

A speculative solution to the astrological paradox

Massimiliano Sassoli de Bianchi

Laboratorio di Autoricerca di Base, Lugano, Switzerland

[February 25, 2015 – Preprint]

Abstract. So far, astrology has not been able to produce significant statistical correlations. However, certain individuals could use it with some benefit in their self-research and self-development. In this article, I propose a tentative speculative solution to this paradox, based on the consciential (multidimensional, multimaterialistic) paradigm.

Astrology (from the Greek *astron*, star + *lógos*, study of), is a very ancient, complex and articulated subject, with a number of different approaches that can be applied, at least in principle, to a variety of different processes, like intraphysical consciousnesses (incarnated human beings), companies, financial markets, entire countries, etc., provided these processes have a clear spatiotemporal beginning. This is typically done in order to gain a better understanding of their characteristics and identify the most significant events that may happen in the course of their evolution.

Of course, from the viewpoint of self-research, the interest of astrology lies in the possibility of using it as a method to “know thyself” (to use the ancient Delphic maxim) and, consequently, to “evolve thyself.” But the crucial question is: *Does astrology work?* And if it works, why does it work? Also, does it work for any consciousness, or process, and if not, why? In this article, I will provide a tentative answer to these inquiries.

Let me start by observing that the general scientific position regarding astrology is that it is nothing but a false system of belief, i.e., a pseudoscience without any foundation in reality. Many physicists, for instance, describe the astrological predictions as the perfect example of independent random variables, associated with perfectly uncorrelated events (Ruelle, 1991), (Rothen, 2014). Of course, not all scientists will agree with such a radical position. Partially, that is so because there also exists some experimental studies highlighting possible correlations between microscopic physical processes and planetary processes.

An example that comes to my mind is the work of the Italian chemist *Giorgio Piccardi*, who after many years of careful research, measuring the rate at which bismuth sulfide becomes a colloid in activated and normal water, was able to show that this colloid-forming rate does vary according to sunspot activity. In turn, the latter is known to be in some way correlated with the different planetary aspects; and this could offer an indirect physico-chemical support to astrology (Piccardi, 1962, Mannzelli *et al.*, 1994).

Other studies that apparently support astrology are concerned with more specific biological variables. Just to give another example, I remember reading with interest, many years ago, the book by two journalists, *Sheila Ostrander* and *Lynn Schroeder* (1972), in which they reported the work of

a certain *Dr. Eugen Jonas*, who claimed to be able to use astrological computations to ensure 98% effective contraception (when his method was combined with the *Ogino-Knaus* method), in addition to sex selection, and many other things as well. However, these results remained highly controversial, as they were never published in scientific journals, nor reproduced by other researchers, so that it is difficult to ascertain if the collected data were really as relevant as they were described.

Other researchers have tried to provide evidence of correlations between astrological variables and more direct psychological attributes. However, as far as I know, none of them succeeded in obtaining significant results. Quite on the contrary, there are studies that do provide negative results, hence the typical position of the scientific community regarding the alleged astrological correlations. An example is the study conducted in the nineties of the last century by psychologists *John H. McGrew* and *Richard M. McFall* (1990), who submitted the birth charts of 23 patients to six different professional astrologers, who then tried, independently of each other, to put them in correspondence with the 23 files of the subjects in question, containing detailed information about their lives and psychological profiles, obtained through different personality tests. The result of the study is that none of the six astrologers was able to produce significant correlations, namely to do better than mere random selection, nor was it possible to detect significant correlations between their different descriptions.

So, does this close the debate? Should we simply admit that, considering the insufficient (if not negative) evidences in our hands, by reading our *birth chart* (a symbolic map showing the positions of the celestial objects calculated at the exact time and place of our birth) we cannot obtain any relevant, objective information about ourselves? Here we face an apparent paradox. Statistically speaking, and until proven to the contrary, astrology appears to provide no objective description of the important attributes of the intraphysical consciousnesses. In other words, astrological correlations appear to be generally ineffective. On the other hand, many individuals, myself included, were able to use the interpretation of their *birth chart* (also called *natal chart*) as a valuable tool for self-investigation and, consequently, self-development. These two statements appear to be, at first sight, contradictory. However:

We must not confuse the statistical level with the individual level.

To give an example, consider another controversial subject: vaccination. Personally speaking, I'm not in favor of today's practice of vaccination; at least, not in the way it is indiscriminately promoted (Sassoli de Bianchi, 2013). Let me assume for a moment, for the sake of reasoning, that at the statistical level it would be more advantageous for us humans to avoid a given disease, instead of having it, as the risks of its complications would be higher than its possible benefits (for instance in terms of reinforcement of the immune system). Also, let us assume that a vaccine would be available for that specific disease, and that, statistically speaking, the possible complications produced by the vaccination would be less problematic than those associated with the disease. Then, of course, and always statistically speaking, it is certainly more advantageous to get vaccinated against such disease. However, we must not forget that we are *individuals*, and not *statistical ensembles*. This means that the advantage is only for the ensemble of the population, and not necessarily for each single person. Individuals are all different, and they all have very different histories, in particular different medical histories (anamnesis). Therefore, they will certainly not react in the same way to a specific disease and/or to its vaccine.

There are individuals for whom, considering their specificities, the vaccination represents a serious danger, and therefore should be avoided, and there are other individuals for whom it is exactly the contrary. But, on average, at the level of the statistical ensemble, the benefits would outweigh the risks (according to our hypothesis). Indeed, each individual is characterized by specific probabilities, which are different from the probabilities assigned to the ensemble of individuals forming the statistical sample (which correspond to a weighted average over the individual probabilities). Therefore, when we affirm, according to a given study, that the benefits of vaccination outweigh its risks, and that *everyone* should get vaccinated, we make a big interpretational mistake: that of considering that every individual necessarily possesses the same propensity towards both the disease, its possible risks, and the side effects of the associated vaccination.

Of course, it is much more laborious and expensive to try to determine the probabilities associated with each specific individual, as this would require a thorough analysis to be made, case by case, based on criteria on which a consensus has yet to be obtained. I will leave it to the reader to draw possible conclusions about the foundations of an indiscriminate practice of vaccination, probably more motivated by economic reasoning than science, as I have to come back to astrology now. I hope the reason of my excursus will now become clear.

In the same way a particular vaccination may be advisable, statistically speaking, but not advisable for all individuals, it is not illogical to assume, *mutatis mutandis*, that although astrology may not be an efficient tool of self-investigation at the statistical level (as some scientific inquiries seem to demonstrate), it could nevertheless remain a valuable tool for some individuals, considering their specific *multiexistential history*. In other terms, my first point is to emphasize that *the individual level and the statistical level are two different logical categories*. The fact that astrology appears (so far) to be ineffective (or very weakly effective) at the level of the statistical ensemble, doesn't mean that it will necessarily be ineffective for all members composing such ensemble.

Let me hypothesize then that some individuals exist for whom the reading of their astrological birth chart can provide them some objective information on their personalities, karma, existential program, and so on. The question we need to address, and tentatively answer, is the following: *Would this just be the result of chance or would it be the result of a more determinative process?* Let me stress, again, that, personally speaking, I have been able to use astrology as an interesting language and tool for self-investigation, and that I know a number of people who were able to do the same. Therefore, the hypothesis that there exist individuals for whom astrology has undoubtedly proved to be useful, at the pragmatic level, is certainly not an empty one. The point is to understand what could be a possible explanation for this effectiveness.

The hypothesis that I would like to consider is that there would be a specific class of individuals for whom astrology does actually work quite well, in the sense of being able to provide some interesting evolutionary information. This wouldn't have anything to do with possible physical-chemical processes, induced by, say, the solar activity, or with other more subtle levels of action of the planets, as a result of, for example, their extraphysical fields of energy (although of course, I cannot exclude these possibilities). No, the explanation would be much simpler than this, if we only take for granted the validity of the so-called *consciential paradigm*.¹

¹ The consciential paradigm is a theoretical framework in which the human being is described as an intelligent principle, of a multi-dimensional and multi-material nature, who can manifest not only in the so-called physical dimension, through her/his biological body, but also on other more "subtle" planes of

To clarify what I mean, let me first consider a simple example. Many of us possess a small portable *zodiac*, usually with two revolving planets. This zodiac is nothing but the spherical dial of an analog wristwatch, with the planets corresponding to, respectively, the hour hand (making two revolutions per day) and the minute hand (making one revolution every hour). Thanks to this small zodiac-like instrument, it is easy to make very efficient predictions about the behavior of the intraphysical human beings. For instance, when the “hour hand planet” is in correspondence with the twelfth house, if you ask a person the question “Are you hungry?” there is a very high probability to obtaining an affirmative answer. Of course, this doesn’t mean that the specific position of the “hour hand planet” would be the *cause* producing the *effect* of the hunger in that person; it would be extremely naive to believe in such a “spooky action at a distance.” What is clearly true here is that people usually live their lives according to the daily cycle, and this cycle is perfectly encoded in the movement of the “wristwatch zodiac,” so that it is possible to establish meaningful correlations between these two systems. What this example reveals us is that:

We must not confuse correlations with cause-effect relations.

The example also reveals to us something very important: if the “wristwatch zodiac” can describe the human circadian cycle, and the phenomena associated with it, this is not by mere accident: it is so because its movement has been *ad hoc synchronized* with the daily cycle, with respect to which humans have also synchronized their biological processes, in the course of their biological evolution. Now, undoubtedly the cyclical astronomical movements of the sun, the moon, and all the other bodies of the *celestial sphere* (partitioned into specific sectors, called *houses*) give rise to a very complex symbolic language. Each specific configuration of the different planets is, indeed, like a giant “multidimensional hieroglyph,” and, undoubtedly, such a hieroglyphic language is sufficiently rich to be able to describe a large number of inner and outer aspects of the human experience. This, of course, is not questioned in the controversy surrounding the subject of astrology. What is questioned, is the fact that there would be an objective correspondence between these “astrologic hieroglyphs” and some of the attributes characterizing a given intraphysical being, like for instance, its weak and strong traits, its karmic debts and credits, its existential program, the important moments of her/his intraphysical life, etc.

In other terms, and to put it in a nutshell, the following question arises: *Who would have synchronized the “star watch” with the specificities of the internal states of those consciousnesses for whom astrology would be a valuable tool of self-investigation?* My hypothesis is that in the same way as humans need to synchronize their wristwatches in order to use them as efficient tools, a similar act of synchronization could have been operated in order to correlate the birth chart of an individual with his personal history and specific consciential attributes (there are, of course, more aspects than just the birth chart that are studied in astrology, but let us keep the discussion simple).

Now, if on one hand we have a single solar system, i.e., a single “star watch,” on the other hand we have billions of different individuals, each with different personal histories and consciential attributes. Also, the solar system, considered as clockwork, is given once for all, and follows a deterministic evolution, according to Einstein’s theory of gravitation. Therefore, its movement

existence, called extraphysical. In other words, according to the consciential paradigm, the human consciousness is an entity capable of embracing much ampler existential dimensions, since it is equipped with an entire multivehicle of manifestation, of which the physical body is just the tip of a huge multimaterial iceberg (Musskopf, 1998, Pitaguari, 1998, Vieira, 2002).

cannot be artificially altered without destroying its very functioning. But, as any astrologer knows, the birth chart of an individual is determined by the contextual factors of the place and time of the biological birth. Therefore, since these factors vary for each individual, it is very rare to find two persons having the same birth chart (twins are a notable exception, although the time of their first breath can vary significantly). In other terms, albeit there is a unique astronomical clock, each individual “sees” a different version of it, because of her/his specific spatiotemporal perspective. But then, how can we synchronize all these different systems to establish some meaningful correlations? Of course, there is only one possibility to do this: considering that the astronomical clockwork is given, and that the history of every single consciousness prior to its incarnation is also given, the only variables that can be altered, to create a correspondence, are those of the place and time of the *intrapysical birth*.

Of course, there are a number of problems to be solved in order to meaningfully correlate the information encoded in the “birth chart symbol” and the evolutionary history of a given consciousness. These, however, are not an impossible task for an Evolutionologist, i.e., for an advanced consciousness having sufficient knowledge of the evolutionary history of each consciousness belonging to its evolutionary group (Alegretti, 2004). An Evolutionologist is a strategist of evolution, and this means that s/he will use any possible mean to favor its progression. So, considering that s/he knows that a certain number of consciousnesses in her/his evolutionary group may have, for reasons related to their multiexistential history, strong affinities with the astrological language, and have a high probability to confront with the study of astrology in their next coming intrapysical life, it is not unreasonable to assume that s/he will take maximum advantage of this to provide these consciousnesses, through the message of their birth chart, some key information about those personal aspects they need to understand and overcome.

As I said, the only way to do so is by purposely choosing the exact place and time of birth, in order to encode with sufficient accuracy in the birth chart the important traits of the consciousness in question, its tendencies, the status of its karmic account, and other information useful for maximizing the intrapysical experience. This possibility, sometimes mentioned in some esoteric writings (Hilarion, 1979), provides a possible (although admittedly very speculative) solution to the astrological conundrum, as it explains why the results so far obtained in the statistical evaluation of astrology are not generally significant. Indeed, only a limited number of consciousnesses would be subjected to the difficult synchronization process, following a scrupulous evaluation of their case by the Evolutionologist of their evolutionary group. Indeed, despite the great popularity of astrology (approximately one-third of the population in Western countries believes in it), certainly only a limited number of consciousnesses would consider taking its study sufficiently seriously to use it to promote their self-research and self-development, thus justifying the effort of synchronizing their first intrapysical breath with the more suitable planetary configuration for describing their actual evolutionary condition.

There is also another aspect worth mentioning. Given that in the past the planet was less populated, and that astrology enjoyed greater prestige (even the Church, for example, widely used it, and many scientists were also good astrologers), and being that delivery generally occurred in the past in a natural way, without the intervention of specific medical acts, it can be conjectured that the practice of “birth synchronization” was not only more widespread (within those consciousnesses having enough erudition to approach and understand astrology), but also easier to be performed in practice by the Evolutionologists and their assistants. On the other hand, more and more often today, the labor and delivery, in hospitals, is induced artificially (without waiting for its natural

course), for example by administering some specific hormones, or by intervening in a surgical way. Often these interventions follow agendas that are dictated by specific protocols, or by the extemporaneous decisions of the gynecologist, and this may considerably interfere with the possibility of extraphysically controlling the appropriate moment (and place) of birth. In other words, medical protocols and medical decisions could make it increasingly difficult for the Evolutionist-astrologer to achieve an efficacious and efficient synchronization. And this could also, in part, explain the mentioned negative results obtained nowadays by modern statistical studies.

Of course, much more should be said about this interesting and speculative topic. Let me, however, conclude this short dissertation of mine with a few remarks. According to the above analysis, astrology wouldn't work for everybody. For some people, it may represent a possible tool of self-research, but for others (probably the majority) it would not. Therefore, it would be correct to affirm that astrology may both work and not work: it may work, because for a few specific individuals it could point to some important information, and it may not work because this wouldn't be true for everybody. Therefore, astrology wouldn't be, as is usually believed, an expression of universal laws, but of much more "parochial" and partial regularities, opportunistically and artificially (and let me add, hypothetically) created by the Evolutionologists.

Having said that, considering that unpredictable factors are always capable of altering the place and time of birth, even for those consciousnesses for whom the astrologic synchronization would have been duly planned, considerable discrepancies are to be expected between the information ultimately encoded in their birth charts and their actual condition. Therefore:

We must not consider astrology as a primary source of information in our self-research.

Other tools for encoding information have probably been used, and are possibly still in use, in addition or as an alternative to astrology, like for instance *numerology*. For obvious reasons, these different encoding techniques, when applied to the same intraphysical consciousness, may not deliver coherent information, and the same holds true when comparing the readings from different astrological traditions, like the Western, the Indian, the Chinese, etc. These differences may be explained in at least two ways: (1) because the encodings used in these different languages are only partially compatible with each other; (2) because only one of them would have been subjected to an active process of synchronization (the one that most probably will be studied by the consciousness in question).

Considering the profound changes that have occurred on our planet in recent centuries, and the recent evolution of knowledge (mainly due to the scientific revolution), it is highly probable that Evolutionologists are planning to use in the near future, or are already using today, other procedures to transfer relevant information from the extraphysical layer to the intraphysical one. This could be because one of the side effects of astrology is to convey the false belief that human destinies would be determined by the stars, instead of being determined by the consciousnesses themselves. Among the more advanced tools for acquiring self-knowledge, we can cite the following: introspection, self-observation, rational self-analysis, self-criticism, discrimination, confrontation with others, development of lucid parapsychism and lucid projectability, direct communication with the helpers, etc.

Another aspect to think about is the following: if we admit that there is a minority of people for whom the birth chart constitutes a good representation of their personal attributes, and that such correspondence is not explainable in terms of mere chance, or by some "hidden cosmic mechanism

of action,” then astrology would provide a possible indirect confirmation of the validity of the consciencial paradigm. Indeed, the only reasonable explanation for its functioning, as far as I can judge, is that a “before birth synchronization” was planned and subsequently executed. And, of course, such an explanation is only meaningful if the *existential seriation* (i.e., the rebirth cycle) is a reality. On the other hand, if we take for granted the validity of the consciencial paradigm, then the only possibility we have to check the correctness of the hypothesis here presented is to obtain an interview with an Evolutionologist, for instance during a lucid OBE, and directly ask her/him if a spatiotemporal astrological synchronization has been really used in the past, and is still in use nowadays, and what are the criteria of its application. Also, in case of confirmation, it would be interesting to know when the system became effective and if it has produced the expected results. Of course, I can only encourage consciencialists with strong affinities with astrology (or numerology), who would have the opportunity to meet their Evolutionologist, to clarify this interesting issue of terrestrial evolution, and to communicate their findings.

In conclusion, I would say that in a minority of cases, astrology can be used to efficiently promote some interesting self-research, provided it is approached with intelligence, maturity and a lot (but truly quite a lot) of discernment. Also, let us not forget that we consciencialists, in our multidimensional evolution, do not only *discover* who we are, but also we *create* who we want to be and become. In that sense, the process of interpretation of one’s birth chart can also be seen not only as a process of *self-discovery*, but also as a process of *self-creation*, and the latter is, of course, much less dependent on the actual accuracy of the data encoded in it.

Personally speaking, as mentioned several times, I was able to use astrology in the past with some benefit, as a tool of self-investigation. It helped me to focus on certain aspects that I was not paying sufficient attention to. It is now long since I left its study, as today, I prefer to use more direct and trustworthy tools. I also think that the more we advance in our evolution and the more we need to learn reading and interpreting not only the signs present in the “outer sky,” but also, and especially, those in our “inner sky,” and therefore we must be careful not to transform the astrologic (transfer of information) experiment (if any) into an evolutionary crutch. As it is known, a crutch is a particularly useful tool, but only if we have the wisdom to use it at the appropriate time, and abandon it when we are able to walk again with our legs, even though we may wobble a little bit, in the beginning.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is my pleasure to thank *Nelson Abreu* for his careful reading of the manuscript, and for being its originator, when some time ago he asked my position, as a physicist and self-researcher, on the controversial theme of astrology. The present article is my tentative answer to his question, which I hope will stimulate further reflections and discussions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALEGRETTI, Wagner (2004). *Retrocognitions – An investigation into the memory of past lives and the period between lives*, Miami, USA: International Academy of Consciousness.
- HILARION, (1979). *The Nature of Reality*, Marcus Books.
- MANZELLI, Paolo, MASINI, Giancarlo & COSTA Mariagrazia (1994). *I segreti dell’acqua. L’opera scientifica di Giorgio Piccardi*, Di Renzo Editore, Roma.

- MCGREW, John H. & MCFALL, Richard M. (1990). A Scientific Inquiry Into the Validity of Astrology; Journal of Scientific Exploration; Vol. 4, pp. 75-83.
- MUSSKOPF, T. (1998). *Consciential Paradigm: Leading Theory of Conscientiology*; Journal of Conscientiology; Volume 1, No. 1, pp. 53-57.
- OSTRANDER, Sheila & SCHROEDER, Lynn (1972). *Astrological birth control*, Prentice-Hall, London.
- PICCARDI, Giorgio (1962). *The Chemical Basis of Medical Climatology*, Thomas Publisher, Springfield, Illinois USA.
- PITAGUARI, A. (1998). *A Paradigm for Consciousness*; Journal of Conscientiology; Volume 1, No. 2, 113-128. Part 2: No. 3, pp. 237-254.
- ROTHEN, François (2014). *La face cachée de la lune: la science et les coïncidences*, Presses Polytechniques et Universitaires Romandes, Lausanne.
- RUELLE, David (1991). *Hasard et chaos*, Editions Odile Jacob, Paris.
- SASSOLI DE BIANCHI, Massimiliano (2013). *La visione rovesciata - Dialogo sulla malattia*, Edizioni Lulu.
- VIEIRA, W. (2002). *Projectiology, A Panorama of Experiences of the Consciousness outside the Human Body*; International Institute of Projectiology and Conscientiology.

Massimiliano Sassoli de Bianchi graduated in physics from the University of Lausanne (UNIL), Switzerland, in 1989. From 1990 to 1991, he was an Assistant in the Department of Theoretical Physics (DPT) of the University of Geneva (UNIGE). In 1992, he joined the Institute of Theoretical Physics (IPT) at the Federal Institute of Technology in Lausanne (EPFL), as a Ph.D. candidate. He received the Ph.D. degree in physics from EPFL in 1995. Since 1996, he has been working in the private sector and as an independent researcher. His research activities are focused on the foundations of physics, quantum theory, and consciousness. He is the director of the Laboratorio di Autoricerca di Base (LAB), in Switzerland, and the editor of the Italian journal *AutoRicerca*.