

The Threefold Rulership System in Esoteric Astrology

Maureen Temple Richmond

Abstract

This article sets forth a theoretical underpinning of the multiple rulership system proposed in *Esoteric Astrology* by Alice Bailey. Placing Bailey's multiple rulership system in the context of rulership systems used from the dawn of present-day western astrology in the Mesopotamian culture of approximately 2000 BCE through classical Greece and Rome, medieval astrology, and Renaissance Hermeticism up to modern times, the author explores: 1) the general concept of rulership; 2) the history of systems used to establish relationships between constellations, signs, and planets; 3) rulership as uniquely defined by the Tibetan Master through Bailey; 4) the manner in which Bailey's multiple rulership system embodies the fundamental contentions of esoteric occultism; and 5) the use of the multiple rulership system in tracing the esoteric history and development of Humanity. The essay concludes with a summary of key points.

Introduction

Perhaps the single most distinctive and widely recognized component of the esoteric astrological system, the Tibetan's association of three planetary rulers with each sign of the zodiac, is considered, by some, the characteristic signature of Bailey's esoteric astrology. Possibly a better flagship for the entire teaching could not be found; for in this triple structure of sign rulership are encoded several key principles at the heart of esoteric occultism and the esoteric astrological doctrine.

As students of the esoteric astrological doctrine are aware, much to be found in Bailey's presentation of the subject has yet to penetrate the consciousness of the mainstream metaphysical and astrological community. Such is not really the case with the triple or multiple

rulership system proposed by the Tibetan, though it may not yet be properly appreciated in its entirety. However, this one facet of the esoteric astrological system seems to have caught the fancy of conventional astrology, given as it is to techniques of classification and therefore to the assimilation of anything which seems to add to that capacity. However great a misinterpretation of the multiple rulership system of the Tibetan may ultimately prove to be, the nuances of the matter have not stopped the astrological field from absorbing what it perceives to be an intriguing analytical technique for use in the delineation of personality or of individual character.

An example of the widespread recognition of the multiple rulership system can be found in the inclusion of the esoteric sign rulers in a little astrological publication designed for a distinctly mass appeal and marketed in American grocery store chains under the title, *The Healing Power of Astrology*, by Suzanne Smither (published by Globe Communications in 1999). This slim handbook claims to offer tips on healing. In fact, it takes a very conventional approach to diet, recommending foodstuffs that would likely raise the eyebrows of most in the holistic health field. Even so, Smither, in her discussion of astrological factors bearing upon health and wellness, incorpo-

About the Author

Maureen Temple Richmond holds an M.A. in English and Creative Writing at Southern New Hampshire University. Richmond is an internationally recognized authority on esoteric astrology and author of the milestone book *Sirius*. She is the organizer of Milltown Review, a writers group that meets regularly at the Company Shops Market in downtown Burlington. She can be contacted at: starsong1208@gmail.com.

rates the notion that each sun sign has, according to the author, a “body ruler” and a “spirit ruler.” These, in the case of each sign, turn out to be respectively the traditional exoteric ruler (well known by mainstream astrology) and, lo and behold, nothing other than the esoteric ruler as proposed by the Tibetan in Alice Bailey’s *Esoteric Astrology*, though not attributed to that source.

The Tibetan also proposed a third ruler, termed by him the hierarchical ruler, but no allusion to such was made in the Smither book. Even so, the implication is there for all to see: obviously, the writer has somewhere come into contact with the idea of the Tibetan’s triple rulership system. Whether she was apprised of its original source and full ramifications or not, the simple fact remains that she has used the very same planets for what she calls “spirit rulers” as did the Tibetan in the category of the esoteric rulers of the signs. That this is a mere coincidence is too far-fetched a notion to even entertain. The odds that Smither would come up with the same information out of the blue are small indeed. It seems far more likely that she has seen the esoteric rulers discussed in some astrological format.

This would have been easy to do in the late twentieth century, as the information on the Tibetan’s proposed three-tiered rulership system had been available in printed form since he first mentioned it in *The Destiny of the Nations*,¹ which volume was first published in 1949.² At that time, the text of Bailey’s *Esoteric Astrology* had not yet been typeset as a book, but was only available in the form of study papers circulated within the Arcane School. Subsequently, Bailey’s *Esoteric Astrology* was published in complete book form, becoming available to the general public in 1951.³ Thus, since the late 1940s and early 1950s, the astrological world has been set on notice that the esoteric astrology of Alice Bailey and the Tibetan Master contains the distinctive three-leveled sign rulership system.

Yet, even though Smither has built her sun sign characterizations around a portion of the Tibetan’s multiple rulership system, nowhere in the Smither book have the names of Alice Bailey or Djwhal Khul been mentioned. This,

in spite of the fact that the “spirit” rulers used by Smither, answer in every case to the “esoteric” rulers proposed by the Tibetan. Dietary indiscretions aside, there is much of encouragement in this situation, for here is a situation in which the esoteric rulers are mentioned as though they constitute an unquestionably accepted factor of astrological analysis, and this in a book so clearly geared to a mass readership. It suggests that certain of the ideas promoted by the Tibetan in Bailey’s *Esoteric Astrology* have so thoroughly permeated at least parts of the astrological world that some within it may not even be aware of the source from which such ideas originated. It also plainly reveals that key esoteric astrological ideas are even precipitating quite miraculously into the awareness of at least some members of the general public.

Though one example does not a theory make, it might nonetheless be inferred that the general notion of a multiple rulership system can thus be legitimately proclaimed as the most distinctive element of esoteric astrology—the one first and best assimilated by the overall astrological field. But, if truth be told, the multiple rulership system in its fullness is actually one of the most abstruse components of the esoteric astrological doctrine, much more exalted and profound than is commonly supposed. That this is so will be demonstrated in the present section, which will proceed under five divisions.

1. General Principles of the Multiple Rulership System
2. The Function of the Exoteric Rulers
3. The Function of the Esoteric Rulers
4. The Function of the Hierarchical Rulers
5. The Signs with their Triple Rulers

The General Principles of the Multiple Rulership System

Throughout Bailey’s *Esoteric Astrology*, the Tibetan Master alluded to the nature of a future astrology—a new astrology which is to help lift the attention of Humanity from a near exclusive focus upon the matters of the per-

sonality to an expanding awareness of the reincarnating soul, its long history, its source in the monad, and the Greater Logocic Lives in which everything takes place.

Within this future astrology, the study of the interrelation of the zodiacal constellations in physical space and their representative zodiacal signs as indicated by a triple rulership system was predicted to be absolutely central.⁴ However, it was not promised that an understanding of the connections amongst the constellational-sign units would be easy of accomplishment. In fact, the Tibetan stated that an understanding of these relationships would only come into focus “when group awareness and continuity of consciousness are established among men.”⁵ This is to say that only when Humanity understands its fundamental connection to all things and realizes equally the persisting consciousness of the reincarnating soul will the true relationships existing between the constellational-sign units be acknowledged. Obviously, since the bulk of Humanity has yet to attain the requisite realizations of unity and the reincarnational cycle, the fullness of the new astrology has likewise yet to appear.

Thus, until the entire collective of Humanity finds itself in the required condition, it is the part of advanced knowers to take the bull by the horns, pressing forward into advanced astrological understanding via the power conferred on the one horn by identification of oneness, and on the other, by recognition of the reality of the reincarnational cycle in all things. Such will act as the vanguard of consciousness advancing into knowledge concerning the hidden story in the astrological round, which is exactly what the multiple rulership system ultimately reveals, as will be demonstrated. To fully appreciate that revelation, examination of the necessary concepts will now take the long way around, to better view the ultimate prize from a place of real perspective.

Definition of Terms in the Context of the History of Astrology

The word “rulership” in the contemporary astrology of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries refers to a similarity held to exist be-

tween certain signs of the zodiac and certain of the celestial bodies, including the planets of our solar system, the Moon, and the Sun. However, the precise scheme by which the signs are associated with the celestial bodies has not always been the same. In fact, the entire concept of rulership has evolved over the entirety of recorded history, which fact is significant as background and context to the triple-tiered rulership system given by the Tibetan.

In the present period of history (the Fifth Root Race), the earliest point at which the notion of rulership appeared may well have been during the Babylonian culture, or approximately 2000 BCE. During that time, the Babylonian religion associated one each of twelve gods with the twelve signs of the zodiac,⁶ which signs in that time were positionally the same with the constellations. Some of the gods associated by the Babylonians with the signs were definitely planetary deities. In fact, certain scholars of the history of astrology consider that the characters of the Babylonian gods were none other than the characters of the planets as they have come to be known astrologically.⁷

It can be said, therefore, that in Babylonian times, there existed something like the present-day idea of planetary rulership, though this idea in the Babylonian context had more of a religious than an astrological function. All the same, the Babylonians conceptualized specific relationships between the signs and planets, and these relationships later became what are now called the exaltations of the planets⁸ This notion is most assuredly an astrological one, as it is understood in modern times.

Thus, this may have been the first appearance of anything like the notion of planetary rulership. Some scholars suggest that the notion of rulership is more ancient yet, having its actual roots in certain Egyptian notions concerning the divisions of the ecliptic known as the decans⁹ Such a notion may have been included in information carried over by remainders of the Atlantean culture when they settled the land of Egypt at the end of the Fourth Root Race. If so, that would make of the rulership concept an aged notion indeed, one perhaps drawn directly out of the occult lore propound-

ed by Hierarchy in various forms throughout the ages.

At any rate, the idea that the astrological signs are inherently associated with certain celestial bodies indeed took root in the fertile soil of western speculative spiritual philosophy, finding there a congenial home throughout the centuries following whatever date was its first appearance (or reappearance, as the case may be) in our current race period.

A related development in western philosophy may well have paved the way for the further elaboration of the rulership concept in the mid-500s BCE, when the Greek philosopher Anaximenes articulated the now well-known idea, “As above, so below.” This phrase embodies the idea that there exists a correspondence between things at a higher, grander, or more abstract level and those at a lower, more mundane, or tangible level. If this idea is applied rather literally to the situation of the solar system in space, it can be said that the constellations as stars far out in space (and thereby the signs) represent the “above,” and the planets, much closer and tangible, therefore represent the “below” part of the formula. Hence, when Anaximenes added the fundamental relationship of macrocosm to microcosm (or larger to smaller, greater to lesser) to the emerging philosophical considerations of his time, he may well have supplied a theoretical foundation for the whole astrological premise, including the idea that there can be identified certain relationships existing between signs (the greater) and celestial bodies (the lesser).

The linkage of above and below continued and proliferated in the Pythagorean tradition of the 500s BCE, which attributed certain magical and therefore curative properties coming from on high to members of the plant kingdom,¹⁰ and thus advocated a kind of celestial therapeutics mediated by the plant kingdom. This fact has led some scholars of the history of astrology to conclude that the real historical origin of the rulership idea lies in the doctrine of correspondences used in plant based medical philosophy extending from the Pythagorean period forward through Medieval European herbology.¹¹ However, it seems the Babylonian idea was sufficient impetus in this direction, and it certainly occurred much earlier. All that followed may well have been an elaboration upon the earlier established theme.

In fact, the correlation of signs and gods was echoed by the famed Greek philosopher Plato, who around 400 BCE advanced the very same idea held by the Babylonian culture and religion some nearly two and a half millennia before him, for he held that the twelve signs of the zodiac were ruled by twelve gods, only in his case, the Greek gods.¹²

The same idea was picked up and stated clearly by the Roman poet Manilius¹³ around 10 CE.¹⁴ Manilius enumerated a list of the relevant twelve gods,¹⁵ most of whom are familiar planetary deities, the remaining divine figures associated today with various of the asteroids. Speaking for the astrological tradition of his day, here, for record, are the rulers of the signs as they were conceptualized in the first century CE. by Manilius.

Correlation of Signs with Gods in the First Century CE.¹⁶

Aries	Pallas Athena
Taurus	Venus
Gemini	Apollo
Cancer	Mercury
Leo	Jupiter
Virgo	Ceres
Libra	Vulcan
Scorpio	Mars

Sagittarius	Diana and Vesta
Capricorn	Vesta
Aquarius	Juno
Pisces	Neptune

A moment's inspection of this list by the astrologically educated reader reveals that the associations of the signs with the gods used in the first century CE are not identical with those used currently in mainstream or exoteric astrology, for Aries, Gemini, Cancer, Leo, Virgo, Libra, Scorpio, Sagittarius, Capricorn, and Aquarius are all associated in contemporary popular astrology with planets named for other gods than the ones given above.¹⁷ Still, it is evident that the basic notion of linking a sign with a god or planet was certainly part of western astrological thinking in the first century CE.

The Roman astrologer Claudius Ptolemy, who lived in Alexandria around 100 CE and who had access to the famed library of that mystical and esoterically eclectic city, further advanced the rulership idea.¹⁸ Situated as he was in proximity to the combined wisdom of the then known western world, Ptolemy was able to survey the entirety of the astrological doctrine as it had been handed down from Mesopotamian times and then modified throughout the following centuries. The fruit of his labors took shape in an astrological text called *The Tetrabiblos*. The resulting Ptolemaic astrological system included as but one of many features the definite association of signs and planets, conceptualized in the same general way that signs and planets are associated in contemporary astrology, though the details differed.¹⁹

Thus, the notion of rulership as an inherent affinity between certain astrological signs and certain celestial bodies had made its definite appearance by the time of Ptolemy and likely well before, for Ptolemy's objective was simply to codify the astrological lore collected up to his time. His compendium of classical astrological knowledge became a primary literary authority for the astrologers of late antiquity and even for those active during the Middle Ages in Europe.²⁰ Claudius Ptolemy in this

way passed along to his astrological descendants the notion of astrological rulership, which is to say, the idea that certain signs of the zodiac are inherently linked to (because similar to) certain celestial bodies.

In this manner, the association of planetary powers with other orders of evolution continued. A link between signs and planets was further perpetuated and elaborated by the Hermetic writings of 100 – 300 CE,²¹ which sometimes associated planets with decans on one hand and with plants on the other, as the Hermetic literature of the first century CE was given to do.²² The contents of these writings were to be passed directly to Medieval and Renaissance astrology in Europe.

By the time the well-known English astrologer William Lilly held forth as an astrological consultant and writer in the mid-1600s, the rulership of signs by their associated planets had become an absolutely key and central feature of astrological analysis, as is plainly revealed by but a moment's examination of Lilly's monumental tome, *Christian Astrology* (so named to protect its author from the ravages of seventeenth century religious zealotry).

As used by Lilly, the rulers of the signs functioned to indicate the nature and condition of persons and situations in the horary chart, a chart drawn up for the specific purpose of answering a definite question. Lilly's method for so doing relied almost entirely upon a complex rulership system, with the planetary rulers of signs on the various house cusps and their interrelations telling the story of how the matter at hand would unfold. The system used by Lilly (and his contemporaries) for attaching the planets to the signs went beyond the simple system used for that purpose in the popular astrology of the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, but the idea of associating signs with planets that either represent or further reveal the nature of the signs was well estab-

lished by Lilly's day, and has remained so right up to modern times.

Rulership as Conceptualized in Modern Times

Thus, as has been shown, the whole idea that a particular celestial body can be perceived as linked with a given astrological sign has been around in one form or another since at least 2000 BCE, and perhaps even longer. By the twentieth century, this idea had taken the form of an implied or understood equivalency between a planet and the sign in which it was said to rule. In fact, this equivalency extended to the houses of the chart as well, such that in the mainstream astrology of the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries, it has become widely accepted that the celestial body

ruling a sign, that sign, and the house of the same number are all alike in meaning.

For example: Mars, Aries, and the first house are all considered in contemporary mainstream astrology to be identical expressions of the same archetype. This is a way of perceiving and analyzing astrological influence that works very well for the description of personality and general world conditions or events. In this way, the notion of planetary rulership has become a key feature in mainstream astrological technique, underscoring a perceived similarity between the celestial body and the sign in which it is said to "rule." Following is a table of the celestial bodies, which are generally held to rule the various signs in the mainstream astrology of the early twenty-first century, though some variations can be found in diverse sources.

Modern Rulership Table

<i>Sign</i>	<i>Ruler</i>
Aries	Mars
Taurus	Venus
Gemini	Mercury
Cancer	Moon
Leo	Sun
Virgo	Mercury
Libra	Venus
Scorpio	Pluto
Sagittarius	Jupiter
Capricorn	Saturn
Aquarius	Uranus
Pisces	Neptune

Again, these associations are based on the perceived similarity of the paired signs and celestial bodies. This method of associating the signs and celestial bodies further has its

origin in what is called the Chaldean order of the planets, which order is a listing of celestial bodies including the Moon and Sun. This ordering is as follows:

Chaldean Order of the Planets (or Celestial Bodies)

Moon
Sun

Mercury

Venus

Mars

Jupiter

Saturn

These were the seven celestial bodies visible to the Mesopotamian peoples (some of whom were from Chaldea, hence Chaldean) to whom are credited the rise of western astrology. This ordering of planets is derived from the relative speed of each body, as its motion was perceived in the ecliptic, starting with the body, which evidences the greatest speed through the ecliptic (the Moon), and ending with the body that evidences the least (Saturn). Thus, the list begins with the Moon, which celestial body is assigned to Cancer. The next fastest moving body as it is perceived in the ecliptic or zodiac is the Sun, which is assigned to Leo. The remaining bodies are then given to each of signs

leading away from these two signs in decreasing speed of movement within the zodiac.

The planets Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto had not yet been discovered by exoteric science at this time (though the existence of these and other planets was most certainly recognized by the Hierarchy²³). Therefore, only the seven visible planetary bodies were allotted to the signs in ancient times. Since there are twelve signs, this meant that after the main lights (the Moon and Sun) were given to Cancer and Leo respectively, the remaining five celestial bodies (all of which are planets) were allotted to the remaining ten signs, with each planet assigned to two signs, in the following manner.

Table of Chaldean Rulerships

<i>Sign</i>	<i>Celestial Body or Planet Ruling</i>
Aries	Mars
Taurus	Venus
Gemini	Mercury
Cancer	Moon
Leo	Sun
Virgo	Mercury
Libra	Venus
Scorpio	Mars
Sagittarius	Jupiter
Capricorn	Saturn
Aquarius	Saturn
Pisces	Jupiter

It is important for students of the Tibetan's esoteric astrological doctrine to know about this table of rulerships because the Tibetan himself appears to have used this basic structure for his exoteric or orthodox table of ruler-

ships, as will be explained shortly. At any rate, the chief points from the table above are the twin facts that:) Cancer and Leo are the heart of the ordering, and 2) that the five visible planets are associated with the

signs on either side of these two in the zodiacal round, starting with Leo and working forward to Virgo, Libra and so on, allotting the planets in the Chaldean order for listing the celestial bodies, and likewise starting a second series with Cancer, and working backward to Gemini, Taurus and so on, again following the Chaldean order. This arrangement is the root of the modern rulership system, which has simply substituted the recently discovered planets for those used previously as rulers of certain signs, with Uranus given to Aquarius, Neptune to Pisces, and Pluto to Scorpio—again, all on the basis of perceived similarities in nature between signs and planets, which is the foundation of the popular concept of rulership in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.

Rulership as Discussed in Bailey's Esoteric Astrology

The Tibetan also spoke of the concept of rulership in Bailey's *Esoteric Astrology*, but the implications of his terminology in this regard are not necessarily what is frequently assumed. Just exactly what is signified by the Tibetan's use of this term and this notion will be unfolded in this section.

First, let it be said that the Tibetan himself stated that in his usage, the phrase "to rule" means "to condition,"²⁴ though he did also allude to the rulership function as one of control.²⁵ To condition is to influence, or to impart the nature of one thing to another, while to control is to regulate, govern, or command. Thus, the Tibetan's proposed rulership system has these several understandings at its base: when planets are said to "rule" signs, it means that they both impart some of their quality or nature to the signs concerned, and at the same time shape, direct, and determine their expression. This vision of rulership is not far distant from the contemporary understanding of rulership, which posits a pre-existing likeness between associated planets and signs, and which holds that rulers in some cases determine where in the natal chart and how in outer life the energy of the sign will be expressed. This much, then, shows the esoteric and exoteric rulership ideas pretty closely matched.

However, that may be where the similarity stops, for beyond this commonality, the Tibetan's thoughts on rulership verge far away from that of the mainstream notion, as shall be shown.

The Tibetan's recasting of the astrological rulership system flows from his general vision of the evolutionary process as expressed through the Human Kingdom, which encompasses individuals at varying stages of progress on the spiritual path. As the Tibetan has outlined, Humanity might be roughly classed in three groups²⁶ – mass or average Humanity, advanced Humanity including disciples, and highly advanced disciples or initiates, particularly those who have arrived at or beyond the Third Initiation.²⁷

Mass or average Humanity is constituted of the teeming billions spread all over the planet who work and toil with little apparent need or hunger for much beyond physical fulfillment. Advanced Humanity is constituted of intellectuals and culturally aware individuals to whom the life of the mind is a factor and for whom life must have meaning, and who seek to ameliorate the condition of Humanity in various altruistic ways. Disciples are those of any spiritual persuasion who definitely recognize that evolution is infinite in nature, that inspiration comes from higher levels, and that it is the responsibility of units thus awakened to help spread goodwill and lift the burden of Humanity in a planned and deliberate manner. Initiates are those few who have integrated the best of discipleship understandings and skills and who are, in addition, concerned with cosmic energy impacts and their right application to evolution under the Plan.

According to the Tibetan, these three categories of Humanity receive the energies that flow from the zodiacal constellations and through their representative signs in manners consistent with their stages of evolution.²⁸ In other words, each category experiences and expresses star energies differently. To reflect this critical and central fact of energy distribution within our planetary life, the Tibetan proposed a three-tiered planetary rulership system for the familiar twelve signs of the zodiac, with each sign given three planetary rulers to de-

scribe the way that each of the three groups characteristically manages the energies of that sign.

To describe the experience of mass Humanity in any one of the signs, the Tibetan stated that the planetary rulers posited by popular or mainstream astrology were sufficient.²⁹ These he termed “the exoteric rulers,” and associated them with the response to zodiacal influences characteristically given by persons living al-

most exclusively in a focus upon the ephemeral matters of the personality. For these, he stated, the planets popularly associated with the signs are adequately descriptive. In Bailey’s *Esoteric Astrology*, the Tibetan Master also called these the “orthodox” rulers, assigning them to the situation of “ordinary” Humanity.³⁰ Here are the pairings relevant for this sector of the Human Kingdom.

**Orthodox, Conventional, or Mainstream Rulership Table
Governing and Describing Experience in the Signs
by Mass Humanity³¹
as given by the Tibetan in Bailey’s *Esoteric Astrology***

<i>Sign</i>	<i>Ruler</i>
Aries	Mars
Taurus	Venus
Gemini	Mercury
Cancer	Moon
Leo	Sun
Virgo	Mercury
Libra	Venus
Scorpio	Mars
Sagittarius	Jupiter
Capricorn	Saturn
Aquarius	Uranus
Pisces	Jupiter

Examination of this list reveals that these exoteric rulers are identical to the ancient or Chaldean rulers, except in one case, which is that of Aquarius. Aquarius has been paired with one of the planets discovered in modern times, Uranus. Otherwise, the entire list conforms to the traditional method of linking the signs and the planets, which method may well have been in use for about two thousand years by the time the Tibetan issued the information on the triple rulership system. Apparently, things have not changed too much for mass Humanity in this regard; therefore these traditional rulers remain

relevant to describe the experience of the personality-centered individual.

However, for advanced Humanity and certain individuals highly responsive to the soul and the influence of Hierarchy (i.e., disciples), the Tibetan Master held that there was required a second set of rulers, called the esoteric rulers.³² These esoteric rulers, he explained, add their effect to that of the mainstream rulers³³ for the group affected, not actually negating the exoteric rulers at first, though supplementing them and only eventually gaining pronounced

dominance in effect.³⁴ And though the exoteric rulers remain somewhat relevant for the group primarily affected by the esoteric rulers, the converse is not true, the Tibetan held. He emphatically stated that the esoteric rulers are not at all indicative of or applicable to the experience of mass Humanity in any one sign, and therefore should not be employed for interpreting their charts.³⁵

The esoteric rulers are therefore reserved specifically for astrological consideration of ad-

vanced Humanity and disciples of attainment up to and shortly before the taking of the Third Initiation, at which point the hierarchical rulers (to be discussed next) become relevant. For this intermediate group, however, the esoteric rulers remain of the essence. Here is a tabulation showing the esoteric or unorthodox rulers (as opposed to the exoteric and orthodox) as given by the Tibetan in Bailey's *Esoteric Astrology*.

**Unorthodox or Esoteric Rulership Table
Governing and Describing
the Experience of Advanced Humanity and Disciples
up to the Gate of the Third Initiation³⁶**

<i>Sign</i>	<i>Ruler</i>
Aries	Mercury
Taurus	Vulcan
Gemini	Venus
Cancer	Neptune
Leo	Sun
Virgo	Moon
Libra	Uranus
Scorpio	Mars
Sagittarius	Earth
Capricorn	Saturn
Aquarius	Jupiter
Pisces	Pluto

Examination of this list reveals the salient fact that the pairings are dramatically different from the ancient or Chaldean listing. Not only are the planets paired with the signs in a vastly changed scheme, but it also uses celestial bodies not even mentioned in the Chaldean Order, such as Vulcan, Earth, Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto.³⁷ The implications of this startlingly divergent method of pairing the signs and planets are many, all generally indicative of the dramatic alterations in personal point of view that come about as the shift from personality focus to soul focus supervenes. For those

who are in process of making that shift or who have accomplished that shift, the above listing of esoteric rulers is the most descriptive, according to the esoteric astrological doctrine.

For the third and final group of individuals, yet a third set of rulers is required, again according to the esoteric astrological doctrine. This third group of rulers pertains to those who have arrived at or gone beyond the Third Initiation,³⁸ at which initiation the monad first becomes a real influence.³⁹ These rulers therefore describe the nature of experience under the in-

fluence of any given sign as undergone by those who are to some degree monadically aware.

Further, this third and final group of rulers was said by the Tibetan to be related to the Twelve Creative Hierarchies,⁴⁰ energy streams which originate in sources far beyond our solar system. The influences of the Twelve Creative Hierarchies were said by the Tibetan to sweep into the consciousness of the advanced initiate, promoting awareness of life within the totality of our solar system by awakening what he termed “major group responses.”⁴¹ This third

and final group of planetary rulers has thus been termed “the hierarchical rulers.” They pertain, as stated, to those who have passed at least the Third Initiation and who have as a result reached some degree of monadic contact. Some students might raise the objection that there are too few such persons with whom to even be concerned, but this was not the position taken by the Tibetan, who stated boldly that the ranks of such advanced initiates are certain to grow as the Age of Aquarius unfolds.⁴² Here is a tabulation of the rulers relevant for the third and final group.

Hierarchical Rulership Table Governing and Describing the Experience Of Initiates at and Beyond the Third Initiation⁴³

Aries	Uranus
Taurus	Vulcan
Gemini	Earth
Cancer	Neptune
Leo	Sun
Virgo	Jupiter
Libra	Saturn
Scorpio	Mercury
Sagittarius	Mars
Capricorn	Venus
Aquarius	Moon
Pisces	Pluto

Examination of this list immediately reveals again a great departure from the mainstream, orthodox, or Chaldean system of pairing the signs and celestial bodies. Further, as in the list of esoteric rulers above, Vulcan, Earth, Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto are included. Here again, it is a matter of symbolizing and characterizing the vastly changed energy dynamics as the human unit moves its locus of control from personality, to soul, to monad, this final list describing the nature of experience undergone by the monadically aligned unit under the influence of the constellational-sign units. Ex-

actly what this statement implies will be taken up in a following section.

At this point, however, it is essential to note that the three levels of rulership correlate precisely to important triplicities well familiar to the diligent student of the esoteric occult doctrine.

First and most obviously, the three-tiered rulership system outlined by the Tibetan addresses the esoteric constitution of the human being—personality, soul, and monad—a basic triad containing within its structure and dy-

namics the equivalent of the powers said to have driven the Universe into manifestation, which is to say the Three Divine or Logoic Aspects. The hierarchical rulers correlate to the First Aspect, the esoteric rulers to the Second Aspect, and the exoteric rulers to the Third Aspect.

Accordingly, a correspondence can be drawn between the Three Divine Aspects as they manifest on our planet and the three levels of rulership, with Shamballa as the head center emanating purpose and significance through the hierarchical rulers, Hierarchy emanating meaning and Plan through the esoteric rulers, and Humanity expressing as appearance and activity via the exoteric rulers.

Furthermore, the three-tiered rulership system implies the three planes of human endeavor through which higher energies must descend on their way to physical manifestation, with the hierarchical rulers corresponding to the mental plane, the esoteric rulers to the astral plane, and the exoteric rulers corresponding to the physical plane.⁴⁴ This correspondence was singled out by the Tibetan as an important concept shedding light on the nature and functioning of the multiple or triple rulership system. It suggests that ideas and energies descend from the hierarchical, to the esoteric, to the exoteric rulers, just as they do from the mental, to the astral, and finally the physical plane. Hence, the sequence of rulers might be said to begin with the hierarchical, from which levels spiritual impulse originates, and then

work down and out into manifestation through the lower level rulers.

In a general way, the Tibetan put all this into context when he stated that the “lords or ruling powers” of the twelve constellations step down or channel into our region of existence the potencies of the three major constellations.⁴⁵

These three being the Great Bear, Sirius (and its group of stars, possibly the entirety of Canis Major), and the Pleiades. This is another way of saying that the “lords or ruling powers” of the twelve constellations step down or usher into our region of existence the potencies of the First, Second, and Third Aspects, of which the respective constellations are the expressions.

In simplest terms, then, this means that the Tibetan saw the celestial bodies associated with the zodiacal signs at any level of rulership as intermediaries in the distribution of the three fundamental energies of creation as these are conducted into the region of our solar system, our planetary life, and human experience. This is but one of several ways that the triple rulership system restates essential esoteric principles.

Thus, as has been shown, the triple rulership system contains within it many concepts foundational to the esoteric occult doctrine. It is therefore as good a representative as any for the entire system, even though its implications may not be properly understood by those unschooled in the esoteric philosophy.

Table Summarizing Correspondences to the Triple Rulership System

<i>Exoteric Rulers</i>	<i>Esoteric Rulers</i>	<i>Hierarchical Rulers</i>
Third Aspect	Second Aspect	First Aspect
Activity	Wisdom	Will
Appearance	Meaning	Significance
Humanity	Hierarchy	Shamballa
Expression	Plan	Purpose
Physical plane	Astral plane	Mental plane
Personality	Soul	Monad

From all this, it might be generally concluded that:

- 1) the exoteric ruler of a sign shows the lesson to be learned, issue to be recognized, or perhaps proper life path to be followed for those functioning at the personality level;
- 2) the esoteric ruler shows the lesson to be learned, issue to be recognized, or perhaps proper life path to be followed for those functioning at the soul level;
- 3) and the hierarchical ruler shows the lesson to be learned, issue to be recognized, or perhaps proper life path to be followed for those functioning at the monadic level.

To state this very same principle the other way around, it would be this:

- 1) individuals living at the personality level are in the process of mastering the lessons and issues of the exoteric rulers;
- 2) individuals living at the soul level are in process of mastering the lessons and issues of the esoteric ruler;
- 3) and individuals living at the monadic levels are in the process of mastering the lessons and issues of the hierarchical ruler.

Or to state the matter in yet another way, the exoteric ruler reveals the outer and physical plane method, the esoteric ruler the inner and subjective or soul motive, and the hierarchical ruler the monadic objective.

Hence, the influence of each zodiacal sign can be examined with these general patterns in mind, whether the zodiacal sign be that of an individual's Sun, Ascendant, Moon, a prominent group of planets, or any other factor thought to be of significance in the set of influences affecting an individual, group, organization, or national grouping. The characters of the relevant celestial bodies (as described in the esoteric astrological doctrine) will be indicative in this regard, as will the rays distributed by the relevant ruling celestial bodies.

As has just been demonstrated, the function of rulership in the astrological doctrine espoused by the Tibetan Master leads to territory far afield from the concept of rulership in conventional or mainstream astrology, for conven-

tional astrology does not of necessity concern itself with the esoteric constitution of the human or the processes of discipleship and initiation which accompany progress from personality, to soul, to monad. This stepwise evolution underlies all that the esoteric astrological system has to offer in terms of techniques or methods of interpretation.

The idea of a stepwise progression is written into the Tibetan's rulership system in yet another way, a feature of the multiple rulership system also not found in conventional or mainstream astrology. This feature of the esoteric astrological system points out underlying or possibly hitherto unsuspected linkages between signs sharing rulers at any level of rulership. So important is this notion that the Tibetan has stated, "...the nature of...impacting energies can only be grasped as we...investigate these signs in the relation which they assume...in connection with other signs, claiming the same planetary rulers."⁴⁶

In other words, the nature of zodiacal forces impacting individuals and groups can only be properly comprehended by exploring the interrelations of signs created by instances of shared rulers. A specific example of this notion might be seen in the regard to the three signs Aries, Libra, and Aquarius, all of which claim the planet Uranus at some level of rulership—Aries at the hierarchical level, Libra at the esoteric level, and Aquarius at the exoteric level.

The implications are many and varied, but suffice it to say just now that the sign sequences created by shared rulers suggest at least two distinct possibilities: a) phases of growth and progress that follow one another, and b) inherent connections within the zodiac of signs which are not apparent to the exoterically focused point of view. The important point to be grasped here and in the context of this introduction to the general theory of the Tibetan's multiple rulership system is simply that his system allows for the identification of relationships amongst the signs that are not accounted for in exoteric astrology.

Perhaps a question that might form in the mind of the inquiring student is as follows: Exactly

how and on what basis have the esoteric and hierarchical rulers been allotted to the signs? Anticipating this question in a general way, the Tibetan Master had this to say. “The energies of the various signs are attracted by the different planets according to their stage of development and by what is esoterically called ‘ancient relationship’ between the informing entities of the planets and of the constellations. This relation exists between beings and is founded on a Law of Affinity. It is this law of affinity which produces the magnetic pull and the dynamic response between constellations and planets with the solar system...”⁴⁷ In other words, there is some type of pre-existing relationship, driven by karmic ties established deep in the past, to be found in play between the various solar logoi constituting a constellation and the indwelling entities of the individual celestial bodies linked with them through the rulership system.⁴⁸

Since the Tibetan has used the word “affinity” to describe this deep pre-existing relationship, it can be assumed that the underlying mechanism of the esoteric and hierarchical ruler assignments is in some regard similar to that of the exoteric rulership arrangement—in other words, it is based on some type of energy quality common to the individual constellations and the celestial bodies with which they are paired. Since the signs represent the constellations, the same can be said directly of the signs. This stated, there still remains a significant degree of mystery as to the exact nature of the karmic link bonding the constellations with the hierarchical and esoteric rulers, which leaves some degree of uncertainty in regard to the precise reason why certain constellational-sign units and celestial bodies are linked.

Further, there is some considerable hint that the hierarchical and esoteric rulers may be found to shift and change over long periods of time. The hint that this is so is subtly stated, the argument for it embedded in a passage that refers to “the inter-relations existing in this particular zodiacal cycle between the twelve signs of the zodiac and the twelve planets...”⁴⁹ This statement would seem to suggest that the particular arrangement of the celestial bodies in the multiple rulership system is relevant on-

ly for “a zodiacal cycle,” though which cycle is not specifically revealed. All the same, the idea appears to be that the assignment of the esoteric and hierarchical rulers to the signs (representing constellations) undergoes revision at cyclic intervals. It is likely that the cyclic revision of the rulership system occurs with the dawn of each new astrological age, or once about every 2100 years.

Given that the Tibetan’s dispensation of the Ageless Wisdom teaching through Alice Bailey is intended to help inaugurate the Age of Aquarius, it would be in keeping that the rulership scheme for this new and emerging age should be issued in this way. Therefore, it may be assumed with very reasonable confidence that the esoteric and hierarchical rulers given in Bailey’s *Esoteric Astrology* are intended by Hierarchy to be used from the mid-1900s CE (with the dawn of nuclear power as the predicted sign that the Age of Aquarius has begun)⁵⁰ for approximately 2100 years forward, or until shortly after 3000 A.D. Thus, students of the esoteric astrological doctrine may be assured that even though the basis upon which the rulerships are drawn may be somewhat veiled and the pairings even subject to change, the system as it stands is worthy of contemplation for what is commonly called “the foreseeable future.”

The time-sensitive nature of the multiple rulership scheme was alluded to by the Tibetan in a subtle manner in a passage in which he used its indications as a basis for prediction. This passage concerns the relationship of the constellational-sign units Capricorn, Libra, Aquarius, and the planet Saturn, which rules in Capricorn at both the exoteric and esoteric levels, and in Libra at the hierarchical. Saturn is also the ancient or Chaldean ruler of Aquarius, and a ruler of one of its decans, as is pointed out.⁵¹

Much is proven by this repeating and critical role for Saturn, the effects of which planet the Tibetan equated to the tests preceding initiation.⁵² He stated that the presence of Saturn at all three levels of rulership in this sign grouping indicates that initiatory opportunity for all life on our planet is imminent. In his words, the strong representation of Saturn in the present arrangement of the triple rulership system

“...makes factual and clear that at this time, the signs of balance and initiation can be intelligently used to produce effects on our Earth and this they will immutably do.”⁵³ The signs of balance and initiation are Libra and Capricorn respectively, and it is to these that he referred. An argument could be made that the sign Aquarius represents both the intelligent application of evolutionary energies to the entire spectrum of life on our planet, plus the timeliness of all these indications for the Age of Aquarius.

It can be deduced, therefore, that the Capricorn-Libra-Aquarius grouping is an occult formula that can be read as indicated, but only with the key knowledge that Saturn is the element that binds the three together. If Saturn, the planet of initiatory tests, were not assigned to each of these signs in just the way that it is, the same conclusion could not be drawn. But, reliable evidence, according to the Tibetan, is in the sky, so to speak, proving that certain outcomes are inevitable.

Hence, it would appear that predictions can be made on the basis of the rulership system; which fact must imply that the multiple rulership system is built on principles designed to reflect the underlying and actual (or occult) energy configuration in effect during a particular time. This feature both distinguishes the multiple rulership system from and relates it to the exoteric rulership concept, which too is used by conventional astrology as a predictive tool, in the sense that things of the nature of a sign's ruling planet are said by mainstream astrology likely to occur under the influence of that sign, whether that be during an astrological age or any other interval of time permeated with the influence of an astrological sign. However, since conventional astrology uses only one level of rulership, it can't generate predictions based on the same type of interlocking rulership patterns as can the esoteric astrological approach. This predictive capability is an interesting and often overlooked feature of the esoteric astrological system delineated by the Tibetan, and one that again underscores the fact that the rulership assignments of the multiple rulership system are intended for use now, in the Age of Aquarius, but not for all

time and eternity. They speak about things timely, and even those things intended and destined by the Plan in the current astrological age.

It might legitimately be said, therefore, that the multiple rulership system is unique in its ability to reveal and elucidate matters pertaining to the overall evolution of Humanity. That this is so may be concluded from a passage in which the Tibetan discussed the function of the planet Venus at two levels of rulership across three signs and then made the following summation remark. “Thus can the golden thread of evolutionary progress be traced throughout the zodiacal path from sign to sign, and thus the history of humanity can be seen and its goal visioned.”⁵⁴ In other words, the trail established through the signs by any given celestial body as ruler at the various levels tells a particular story related to the issues encountered in the collective spiritual progress of the Human Kingdom. Another exposition of this principle appeared in the Tibetan's discussion of the esoteric and hierarchical rulers of Gemini, the tension between which he said generates a process which “intensifies all that goes on and leads to the unfoldment upon our planet of the consciousness of universality—to which the word ‘Hierarchy’ is the key.”⁵⁵ Here again is an instance in which the multiple rulership system functions to reveal all-encompassing evolutionary movements affecting the entirety of the Human Kingdom.

This method of utilizing and interpreting the rulership system is unlike anything found within the sign rulership system used by conventional astrology, though it is true that many mainstream astrological writers give considerable attention to the fact that persons exist at a range of evolutionary levels and so express the sign characteristics in varying ways. Still, the business of following the rulers through a sequence of signs and thus reading the history and future of Humanity in general is unique to the esoteric astrological system, and will be explored in detail shortly

The connection of the multiple rulership system with the history and future of human spiritual evolution is but one relatively obscure proposition associated with this feature of the

esoteric astrological system. Yet another concerns the Creative Hierarchies associated with the signs, as given in a chart found in the early pages of Bailey's *Esoteric Astrology*.⁵⁶ According to the Tibetan, study of the Creative Hierarchies associated with the signs and kingdoms is one of the ways to grasp the nature and purpose of the three-level rulership system,⁵⁷ though in exactly what way, he did not specify. Further, enough information to even get started in this direction has been given for only seven of the twelve astrological signs, the highest five lacking association with specific kingdoms. Thus, this particular method of scrying into the nature of the multiple rulership system is not entirely accessible at present. However, it should be borne in mind that the triple rulership system is in some way related to the Creative Hierarchies. It is hoped that the exact manner in which this is so will be revealed in the installment of the Ageless Wisdom anticipated to be disclosed in the early portion of the twenty-first century.

At any rate, many features of the multiple rulership system are in no dispute whatsoever, constituting rock solid concepts upon which the student can depend. The first and most evident of these is the way in which this system reproduces the essential triple structure attributed by the esoteric occult doctrine to the entirety of manifested existence. Another is the fact that the multiple rulership accounts for a basic premise of esoteric astrology—that zodiacal energies are integrated differentially by persons of varying grades of evolutionary status. Yet a third is the notion that hidden relationships existing between the signs are revealed by following the trail of rulers at varying levels of rulership.

Another feature of the multiple rulership system which is undisputed is the fact that it indicates, in both a symbolic and literal fashion, the complexity of energies faced by the individual who is progressing upon the rigorous and demanding path of discipleship and initiation, which path is filled with all sorts of tests, necessary discernments, and subtle issues to be grasped and mastered. These matters, which so try the soul of the seeker, can be seen reflected

in the welter of different rulers and the tensions between them.

That tension can be understood as the conflict between the different rays they distribute, for the rays distributed by the esoteric rulers, are by and large, not the same as those distributed by the exoteric rulers and the related signs. As a consequence, there is brought to bear a variety of ray energies upon the individual who by virtue of spiritual evolution comes within range of influence emanating from the esoteric rulers; for he or she is responsive to both the exoteric and esoteric rulers for a considerable time,⁵⁸ which is to say, many and diverse ray influences.

About this the Tibetan has stated that it is via the combined forces of the exoteric and esoteric rulers that the seeker on the discipleship path "...finds himself responsive to a very wide number of energies...hence the difficulties of the man upon the Path of Discipleship."⁵⁹ This statement might be interpreted to say that the difficulties encountered on the path are directly related to the multiplicity of energies coming through the relevant rulers, each representing pulls, incentives, or particular values vying for the disciple's attention.

In this sense, it might be said that the differences in character and ray natures between the relevant rulers represent the various sets of dualities and conflicting values, choices, or possible adaptations encountered and entertained by the seeker. Much time is required in the process of sifting through these matters; in essence, deciding which of the rulers (exoteric, esoteric, or perhaps even hierarchical) and which of the related rays shall dominate and constitute the way out of dilemma. The choices are many and persistent all along the path, for as the Tibetan has stated, the range of vibrations to which even the initiate is subjected is manifold.⁶⁰ This situation is technically reflected by the fact that in the later stages of the discipleship path, the hierarchical rulers exert influence along with and on top of the residual effects from the exoteric and esoteric rulers. In this way is the individual trained in universality, flexibility, and adaptability, even at the same time he or she is subject to necessary

choices and decisions. All this is coded into the multiple rulership system, constituting as it does a hieroglyphics of energy impacts greeting the striving seeker who progresses from emphasis upon the things of the personality to those of the soul and monad.

The dedicated student of the Ageless Wisdom might find it of interest to note that the early twentieth century Theosophical astrologer Alan Leo may well have anticipated the multiple rulership system ultimately articulated by the Tibetan, in which three rulers are attributed to each sign. Leo also held that every zodiacal sign is inherently triple, with one part reflective of the self, one the not-self, and the third the relation between,⁶¹ a wording used by the Tibetan himself to describe the interaction of the Three Divine Aspects, of which the triple rulership system is assuredly a reflection. Here the self might be understood as the monad, the not-self the personality, with the relation between being the soul. At any rate, the similarity in thinking and expression between the notions and even the language of Leo and the Tibetan hints that Leo may well have been tuned into the thoughtform of the coming triple rulership system long before it formally appeared in print. Further evidence that this may have been the case comes from Leo himself, who made what would appear to have been a prescient remark when he wrote that the shift from personality emphasis to spiritual emphasis “changes the rulers....”⁶² And that little notion is, in essence, what the multiple rulership system of Alice Bailey and the Tibetan is all about.

Conclusion

As this study has demonstrated, the three-fold rulership system proposed and advocated by the Tibetan Master emerges as a key concept within the esoteric astrological system of Alice Bailey. Students of Bailey’s esotericism interested in this facet of the teaching may be aided in their contemplations by considering the main points presented here, which are these. First, the general notion of astrological rulership has its roots in ancient ideas dating from at least 2000 B.C.E. Further, the general idea of associating signs and planets fits into the history of rulership theory that has

evolved continuously from classical times up to the present. To this background of a well-established historicity, the Tibetan Master has added a unique three-tiered rulership system that appeals to the esoteric mind for several reasons. First, the triple rulership system carries weight for the esoteric student because it reproduces the triple structure espoused throughout Bailey’s esoteric occult doctrine. Second, the three-tiered rulership system accounts for the nature of experience under the influences of the signs at the personality, soul, and monadic levels. Third, the triple rulership system speaks uniquely to the esoteric mind because it suggests and reveals hitherto unsuspected relationships between the signs, relationships that evoke the history of not only the individual soul but also of the entire collective of the Human Kingdom. In this privileged view of sign rulership proposed by the Tibetan Master during the twentieth century, much has been given which invites further contemplation, research, and explication by coming generations of esotericists.

-
- ¹ Alice A. Bailey, *The Destiny of the Nations* (New York: Lucis Publishing, 1949), 70.
 - ² James Stephenson, *Prophecy on Trial* (New York: Lucis Publishing 1983), 23.
 - ³ Ibid.
 - ⁴ Alice A. Bailey, *Esoteric Astrology* (New York: Lucis Publishing, 1951), 274.
 - ⁵ Ibid.
 - ⁶ A.H. Sayce, *Astronomy and Astrology of the Babylonians* (San Diego: Wizards Bookshelf, 1981), 148.
 - ⁷ Michael Baigent, Nicholas Campion, and Charles Harvey, *Mundane Astrology* (London: Thorsons Publishing Group, 1984), 17.
 - ⁸ James H. Holden, *A History of Horoscopic Astrology* (Tempe: American Federation of Astrologers, 1996), 4.
 - ⁹ Jim Tester, *A History of Western Astrology* (New York: Ballantine, 1987), 76.
 - ¹⁰ Lynn Thorndike, *History of Magic and Experimental Science* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1923), v. 1, 65.
 - ¹¹ See J. Lee Lehman, *Essential Dignities* (Pennsylvania: Whitford Press, 1990).
 - ¹² Rupert Gleadow, *The Origins of the Zodiac* (New York: Dover, 1969), 80.
 - ¹³ Holden, *History*, 22.
 - ¹⁴ Tester, *History*, 34.

¹⁵ Gleadow, *Origins*, 80 – 81.
¹⁶ Holden, *History*, 22.
¹⁷ The full rulership list as used by the mainstream astrology of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries will be given shortly in this section. Those already familiar with the exoteric rulerships scheme of modern time will notice, however, that the god associated with Pisces in the first century C.E. was Neptune, thus setting the foundation for the modern rulership of Pisces by Neptune.
¹⁸ Nicholas Campion, *An Introduction to the History of Astrology* (Bromley, Kent: Institute for the Study of Cycles in World Affairs, 1982), 34 – 35.
¹⁹ Tester, *History*, 72.
²⁰ Holden, *History*, 49.
²¹ Francis Yates, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition* (New York: Random House, 1969), 2.
²² Thorndike, *History*, v. 1, 288.
²³ Bailey, *Esoteric Astrology*, 14.
²⁴ *Ibid.*, 277.
²⁵ *Ibid.*, 550.
²⁶ *Ibid.*, 65.
²⁷ That the third group is constituted of third degree initiates and beyond can be deduced from comments given on 163 of Bailey’s *Esoteric Astrology*.
²⁸ Bailey, *Esoteric Astrology*, 65.
²⁹ *Ibid.*
³⁰ *Ibid.*, 66.
³¹ The information in this table has been drawn from page 66 of Bailey’s *Esoteric Astrology*. The tabulation there is titled “The Orthodox Astrological Relationship: Constellations and Planetary Rulers.” Note this tabulation is given for constellations rather than for signs, but since the constellations express themselves through the signs of the same names, it is accurate to simply associate the relevant rulers with the signs.
³² Bailey, *Esoteric Astrology*, 66.
³³ *Ibid.*, 268.
³⁴ *Ibid.*, 139 – 140.
³⁵ Alice A. Bailey, *The Rays and the Initiations* (New York: Lucis Publishing, 1960), 253.
³⁶ The information in this tabulation is again taken from *Esoteric Astrology*, 66. The original is titled “The Unorthodox Astrological Relationship: Constellations and Planetary Rulers.” Note that the original tabulation title refers to constellations and not signs, but since the constellations express themselves through the

signs of the same names, it is again accurate to simply relate these rulers to the relevant signs.
³⁷ The Tibetan implied that the still invisible Vulcan plus Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto—the planets discovered in modern times—all should indeed be assigned to placement as sign rulers, even though certain astrologers of the mid twentieth century disagreed. See Bailey’s *Esoteric Astrology*, 114.
³⁸ This is implied at Bailey, *Esoteric Astrology*, 63.
³⁹ Alice A. Bailey, *Discipleship in the New Age I* (New York: Lucis Publishing, 1944), 271; *Discipleship in the New Age II* (New York: Lucis Publishing, 1955), 768.
⁴⁰ Bailey, *Esoteric Astrology*, 65.
⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 65, 268.
⁴² *Ibid.*, 268.
⁴³ This table has been drawn from information given on 68 of Bailey’s *Esoteric Astrology*, which associates the rulers with the constellations. However, as is the case with the two preceding tables, since the constellations express themselves through the zodiacal signs of the same names, it is accurate to simply associate the relevant planetary ruler with the indicated sign. Note also that the original table does not include reference to initiates of any degree. That information comes from page 163 of Bailey’s *Esoteric Astrology* in a discussion of the triple rulers of Capricorn. There it is stated that the hierarchical ruler (Venus) supercedes the esoteric ruler (Saturn) at the Third Initiation. From this passage it can therefore be inferred and extrapolated that in general, hierarchical rulers come into effect at the Third Initiation.
⁴⁴ Bailey, *Esoteric Astrology*, 216.
⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 85, 595.
⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 321.
⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 266 – 267.
⁴⁸ This may be the underlying reason why the Moon is said to veil other planets, for the Moon no longer has an indwelling entity, and can therefore no longer lay claim to a pre-existing karmic tie with other logioic life.
⁴⁹ Bailey, *Esoteric Astrology*, 51.
⁵⁰ The date for the beginning of the Age of Aquarius is indeed a matter of contention and debate amongst astrologers and esotericists. However, there are two statements made by the Tibetan that allow us to situate the probable onset of the Age of Aquarius in the first half of the twentieth century. In *Problems of*

Humanity, 81, the Tibetan stated unequivocally, “The release of the energy of the atom is definitely the inauguration of the New Age.” In *The Reappearance of the Christ*, 82 – 83, the Tibetan all but stated flatly that the Age of Aquarius began in June 1945 with the assumption by the Christ of his Aquarian role. Thus, let us look briefly at the history of nuclear power and the significance of the year 1945 in particular. In the late 1920s and early 1930s, the structure of the atom was discovered progressively by a number of researchers throughout the world scientific community. Yet, it was not until 1938 that the German physicist Otto Hahn first split the atom. Hahn’s achievement demonstrated the possibility of sustained nuclear reaction, which ultimately was first achieved in the United States at the University of Chicago on December 2, 1942. The world’s first operational nuclear reactor was activated at Oak Ridge, TN, USA, in 1943. Finally, the first experimental atomic bomb was exploded at Alamogordo, NM, USA, on July 16, 1945. Barely three weeks later, the first nuclear weapons were detonated over Japan on August 6 and 9, 1945. Thus, key developments in the unleashing of the power of the atom occurred in 1938, 1942, 1943, and 1945. The last of these coincides dramatically with the Tibetan’s specific identification of June 1945 as the beginning of the Age of Aquarius. Thus, the Christ assumed what D.K. referred to as his “Aquarian role” in June 1945, and about one month later, the first massive release of nuclear power occurred, to be followed by even more titanic releases about two months after the Christ’s accession. Bearing all this in mind, together with the facts that the Tibetan has stated that the onset of the Age of Aquarius was to be signified by the release of the energy of the atom and by the accession of the Christ to his current status, it is well nigh impossible to conclude anything other than that the Age of Aquarius is now under way and has been so for a good half century. To all this might be added the fact that the currently used form of the Great Invocation was given in 1945. In *Esoteric Psychology* II, 145, the Tibetan called the Invocation an “inaugurating mantram” of the Seventh Ray, which is of course one of the rays associated with the Age of Aquarius. The planet Uranus, exoteric ruler of Aquarius, distributes the Seventh Ray and is the source of the strong Ray Seven energies expected and

predicted to come forth during the Age of Aquarius. Thus, the Tibetan has as much as stated that the Great Invocation is designed to jumpstart the Aquarian Age.

It is of consequence to note also that the Tibetan predicted in *Esoteric Psychology I*, 415, that the incoming Ray Seven energies would cause great destruction of present animal forms, and this we are given to understand, not for some arbitrary reason, but because the present forms are attuned to the departing Age of Pisces, and hence must give way to new configurations. In this vein, consider that fact that the number of persons deceased in World War II, leading up to and overlapping the likely onset of strong Ray Seven influence, was 45 million. If the human form can be considered a heritage from its animal past, then the end of World War II and the putative onset of the Aquarian Age contain demonstrated world events that reflect the Tibetan’s characterization of Ray Seven influence. Here indeed is a gripping argument for the validity of the Tibetan’s claims and likewise for the fact that the Seventh Ray Age of Aquarius has already begun. This contention is further supported by the fact that destruction of animal forms continued almost unabated throughout the twentieth and early twenty-first century, with extinction of animal species progressing at what is to many an alarming rate. Though no esotericist can justify environmental degradation for the purposes of corporate selfishness, we can however adjust the sadness consequent upon loss of animal species with the insight at hand regarding the inherent effect of the Seventh Ray. Further, we can advisedly know that this destruction of form will eventually make way for a liberation of the animal kingdom into higher grades of evolution.

As has been shown in regard to the advent of nuclear power, the work of the Christ, and the expected effect of the Seventh Ray upon animal form, there exists compelling evidence that the Age of Aquarius began right before the middle of the twentieth century.

51 Bailey, *Esoteric Astrology*, 550.

52 Ibid., 549 – 550.

53 Ibid., 550.

54 Ibid., 245.

55 Ibid., 361.

56 Ibid., 34 – 35.

57 Ibid., 243.

58 Ibid., 139 – 140.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 268.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Alan Leo, *Esoteric Astrology* (Rochester: Destiny Books, 1989, first published 1913), xviii.

⁶² Ibid., 145.