STUDY GUIDE 2A

Material from: Cornelius, G. (1998, October). Is astrology divination and does it matter? In *United Astrology Congress*, May (Vol. 22).

1.  Know whether or not **divination** is a word that is often loosely used to mean a type of **intuition**. Know whether or not [the author] came into astrology directly through the ***I Ching*** and a love of divination. Know whether or not, for many people, astrology is the **first** **form** of symbolic thinking they have explored, making their experience somewhat **different**. Know whether or not, lecture after lecture and book after book, [the author] **almost** **never** **encountered** the word ‘divination’ in relation to astrology.

2.  Know whether or not intelligent critics of astrology maintain that astrologers have always managed to use the **prevailing** **culture** and **ethos** of the times in which they live (the science and philosophy of their period) to disguise themselves and **cunningly** **continue** with their practices. Know whether or not, after **Pico**, craft horoscopy **never** had a **serious** **intellectual** **case**. Know whether or not that, while it’s not [the author]’s intention to speak against scientific research, he doesn’t see that it **has** **much** **to** **offer** **astrology.**.

3.  Know whether or not Paul **Kurtz** and the Nobel Prize winners who proclaimed against astrology wouldn't care… if we said we were **doing** **poetic** **astronomy**. Know whether or not it is **disingenuous** of astrologers to even hint at a **scientific** **basis** of the sort understood in physics or biology. Know whether or not there can be no doubt that, strangely and mysteriously, there is some type of **response** in the universe - captured in the old doctrine of **correspondences** - that is worthy of a spiritual-scientific endeavor, or of a science of the **future**. Know whether or not it's **quite** **possible** for something to have a genuine physical reference and connection to a mysteriously organized universe…and, at the same time, for each of our acts of horoscope interpretation to be **very** **purely** **subjective**.

4.  Know whether or not, when you make a **divination** with the ***I Ching***by manipulating the trigrams, with their references to the natural world, it doesn't depend on any **objective** **truth** that you already know about the nature of wind or water or wood. Know whether or not some astrologers cannot bear the thought that a considerable degree of the inference drawn from symbols is a type of **subjective, creative** **process** of the astrologer, and is **not** **dependent** on a physical process in the natural world. Know whether or not [**Jung**] is probably the **most** **important** **single, intellectual influence** for astrologers in the 20th century.

5.  Know whether or not, although much that occurs in astrology can be classed as **synchronicity**, it would be misleading to approach all of its phenomena in this way. Know whether or not, according to **Jung**, our categories of causality, synchronicity, and symbol are only our mental categories of such things ("nature is not so **simple**”). Know whether or not the way things actually are defeats any conclusive attempt to catch **Nature** **in** **our** **boxes** **and** **categories**. Know whether or not our practice of judgment from horoscopes, and the results we get when we make those judgments, constitutes divination, and involves a profound dimension of **psychic** **creativity**.

6.  Know whether or not [the author] is sure many modern astrologers would agree that the whole system of stars and planets is an **elaborate** **metaphor** or allegory by which to describe another situation in **reality**. Know whether or not, without the astrologer’s **intervention**, the creation of the space of astrology, there would be **no** **mirror** and **no** **seeing**. Know whether or not the astrologer’s intervention is a type of **mediumship**. Know whether or not it is we who assign **significance**, not **the** **stars**. Know whether or not, when people get into horary, and see horary really **working**, they realize it does have an **objectivity** to it.

7.  Know whether or not a genuine horary will **show** **directly** a description given by the heavens of a situation in human life. Know whether or not classical astrology, on the whole, has had a lot of **trouble** with horary and usually tries to **repress** it. Know whether or not, where **psyche** is concerned, time is almost **infinitely** **flexible**. Know whether or not horoscopes work because **psyche** and **emotion** are brought into a **symbolic** **equation** through some device. Know whether or not most horoscopes of **catastrophic** events are actually **meaningless** **charts**. Know whether or not some part of the phenomenon of astrology belongs to the natural world and is in principle **amenable** to **scientific** **investigation**.