are written in the cosmos, that all things can be described by means of astrological methods, and that it is only a matter of time till when we are capable of doing so, ...", just as the past-century positivist did about mechanistically understood science. This and similar nonsense is going much beyond the factual basis of astrology and beyond any rigor of evaluating the known facts in order to derive from such evaluation methods that are useful, not just "true, philosophically speaking". Again, in the following, we will make a series of statements relevant to important questions of astrology. We will attempt to stay as close as we can to the known facts, given our own linguistic structures and underlying metaphysics.

1. A statement derived by astrological methods may be compared with the general solution of a differential equation. Such a statement describes what we may term

“descriptions of potential processes”.

The more we know about the individual, its characteristics, previous (known) trends, at a time-interval close enough to the interval of time of which we are describing the potential trend, the more details (or “content”) we can put into those processes.

Later we will see that any other field of interval can be a substitute for the interval of time.

Regardless of how much we know about the individual or event, and regardless of how much we are capable of describing it, there will always be characteristics left out. Descriptions of potentials of characteristics, trends, events, etc. are not the trends, events, etc. which are on the objective, unspeakable levels; nor are those descriptions what we perceive about those trends, events, etc. For this reason a description that is 100% is impossible.

2. As is implied in (1): the more detail we want to achieve in our statements, the more knowledge relevant to what we describe we need to have a priori in order to adjust to it. If

we cannot get more relevant knowledge of this kind (about the events, trends, etc. which we are to describe), then the probability of accuracy of our statements will diminish proportionally to the extent of detail we intend to achieve.

3. Since we know that 100% accuracy can not be achieved, and since we know that there is proportionality between precision of statements, amount of relevant information prior to the statements (non-astrological information), and the degree of accuracy, we are looking for the most efficient methods relating rate of accuracy and effort invested.

4. Since we know that 100% cannot be achieved, and since we know several reasons for this fact, there is no factual basis for the assumption of "astrological determinism" of a strict kind. Hence, every known system or astrological method that claims to be based on exact correspondence in the sense of a "mirror-image" between astrological patterns and our world, has a wrong basis. Better: it is based on misinterpretations of the existing factual basis. Proof of such "mirror images" could not be furnished as

yet, and, due to the difference of levels of abstraction, can not be furnished.

5. For the same reasons, "determinism" becomes a term – and has to be understood as a term/linguistic construct, that has no correlation whatsoever in the real world of perceived phenomena. "Determinism" can only be regarded as a linguistic construct which, for this reason, does not belong into the repertoire of a scientist, but rather into the repertoire of a philosopher who is used and trained to juggle with terms of this kind.

6. We have sufficient (and overwhelming) proof of astrological methods. Consequently, we can state that wherever such methods are useful, there is a well-defined set of correlations between horoscopic structures, statements derived from such structures, and observable events on the unspeakable, objective levels. This correlation is such that it allows us to make statements about characteristics, events, trends, etc. that have a very high probability of accuracy.

7. Inversely, there is no event that we know of to which we would not be capable of assigning appropriate horoscopic structures of some kind, which structures may be then used in the search for methods of more accurate descriptions of such events. Whether we then can actually derive useful methods to describe those structures more precisely, or not, can not be taken for granted.

8. The statistical average of accuracy reached by means of astrological methods (those which are commonly used) is high, very high, when compared to other methods of deriving similar statements. Furthermore, with astrological methods the possibility is given to efficiently include the dimension of time, which hardly any other method is capable of, especially none of the methods which are "officially accepted" that I know of is capable of including the dimension of time to even the fraction of the extent that astrological methods are capable to. This efficiency and higher extensiveness is a good reason why most psychologists hate astrology irrationally, to the extent of completely disregarding an overwhelming factual basis of those methods and to actually launch smear campaigns

against astrology which are based on their vested interests rather than reason (which most of those people have in extremely poor quantity and quality, anyway).

9. If we talk about high statistical averages, we mean a minimum of 80% accuracy. Then we mean also that the "rest to 100%", i.e., 20% or less, will be inaccurate or incorrect. Those 20% or less are not to be understood as an exception to a statistical law, but rather to part of our formulation of the statistical law. The difference in those points of view lies in the fact that the assumption of "20% being an exception" implies that 100% can be reached, hence some form of scientific-astrological positivism, while the assumption of non-matching failures as part of a statistical law will lead to some attempts of getting higher scores, but at the same time being aware that 100% can not be reached. Non-matching then would not imply failure of the system or astrologer in every case. The benefits to the customer of an astrologer would be tremendous, and many disappointments could be prevented.

20% or less failures (non-matching) would be an inherent

characteristic of most astrological methods just as 80% or more matching of statements with "reality" is another characteristic of the system. Here we have then to do with a statistical law concerning astrological methods that is based on the actual results of the methods rather than on mere speculations which are based on expected results.

10. In view of such percentages any discussion of "determinism" versus "indeterminism" that is based on astrological methods, becomes futile, irrelevant, without basis. It shows also how detached from actually perceived "reality" such linguistic terms are.

11. Continuity in astrology: Another, generally accepted, quietly assumed characteristic of astrological methods is "continuity", which means that for any given point of time you have an astrological (horoscopic) structure from which you can then derive statements that exactly match this point of time. Instead of "point of time" you may also use the term "interval of time" which does not change much essentially on the basic assumption of continuity. As we have seen in the previous points, such an assumption is

untenable and certainly does not conform with the actual results of astrological methods. However, we consider it necessary to get into more detail, especially about this point, since it is an assumption which is very deeply ingrained in most any astrologer that I know of, and therefore the source of much misinterpretation that could be avoided if the problem was dealt with more intelligently. Here I want to bring a very striking example that may bring light in the whole problematic. Several years ago, I developed a method to calculate the "behavior" of stocks, trends, etc. by astrological means. This method has a nice characteristic from a scientific point of view. There is only one relevant variable that is brought in correlation with the horoscopic patterns; the price of the share is all that counts (it is amazing how much the planet of illusion and deception, Neptune, is involved in those fluctuations!). The development of an efficient method to calculate trends of stocks shed an anticipated, but generally not expected, light on what we may term "continuity" of stellar "influences". It showed clearly the "continuity" is also a linguistic construction rather than something which actually exists. It showed that this kind of

linguistic construct is detrimental to some astrological methods, if piously applied in every instance and assumed as generally valid “natural law of stellar influences”. Let’s explain how this was shown by means of practical results (rather than logicistic deduction). I had rather nice results with my stock-predictions: due to the very low initial investment, I did not make very exceedingly high gains, but I could make a good living with it. I came out ahead. Because of initial success, I assumed that stellar patterns would necessarily indicate the behavior of the trend-line of some specific stock for any moment in time when the stock is on the market. Therefore, whenever someone would ask me: “What action of this stock can I expect tomorrow?”, then I would look at the charts, determine the active transits (of all the examined methods of directing, only transits proved to be a useful method. Everything else failed utterly), and then I would tell my verdict about the trend. Personally, as long as I used this method, I failed, then I failed again, and again. Enough “proof” for intellectually less gifted persons that I knew, that astrology “simply does not work” – just as da Vinci’s failed attempts of flying some 400 years ago proved beyond any doubt

that aeronautics can not be performed --- right??? Oh – I forgot, the jets that we are seeing in the sky are hallucinations, or course! And people that claim to have flown in jets should better be put into mental hospitals... Anyway – the failures naturally led me to refrain my speculations to those cases and patterns which I knew, and for which I had sufficient statistical data to make highly probable predictions with. Doing this, I dropped a generally accepted assumption (in astrology and elsewhere) which has nothing to do with the results that a methods yields, which is totally irrelevant in the context of those results: I dropped the (near-proven) assumption of continuity in astrology. An assumption which has never been proven anyway, and which appears improvable. An assumption which is equivalent with the assumption that as astrological pattern can determine every instant in life. Such determination may hold for some interval of time, and may be proven to some extent within this interval (given interval), but by no means can it be proven as constituting a generally valid astrological law. Even though we are capable of relating some horoscopic structures to any event at any point of time, that does not imply that

such horoscopic structures would necessarily be useful to yield fairly accurate results for "all" instances. For all practical reasons of usefulness (and financial gain), I adjusted my methods of determining fluctuations of stocks to the structure of results (factual basis) that I gained earlier. No assumption of continuity, definitely no work in that respect, but the determining of patterns that proved statistically conclusive, to determine the intervals of time when those patterns existed (ahead of time, of course), and to forget about interpreting any other interval until, perhaps, new patterns for other intervals were found being useful. I called this approach a quanta-approach, since it only focused on known patterns and only on the intervals when those patterns were active.

The fact that nothing can be determined 100% and the ensuing law of inaccuracy should actually have decided the question of continuity long ago.

After I started the more true-to-methods quanta approach, I gained momentum again, and I had considerably less failures (which, in the case of stocks, are hurting

financially). We can conclude that the assumption of "continuity of stellar influences" (or correlations) does not conform to the known results of successful application of astrological methods. Such an assumption of continuity does not correlate to anything in the real world, and, like "determinism", "infinity", etc., constitutes a linguistic construct. Like determinism, continuity should not be used in the formulation of astrological facts or methods, lest failure will be the result (quite painful when the subject is speculation on stocks). Special care should also be taken that "continuity" does not sneak into such formulations by implication rather than plain use of the concept.

12. Summary of "continuity" versus the "quanta-approach":

The assumption of continuity postulates – or implies – a 100% correlation between horoscopic structures and trends in all intervals of time. The quanta-methods restrict statements to those intervals that show patterns which make the expectation of maximum accuracy of derived statements a very probable one. Those patterns are determined by statistical methods.

There are often interpretations where no interpretation is possible, when the continuity is assumed. The quanta-method interprets only where the potential of accurate statements is established.

The assumption of continuity leads to the attempt of "describing everything". The quanta-method describes according to usefulness.

The assumption of continuity implies some "absolute determinism". The quanta-method accepts an infinite-valued determinism of inclination according to known patterns of trends using a language of probability and statistical averages.