

Assessing the Epistemic Value of Astrology: A Comparative Analysis with other Sciences

Ramprasad S.¹ and Manohara²

¹Lecturer, Department of Sanskrit, Kukke Sri Subrahmanyeshwara College, Subrahmanya, Karnataka, INDIA.

²Lecturer, Department of Sociology, Kukke Sri Subrahmanyeshwara College, Subrahmanya, Karnataka, INDIA.

Corresponding Author: Ramprasad S.



www.ijrah.com || Vol. 3 No. 4 (2023): July Issue

Date of Submission: 15-06-2023

Date of Acceptance: 25-06-2023

Date of Publication: 05-07-2023

ABSTRACT

This research paper aims to critically evaluate the epistemic value of astrology in comparison to other scientific disciplines. Astrology has long been a subject of fascination and controversy due to its claims of predicting human behavior and destiny based on celestial positions and relationships. However, its credibility as a scientific field remains a topic of intense debate. The study employs a comparative analysis approach to assess the highness of astrology in relation to other well-established sciences. By examining key criteria such as empirical evidence, testability, falsifiability, explanatory power, and predictive capacity, we aim to determine the epistemic strength of astrology relative to other scientific disciplines. Our findings reveal that astrology falls short in meeting the rigorous standards of scientific inquiry when compared to disciplines such as physics, chemistry, biology, and psychology. The lack of empirical evidence supporting astrological claims, combined with the inability to generate reliable and consistent predictions, limits its validity as a scientific field. In contrast, other sciences have demonstrated significant advancements through experimental verification, peer review, and the development of robust theories and models. They have consistently produced reliable results, contributed to technological advancements, and expanded our understanding of the natural world. While astrology may hold cultural and historical significance, its highness in the realm of science remains questionable. This study emphasizes the importance of critical thinking and evidence-based reasoning when evaluating scientific claims. Furthermore, it highlights the need for rigorous scientific methodologies in distinguishing between pseudoscience and legitimate scientific disciplines.

Keywords- Astrology, Science, Epistemic value, Comparative analysis, Empirical evidence, Testability, Falsifiability, Explanatory power, Predictive capacity, Pseudoscience.

I. INTRODUCTION

Ancient sages called astrology the eye of the Vedas. As eyes are to the human body, astrology is to the eyes of the Vedas. The sun which caused the birth of the world is called the eye of the world. Since all the planets originate from the sun, the sun is the most important force for humans living on earth to control time and thereby control the functioning of this world. Thus, the original energy or spirit for astrology is the Sun. Just as the Vedas are scriptures without a creator, astrology can also be said to be a scripture without a specific creator. But many sages have characterized astrology by their intuition, Siddhi Sadhanas.

When the planets were born and how they were born is the study of science, how astrology was born and where it was born is the study of Vedanta. Astrology is mentioned in Vedas, Smritis, Puranas and history. Astrology is present in poetry like GadyaPadya of ancient poets. If anyone knows that Jyotishyav only predicts the future, then it is wrong. It characterizes the destiny karmas of human life, informs the rules. Astrology has the duty of shaping human life according to the effect of seasons. All the rituals of Indian tradition are a testimony to this. Those who live their lives according to this astrological rule will automatically get the knowledge of past, present and future.

Astrology is believed to have originated from the Sun. Then this Shastra was told by the sun to Brahma, the Lord of creation. Sages who did penance on Brahma acquired knowledge of astrology. Then he taught the disciples. Vyasa Vasistha Atri Parasara Kasyapa Narada Rgya Maricha Manu Angirasa Lo Masha Purasya Chavana Yavana Brugu Shaulaka These 18 sages were the first to understand ancient astrology.

Later, Aryabhata VarahaMihira, an astrologer who came in the fifth century, played an important role in taking this science to a higher level and making it known to people all over the world. Later, many scholars, scholars, poets, writers have developed astrology.

He considered Varahamir to be the greatest scholar among them. He introduced the divisions of Rashi, Amansa, including geometrical theory, which combined Eastern and Western theories in astrology. From Varahamira's Shastra, we can know the secret of dividing the group of twinkling stars in the sky into 12 Rasis and marking the star line to create the Rasis. VarahaMihira composed several texts such as Brihat Jataka, Brihat Samhita, Yoga, VivahPatala and Laghu Jataka. Then great men like Aryabhata, Brahmagupta, Bhaskaracharya, Muneshwara, Kamalakara Bhatta, Venkatesa, Kalyana Varma, Vaidyanath, Mukteswara, Manasa Sagara, Sripati etc. have enriched astrology. The astrological knowledge of ancient countries like Rome, Greece, Egypt, Babylonia, Tibet, China etc. is present in our astrological science today [1, 2].

II. METHODOLOGY

A belief system known as astrology proposes a relationship between celestial phenomena and occurrences or characteristics on Earth. The scientific community views astrology as a pseudoscience since it lacks empirical support and is not founded on the scientific process. I can, however, provide you a summary of some research techniques that astrologers might use in the context of astrology itself [3].

2.1 Natal Chart Analysis

Natal charts, commonly referred to as birth charts or horoscopes, are frequently made and interpreted by astrologers. These graphs are based on the time, place, and date of a person's birth. The positions and interactions of celestial entities, such as the Sun, Moon, planets, and zodiac signs, are studied by astrologers in order to predict or analyze a person's personality traits, life experiences, and prospective future.

2.2 Transit Analysis

In order to determine prospective influences or consequences on a person's life, astrologers consider the current positions of celestial bodies in relation to their natal charts. In this procedure, the positions of the planets are compared to the positions they held at the time of a person's birth. Astrologers think that these

transits can reveal clues about future developments or changes in a person's life.

2.3 Statistical Analysis

Some astrologers make an effort to use statistical analysis to support their predictions. They may compile information on a large number of people and contrast astrological variables, like zodiac signs or planetary positions, with certain traits or occurrences in life. It is crucial to keep in mind that statistically strong correlations do not always imply causality, and astrological studies frequently struggle to develop trustworthy controls and techniques.

2.4 Case Studies and Observational Analysis

In addition, case studies and observational analyses may be used by astrologers as evidence. They might carefully consider the experiences, occasions, or characteristics of a person or a group in relation to astrological elements. However, these techniques frequently lack strict scientific standards, making it difficult to draw firm or universal conclusions.

2.5 Astrological Consultations and Surveys

Astrologers frequently obtain data through client sessions or questionnaires. They could enquire about people's experiences, character qualities, or life events and correlate them with astrological elements. This method, however, mainly relies on self-reported data and subjective interpretations, which could induce biases.

It is important to stress that astrology lacks scientific credibility because it cannot consistently show the accuracy of its predictions and lacks empirical evidence. Although astrologers may use a variety of techniques in their work, the scientific community as a whole has not validated or recognized these techniques [4].

III. ASTROLOGY VS. ASTRONOMY

Due to their dissimilar methodologies and claims, astrology and astronomy are frequently contrasted. Astrology relies on ideas and interpretations that lack scientific validity, whereas astronomy is a field of study grounded in practical observation and exacting procedures. Here are a few significant areas of contrast:

3.1 Basis of Knowledge:

Science-based experimentation and methodical observation provide the empirical data on which astronomy is founded. Telescopes, satellites, and other tools are used by astronomers to obtain information on celestial occurrences and objects. The assertions of astrology, on the other hand, are supported by no actual data and are based on prehistoric beliefs and subjective interpretations. Astrology doesn't offer a reliable and repeatable foundation for comprehending how the stars affect people's actions [5].

3.2 Predictive Ability:

Understanding the physical principles and processes that govern celestial bodies is the main goal of

astronomy. Based on mathematical models and scientific knowledge, it can reliably anticipate astronomical occurrences like eclipses, planetary transits, and cometary appearances. Contrarily, astrology asserts that future developments and personal traits can be predicted based on the positions and motions of celestial bodies. Numerous investigations, meanwhile, have fallen short of offering factual proof that astrology is capable of making predictions that go beyond what can be attributed to chance.

3.3 Testability and Falsifiability

The field of astronomy is quite testable. Astronomical theories and hypotheses can be put to the test by careful observation, experimentation, and testing. The field also encourages attempts to refute established theories using fresh data and rigorous examination. On the other hand, astrology has issues with testability and falsifiability. It is challenging to create precise standards for evaluating astrological claims because to the lack of agreement among astrologers and the wide range of interpretations.

In conclusion, astronomy upholds the standards of rigorous science, empirical support, testability, and replication. Its understanding is based on methodical observation, research, and mathematical models. Contrarily, astrology is based on subjective judgments, has no empirical backing, and does not adhere to the rules of scientific investigation. The basic distinctions between these two disciplines are brought out by the contrast between the rigorous scientific approach of astronomy and the unproven assertions of astrology [6, 7].

IV. ASTROLOGY VS. PSYCHOLOGY

Psychological theories and astrological personality profiles take different approaches to comprehending human conduct and personality. These two viewpoints are contrasted here:

4.1 Basis of Analysis:

Astrology makes predictions about a person's personality traits and physical qualities based on the locations and motions of celestial bodies. Based on a person's zodiac sign or the positions of the planets at the time of birth, it determines personality qualities. Astrological descriptions sometimes rely on broad generalizations and descriptions attached to particular zodiac signs.

4.2 Testability and Falsifiability:

Because astrological statements are subjective and lack definite standards for evaluation, they are frequently challenging to verify or disprove. A consistent and trustworthy framework for evaluating astrological claims is difficult to construct because the interpretations and forecasts offered by astrologers might differ greatly.

4.3 Scientific Consensus:

Astrology is largely discredited by the scientific community as a legitimate and trustworthy method of analyzing personality and conduct. Due to its lack of empirical backing, contradictions, and absence of a tenable causal mechanism, astrology is not regarded as a scientifically rigorous technique.

In conclusion, astrology personality profiling lacks empirical backing, consistency, and scientific validation because it relies on arbitrary interpretations of celestial placements. Comparatively, psychological theories are created through empirical research, are put under close inspection by scientists, and attempt to explain personality traits using psychological mechanisms. A more trustworthy and fact-based approach to comprehending human behaviors and personality is provided by psychological theories [8, 9].

V. ASTROLOGY VS. STATISTICS

There are big disparities between astrology and statistics when it comes to probability and prediction. Here is a comparison of statistics' use of probabilistic techniques for forecasting with astrology:

5.1 Data-driven Approach:

Statistics uses a data-driven methodology in which predictions and findings are drawn from the examination of empirical data. To find patterns, correlations, and trends, statistical approaches collect, arrange, and analyze data. The utilization of data enables statisticians to generate probabilities based on observable trends and make educated forecasts. Astrology, in contrast, doesn't use a data-driven approach. Instead of assessing empirical facts, it depends on subjective interpretations of astronomical positions and motions. Rather than a careful examination of the data, astrological predictions sometimes rely on generalizations and personal assumptions.

5.2 Probabilistic Modeling:

Probabilistic modeling is used in statistics to calculate and measure prediction uncertainty. Statisticians can give probabilities to various outcomes or events by using statistical distributions and probability theory. This enables a more sophisticated understanding of the chance of specific occurrences happening and the corresponding degree of uncertainty.

5.3 Testability and Validation:

Hypothesis testing, cross-validation, and other statistical techniques are used to emphasize testability and validation in statistical approaches. To evaluate the precision and generalizability of statistical models and predictions, additional data might be used. The prediction models are improved and refined through this iterative method. In contrast, astrology has difficulties being verified and tested. It is challenging to create precise standards for evaluating astrological claims due to the lack of agreement among astrologers and the subjectivity of interpretations. Controlled investigations

that have attempted to support astrological prophecies have typically been unable to offer empirical support beyond what might be predicted by chance.

5.4 Transparency and Replicability:

Through transparent methodology, documentation, and open access to data and analysis, statistics fosters transparency and reproducibility. This makes it possible for other academics to repeat and confirm statistical findings, so confirming the accuracy and legitimacy of the forecasts. Astrology's methods and interpretations frequently lack transparency. Astrologers are not required to give thorough justifications or explain how they arrived at their conclusions. This lack of openness makes it difficult to evaluate and verify astrological claims.

In conclusion, statistics makes predictions and determines uncertainty using a data-driven methodology, probabilistic modeling, testability, and transparency. It bases its arguments on careful analysis and empirical data. In contrast, astrology typically lacks these qualities, relying more on arbitrary interpretations and preconceptions than on an impartial evaluation of the evidence. While statistics provide a structured framework for probability and prediction, astrology's practices do not follow the fundamentals of statistical analysis [10].

VI. LIMITATIONS

6.1 Lack of empirical evidence:

The underlying tenet of astrology is that the locations and motions of celestial bodies have an impact on how people behave and what happens on Earth. This assertion, however, is unsupported by scientific study and lacks empirical backing. Applying statistical techniques to astrological data cannot substantiate the precision or prediction potential of astrology without a strong foundation of supporting data.

6.2 Subjectivity and confirmation bias:

Predictions and interpretations based on astrology are very individualized. The same birth chart may yield different readings from several astrologers. Astrologers may also be subject to confirmation bias, which is the selective concentration on data that supports their opinions while dismissing contrary data. It is challenging to develop trustworthy and consistent statistical analysis within astrology due to these subjective components.

6.3 Lack of control variables:

To establish causation, statistical approaches need to carefully control the variables. Numerous celestial factors, such as planetary positions and aspects, might potentially affect results in astrology. Applying rigorous statistical analysis is difficult due to the difficulty in scientifically isolating and controlling these factors.

In conclusion, astrology as a whole lacks a scientific basis and empirical data, even though certain

astrologers may try to include statistical methodologies into their practice. The subjective nature of astrology, together with inadequate data and a lack of control variables, prevent statistical approaches from being applied in a meaningful way in this area.

VII. IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Comparative analysis is important in determining if astrology is accepted by science or rather, whether it is not. Astrology continually fails to fulfill the requirements of empirical evidence, logical coherence, and predictive accuracy expected in scientific fields when put through comparative examination with scientific principles and rigorous testing. The following are some ways that comparative analysis affects how astrology is viewed by scientists.

Comparative analysis entails conducting controlled tests and statistical research to examine the validity of astrology. Numerous scientific investigations have been carried out to examine astrological claims, including the correlation between personality traits and birth dates and the precision of astrological forecasts. These studies have repeatedly been unable to uncover any proof that astrology is true beyond what can be predicted by chance or psychological factors.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Astrology does not adhere to the criteria necessary for recognition by science in its current form. Due to its dearth of empirical support, lack of a believable mechanism, inconsistencies, and inability to resist scrutiny and thorough testing, it is regarded as a pseudoscience by the scientific community.

Astrology is a form of religion. Yes, it is a science, but astrology cannot be supported by conventional science. All kinds of scientific concepts that we haven't yet been able to prove scientifically can be found in the ancient scriptures. Unfortunately, despite our best efforts, we have been unable to determine many of the celestial bodies, several planets, and unusual phenomena associated with the stars that are plainly stated in astrology. Astrologers today place a high value on the outcome and make no effort to understand its scientific basis. This makes it impossible to claim that our astrology is particularly obvious when compared to other scientific theories. There needs to be more research on this. Astrologers will unavoidably try to rationally explain every part of astrology in the days to come by conducting additional research and study.

REFERENCES

[1] Jotinibandhadarsha, Dr. Shatrughna Tripathi, Department of Astrology, Kashi Hindu University,

Varanasi.

[2] Sanskrit Nibhand Manjusha, Dr. Uday Shankar Jha, Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan Varanasi - ISBN: 978-93-82443-48-3

[3] "Light on Life: An Introduction to the Astrology of India" by Hart de Fouw and Robert Svoboda.

[4] Prashnamargam, Jyotisharatnam Kabyadi Srinivasa Acharya, Kabyadi Math., Published by – Balram Acharya, Kabyadi Math, Parkal.

[5] "Universe: Stars and Galaxies" by Roger Freedman, Robert Geller, William J. Kaufmann III, and Hugh D. Young.

[6] Addey, J. (1987) 'Astrology Reborn', in A.T. Mann (ed.), The Future of Astrology, London: Unwin Hyman.

[7] Cornelius, G. (2003), The Moment of Astrology (2 ND Edition), Bournemouth: Wessex Astrologer.

[8] Perry, G. (1988). Astrology as a Diagnostic Tool in Psychotherapy. The Astro therapy Newsletter

[9] Brannigan, G. G., & Marrens, M. R. (1993). The undaunted psychologist: Adventures in research. New York: McGraw-Hill.

[10] Abelson, R. P. (1995). Statistics as principled argument. Hillside, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.