

continued monitoring. What made the British public ignore the Condon Report, which was widely publicized in that country?

There are a couple of minor quibbles about the book, more having to do with the book's production than its contents. The graphics were generally good with relevant photos and document reproductions. There was an odd mix of using footnoted quotes in straight type style like the rest of the book's print, and in a style giving the impression of documents coming right off of an old manual typewriter. This is surely to give the image of direct reproduction from actual documents being pasted into the book. But they aren't reproductions from the documents. The type is the same for a wide variety of sources, including news clips. If the quote in the original document is clear, use it as a graphic. If it isn't clear, use the same type font as the rest of the book. Mixing styles unnecessarily gives the book a cheesy appearance. Also, an annoying habit of publishers is to reproduce news clips as graphic material where they are copied too small to read, or scissored through to fit a page. This book reproduces one of the earliest British pro-flying saucer pieces from the October 1, 1950, *London Sunday Dispatch*, which I would have liked to have read but couldn't because it is shrunken beyond readability. These are not easily obtained by the reader and would have been better copied in full. Another clip is cut through, butchering the story. As graphics, they show what the clips looked like, but as information they are a waste of pages.

I highly recommend *Out of the Shadows* as a concise summary of official British UFO history. The authors do well in taking a mass of disjointed information and creating a flowing commentary. They have also managed to avoid "spinning" the information into something it is not. This is most appreciated by one who is tired of the exaggerations that have plagued UFO research.

BARRY GREENWOOD
Stoneham, Massachusetts

Astrology: The Evidence of Science by Percy Seymour. Luton, Bedfordshire, UK: Lennard Publishing, 1988. 200 pp. £12.99 (cloth). ISBN 1-85291-025-9.

The scientific evidence for the validity of astrology, as it was traditionally practiced in Western Europe and North America, is virtually non-existent. For despite the much-cited statistical and other studies that, since the early twentieth century, promised to place traditional astrology firmly within the empirical groundwork of western science, it appears, in my view anyway, there's no single unambiguous piece, or corpus, of scientific work that does this, nor should any be expected to, given the nature of the astrology of tradition.

Given this, in writing *Astrology: The Evidence of Science*, Percy Seymour took on an unenviable task, that, since the book was published, has become even less enviable with subsequent criticism of what was formerly considered by many to be quality statistical work in astrology.

Thus the relation of astrological factors to personality dimensions, claimed by the late Professor Hans Eysenck; and the heroic studies into the so-called “Mars Effect,” by Michel and Françoise Gauquelin, are no longer universally accepted by the main body of researchers into such phenomena, as valid, incontrovertible proof of astrology or anything like it. Given this, much of the evidence cited in Seymour’s book as being favourable for astrology is now, in the view of many, found to be wanting.

In terms of content, and given the nature of the *Journal of Scientific Exploration* readership, it should be stressed that the book relies strongly on first-hand opinion and second-hand sources. Further, a number of the secondary sources that should have been standard citations in such a work receive no mention. In addition, some statements made, such as that indicating we can attribute Jesus’ qualities as a leader to the fact he had Jupiter rising at the precise time of his birth: “sunset on Tuesday 15 September, 7 BC,” are possibly better suited to more popular works, and indeed Dr. Seymour has written such works since this book was published.

That said, and given the book’s chronological pedigree, it still presents an interesting and provocative case for there being certain links between ourselves and the cosmos, which, in recent years, have become progressively more credible. In particular his idea that electromagnetic interplay between the sun, moon, earth, and other planets could provide an explanation for some astrological belief is more credible today than it was when the book was written.

It’s interesting to note, however, that Seymour doesn’t cite the ideas of Arnold Lieber in this respect, as described in the latter’s 1978 publication, *The Lunar Effect*, nor does Lieber cite Seymour’s in *How The Moon Affects You*, revised in 1996 and reviewed in the Winter, 2002 issue of the *Journal of Scientific Exploration*. This is unfortunate, as both men—respected professionals in their own disciplines—appear to have had much to offer one another some years ago.

In short, the main failing of *Astrology: the Evidence of Science* is the fact that it’s become dated. The major reason for reading it now, therefore, is probably threefold. To catch a glimpse of how, at least some, professional scientists were thinking concerning astrological causation a decade and a half ago; for past insights and speculations into the now established interaction between ambient electromagnetism and human physiology; and for the general material the book contains that makes it still well worth a read on that count alone.

FRANK MCGILLION
Honorary Advisory Consultant
RGCSA Group
University of Southampton
U.K.