

FREUDASTROLOGY: HERMENEUTICS

CONTENTS:

Hermeneutics I: Part-within-Whole (pg.2)

Hermeneutics II: Chapter-within-History (pg.12)

Hermeneutics III: Note-within-Melody (pg.22)

Hermeneutics IV: Now-within-Eternity (pg.32)

Hermeneutics V: Monty-within-Python (pg.42)

Hermeneutics I: Part-within-Whole

Jun/2022

With Godel's proof that science is fated to be an incomplete set of 'parts', there will always be (i) "gaps" within which gods/God could work, and (ii) a role for human intuition to 'meta-scientifically' grasp the 'whole/Whole'. Therefore, "hermeneutics" – the process of distilling meaning by cycling between 'parts' and their 'w/Whole/s' – applies to all walks of life, including "science". But, what about "post-modernism"?

Hermeneutics II: Chapter-within-(Hi)Story

July/2022

"Modern" philosophy begins with Descartes. It didn't take long to go off the rails with John Locke and, before you know it, along comes Marx (who pretends that David Hume, the early voice "for synchronicity", never existed). The irony of modern philosophy is that Marx's other 'parent', Hegel, had warned us that narrowing one's big picture focus to the century or so in which one lives is, in effect, a "Freudian slip".

Hermeneutics III: Note-within-Melody

Aug/2022

In the early 20thC, Karl Popper might have thought that he had stumbled upon the "end of history" of "the philosophy of science" but, courtesy of Thomas Kuhn, it had, by the end of the 20thC, become clear that "falsificationism" is itself "falsifiable". As "The Architect" of "The Matrix" reminds us, sooner or later, anomalies pile up to a "critical mass". Non-recognition of anomaly leads to loveless, cruel "imperialism".

Hermeneutics IV: Now-within-Eternity

Sep/2022

For many hermeneutists, the "hermeneutic cycle", from part to whole back to part out to wider whole, is better conceived as a "hermeneutic spiral". Others would go further still to conceive the "hermeneutic tapestry". And, given that, in spacetime, the Earth-Sun axis is more cylinder than it is either cycle or spiral, FA has grounds to add the neologism, "hermeneutic cylinder", to the 'meta-hermeneutic' lexicon.

Hermeneutics V: Monty-within-Python

Oct/2022

Although the term hermeneutics was recently coined by Mauricio Beuchot, the practice goes back to Plato & Aristotle. The 'renaissance' of hermeneutics can be said to have begun with Martin Luther's desire to forget about what the popes were saying and interpret the Bible. Having grown with Friedrich Schleiermacher, hermeneutics matured when the time came to see its funny side, "blessed are the cheesemakers?".


HERMENEUTICS I: PART-WITHIN-WHOLE

META-PHILOSOPHY or META-META-PHILOSOPHY?

There is a sense in which all philosophers are aiming to be ‘meta-philosophers’. The best example of this, perhaps, is the “post-modern philosopher” insofar as s/he is ever keen to advise the “(pre)-modern philosopher” that, by not noticing or evaluating the dubious “meta-narrative” that underpins his/her philosophy, s/he barely deserves the title, “philosopher”. For a specific example, the “post-modernist” might nominate (the narrative of) “progress” that incoherently underpins the philosophy of scientism: science’s own foundation of “chance-‘n’-necessity” reveals that there is no “progress”, meaning that it is not “progressing” towards, say, a “Grand Unified Whole”. Overall, for the post-Nietzschean post-modernist, we exist in a fractured world with 8+ billion opinions about how the world ‘is’, all incomplete, flawed and terminally relative.

Therefore, “hermeneutics”, the study of how meaning is established by cycling between parts and their (often meta-narrative-laden) whole, is “modern”. Astrologers are hermeneutists insofar as they recognize both parts – archetypal interactions – and the whole – the zodiac. Freudastrologists are ‘very hermeneutic’ insofar as we are keen to couch all archetypal interactions within an assessment of how far the individual has grown across his/her ‘2-3-4-5-6-7-(8) lower hemisphere’ to, thereby, properly ‘ground’ any ‘9 philosophy’ that s/he might articulate to the ‘10-11-12-(1) collective’.

A \$64000Q now begs: if we examine a horoscope of a post-modern philosopher, would this constitute “regression” to (dubious) “modern philosophy” or “expansion” to ‘meta-meta-philosophy’? If the former, then the philosopher, if s/he were alive, is right to reject us; if the latter, then s/he might take some interest; for an example, let’s turn to the philosopher who wrote the 1979/84 book, “The Postmodern Condition”...




With our (as we shall see, too) cursory ‘first take’ of Jean-Francois’ birth chart – extraverted thinking Gemini ascendant with chart ruler, Mercury, the Sun & Venus in the heroic lower hemisphere – we might see a chart that could promote development

toward a creative, flexible ego structure. Yet, upon noticing Venus conjunct Pluto, Sun conjunct Neptune and Mercury opposite Uranus, the Freudastrologer would become hesitant. S/he becomes more hesitant still upon noticing the “blocking” that Saturn in Libra opposite Chiron in Aries is likely to enact on efforts to ‘develop up’ from the 5th house into the 7th house (wherein we see his Jupiter-Moon conjunction in Sagittarius). This “block” is amplified by the fact that the cusp of the 9th house of philosophizing is straddled by Capricorn, the sign that points back down to the problematic Saturn (in the 6th house). With this more hesitant view that picks up so many potential problems in Jean-Francois’ horoscope, a Freudastrologer would assume until proven otherwise that “philosophy” was a psychological “defense” against the realization that he needed a personal-heroic “meta-narrative” to underpin the growth of a centred, adaptive and balanced ego structure. If we had been bitten by Billy Wilder in “Sunset Boulevard” mode, we would worry that Jean-Francois’ superego had “enfolded” him.

At this point, Jean-Francois might ‘complain’ that our overview is too focused on his superego... (if he was astrologically literate) Jean-Francois would point out that his rising sign, Gemini, is the sign that notices the 10,000 things (& 8+ billion opinions), so, if there was any enfoldment, would it not be a function of his ‘ig’? A: agreed, to be fully accurate, hermeneutic Freudastrologers would describe (i) a truncating feedback loop between the ascendant and his (Aquarius) M.C., and (ii) a ‘short-circuit’ between M.C. and its ruler, Uranus, ‘doubled up’ in his 11th house (this M.C.-ruler is opposite the chart ruler). Nonetheless, we stay focused on the superego because it is the organ of negation, elimination & mutual exclusion. Yes, “modern philosophy” is negating – John Locke’s “nihil est in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu” (paraphrasing, “a newborn psyche is a ‘blank slate’”) – but the post-modernist’s disdain for silly appeals to authority has a smell of authoritarianism in its disdain. It is never about the content of superego statements; it is ever about the (you’ll know them by their) “fruits” of superego statements... flawed, terminal relativisms sprout mental illness.


Hermeneuticists, by contrast, are ‘meta-meta-philosophers’ insofar as they can see that ‘(w)holism fetish’ of modernism and the ‘part-(ism)-fetish’ of post-modernism need to be flexibly and creatively connected via the following “hermeneutic cycle”...



... in Hegelian words, the modernist theses might have generated post-modern antitheses but “the problem of opposites” is solved by expansion to a quadratic i.e. by seeing the cross set of opposites as a choice: how to pass between them? Before one/neo can choose, however, one/neo needs a developed ego, something that requires sacrifice of one’s superego-ig-ic stasis (= entry into the “massa confusa”). These ideas have been famously presented in a movie trilogy that presents this quadratic by considering the differences between (if instinctual) “choice” and its (if rational) “understanding”...

‘HERMENEUTIC TRILOGY’ A: THE MATRIX (1999-2003) ☺☺☺

Andy/Lilly Wachowski
29/12/1967 3.00am
Chicago, Illinois



An individual who (i) values his/her individuality & (ii) feels its incompleteness is on the road to being a hero. The hero’s journey requires, first of all, for a hero to be aware of his psychological ‘division’... his ‘parts’. As “Agent Smith” (Hugo Weaving) reports to “Mr. Anderson/Neo” (Keanu Reeves), “we have had our eye on you for some time now, it seems that you have been living two lives” (the ‘10 superego-ic’ conformist computer programmer; and the ‘11-1 supraego-ic/ig-ic’ computer hacker-rebel). This ‘part-ness’ is why Joseph Campbell included a “refusal of call to adventure” phase in his archetypal overview of the hero’s “meta-narrative”. The reason that “Morpheus” (Laurence Fishburne), god of the ‘12-(4) (day)-dreaming id’, contacts Neo is because, at last, Neo’s (red pill) ‘ig’ has become stronger than his (blue pill) superego.

Although the Wachowskis reference Jean Baudrillard’s terse, “post-modern” manifesto, “Simulacra & Simulation” (1981) – not only can anything mean anything, but everything means everything in such a persistent way that, eventually, everything means nothing – the film is more focused on the struggle between two meta-narratives, (i) the archetypal hero with an (if hesitant) aim to journey anti-clockwisely to achieve “integrative pluralism”, & (ii) the anti-heroic collectivist attitude that has uncritically swallowed the superego’s meta-narrative, “self-division is O.K.! no-one has to worry about an individual (a collective or a civilization) threatened by ‘disintegration!’”.

So, in Campbellian terms, we see Neo taking the red pill of his first “dangerous transition” and, in Freudastrological terms, we see Neo using his ‘ig’ for the first time to realize that he was too beholden to his superego. We especially like the scenes where Neo learns to use his musculature in a positive way because it denotes the achievement of having departed from negative-neutral, ‘bony’ Capricorn and having entered the sensually positive, ‘fleshy’ Taurus. At this point, Neo has not developed any feeling for his situation, even if “the Oracle” (Gloria Foster) predicts that he will develop enough feeling for his father-figure, Morpheus, that his ‘4 atonement’ looms. In the meantime, of course, there is plenty of interaction with ‘3 siblings’, including regretful “Cypher”

(Joe Pantoliano) and smitten “Trinity” (Carrie-Anne Moss), the latter symbolizing the threat of endogamy. Longstanding readers will know that psychological endogamy is an ‘OK’ eventuality and physical endogamy a ‘not-OK’ eventuality. The fact that Neo and Trinity don’t get it on until the former has undergone death and resurrection is a ‘better-than-not-OK’ eventuality. In the trilogy’s second edition, it is Trinity’s turn to die and be reborn... a ‘good’ eventuality that delivers the (now “centroverted”) couple from Leo into Scorpio. If one includes her ‘8 climax’, Trinity, overall, undergoes three deaths and two rebirths. Lana’s 2021 expansion brings her back for the third time.


The references to the best-known of Campbellian hero myths, Christianity, are impossible to miss, but the Wachowskis introduce a few twists. First, the feminization of the Trinity and this can be astrologically justified insofar as the “Age of Pisces” is, after all, a ‘feminine’ age. Indeed, when the “Architect” (Helmut Bakaitis) explains to Neo that the matrix is “mothered”, he subscribes one of the ‘masculine’ functions, the intuition, to its mother. In the zodiac, ‘12’, ‘4’ & ‘8’'s feminine feeling ‘feeds forward’ to ‘1’, ‘5’ & ‘9’'s intuition. A 2nd Wachowski twist is the (at least, temporary) idea that Plato’s ‘(further) inner’ world of archetypes – the world that is designed by the deistic architect and the theistic oracle – is the false world (noting that Christianity takes the Platonic realm as true). By the end of the narrative, of course, the audience will realize that there is a ‘golden reality’ to the matrix if it is accessed from Neo’s anti-clockwise direction i.e. Neo ‘deals’ with “The Merovingian” (Lambert Wilson), a character that, by virtue of (i) his marriage to “Persephone” (Monica Bellucci), (ii) his obsession with thermodynamic causality, & (iii) his control of limbo, reveals that he is ‘8 gatekeeping’ the ‘true 9-10-11-12 Platonic-Christian’ philosophy, rather than the ‘false 12-11-10-9 confused’ philosophy of the agents of the matrix. A 3rd Wachowski twist is the Cathar’s overview that Christian underpinnings don’t have to be mutually exclusive of Eastern reincarnation i.e. there is reconciliation between Eastern & Western religion in the final scene: “Sati” (Tanveer K. Atwal) and the reincarnated oracle (Mary Alice) sitting together on a park bench. Although it is more a scientific than a religious twist, the irony of Agent Smith complaining to Morpheus that Homo sapiens behaves more like a virus than a mammal and, hypocritically, becoming a virus himself is another twist.

In turning to Andy/Lilly’s natal chart, the benefic side of his mother (image) is not hard to spot i.e. Jupiter in Virgo the 10th house square Moon in Sagittarius in the 2nd house. In turn, we notice the strength of the feminine-in-general as symbolized by Venus-conjunct-Neptune in Scorpio in the 1st house. We don’t have enough biography to know the degree to which Andy/Lilly has formed a “relationship to” (reciprocating any “possession by”) the mother and feminine-in-general. We don’t need a biography, however, to notice that the difficult father image puts a lot of “pressure” on the benefic mother image to be benefic i.e. as for so many born in the 2nd half of the 1960s, Pluto conjunct Uranus opposite Saturn-Chiron messes with a luminary... in Andy/Lilly’s case, it is his/her Sun-Mercury conjunction in the 2nd house. Although Uranus-Pluto in the 11th house invokes a power-wielding “Architect”, we get a sense of him (as Freud would say it) being “sealed on the other side” by the Mars conjunct I.C. in Aquarius.

We have insufficient biography to comment about his/her “progressed Moon” rolling through his/her I.C. in 2001 but, however it was expressed, it will be covered by a new ‘layer’ of incarnation in 2031. More Morpheus, less Architect?

‘HERMENEUTIC MONOLOGY?’ A: ANNIHILATION (2018) ☹☹☹

Alex Garland
26/5/1970
London, U.K.




With the Latin word, “nihil”, sitting within the title of Alex’s underappreciated 2nd film, our focus returns to the theme of the eliminative superego & its 1st “modern” philosophical exponent, John Locke. A collective of scientists are forced to ponder an alien presence, a “shimmer”, that ultimately leads one, “Dr. Ventress” (Jennifer Jason Leigh), to “identify” with it and declare, “I don’t know what it wants... or if it wants”.

‘Wanting’, per se, is a function of the 1st archetype but, as noted with not only John Locke’s but also Jung’s epistemological declaration, mental activity begins with 2nd archetypal sensing. Or, if the eliminative superego is on full thrust, mental activity begins with 10th archetypal ‘negative sensing’. The reason that the “shimmer” is able to “refract” and dissipate the genetic code of (in particular) Homo sapiens and lead it to self-destruction seems to be due to Homo sapiens’ failure to give sufficient birth to a 1st archetypal ‘want’ that could ‘trump’ the alien’s. Thus, too much of Homo sapiens’ (collective) psyche is stuck inside its neotenous, John Lockean ‘10-(11-12) masochism’, and too keen to eliminate 1st archetypal “personality”, “intentionality” and “proto-teleology”. So keen, in fact, that chances for “resurrection” are reduced to zero.

Prior to the scientific pondering, however, the story has a backstory of military intrusion into the “shimmer”. Although astrology recognizes the 1st archetypal link to “war”, the psychological astrologer would hasten to add that “war” is best ‘pondered’ as a “compensatory” leap from a masochistic 4th quadrant archetype to a sadistic 1st quadrant archetype and this same “compensation” robs the 1st quadrant from its need to imagine its self-sacrifice(s) and resurrections into “higher” levels of “teleology”. If ‘1’ doesn’t ‘reach’ ‘5’, humanity can only intuit triumph or defeat... as symbolized by the capacity of the “shimmer” to scramble the sequencing/co-operating “Hox” genes.

Alex’s Mercury (admittedly, conjunct Saturn), Sun, Mars and Venus placed in the 1st quadrant and his interest in ‘hermeneutic heroines’ more than heroes, leads us now to roll back to, as ratings reveal, cinema’s most famous ‘hermeneutic heroine’...

ESSENTIAL HEROINES A: THE WIZARD OF OZ (1939) ☉☽☿♁



Of the handfuls of great films that highlight the writer more than the director, the “most watched” is the adaptation of L. Frank Baum’s fantasy journey somewhere beyond Kansas. Our writer’s highlight here is, in part, an outcome of the Hollywood system of the 30s that had directors work for studios rather than ‘for the film’, per se. Specifically, in the film adaptation of “The Wizard of Oz”, Victor Fleming is identified as the director but, film historians tell us that George Cukor, Mervyn LeRoy, Richard Thorpe and King Vidor were contributors. In any case, the main reason for our focus on L. Frank’s natal horoscope (with, again, a guess at a birth-time) is that he was born within two weeks of Freud and, therefore, we can make more astrological comparisons to Freud than we are able to make in comparison to, say, Victor Fleming.

So, before we compare L. Frank to Sigmund, this is a good juncture to re-ask the ‘basic’ astrological question: why use the birthdate (± birthtime) as one’s primary point of reference? The answer, in fact, spins out of a ‘deeper’ primary question: why is the zodiac’s ‘birth’, 0° of Aries, located at spring’s equinox? The simplest answer to this question is that the equinoxes are times that speak to what existence would be like on a non-tilting earth – seasonally ‘meaningless’ – and, so, the 1st (2nd) day of spring is the re-launch of seasonal meaning in the tropical zodiac. Translating this to the birth of an intuiting organism, we see that its physical birth is the beginning of intuitions of meaning for the life that is about to be lived. Agreed, it may not be a meaning that will sustain itself all the way through life but, as noted in our mini-essay on “Annihilation”, that doesn’t diminish its usefulness. This is precisely what each one of us intuit at our birthday celebrations – at our (respective) “Solar returns” – and, if we have access to our (respective) birthtimes – we re-commence our intuitive desire for “individuation” whenever our (respective) ascendants ‘interact’ with the Sun and/or planets.

With this ‘outlook’ in mind, our first guess for L. Frank’s ascendant is the Crab because his heroine, frightened farmgirl “Dorothy”, was perfectly played by a Cancer-on-the-ascendant actor, Judy Garland, and the astrologer would be on the lookout for

some synastry (= ‘inter-horoscopic resonance’) between them. Astrologers who guess for a different ascendant would likely cite the key ‘resonance’ as L. Frank’s Jupiter in Aries opposing Moon-Mars in Libra sitting on Judy’s Saturn-Jupiter conjunction in Libra. The Freudastrologer, however, in noticing its narrative emphasis on the ‘11-10 ego-ideal/superego-ic fear factor’ – to the animus possession of Miss Gulch (Margaret Hamilton) and the twister that comes in her wake – would be keen to point out that Judy would have resonated to L. Frank’s story because she had all three 4th quadrant archetypes, ‘10’, ‘11’ & ‘12’ (i.e. Uranus in Pisces on the M.C.) interacting on her M.C., square Sun in Gemini in her 12th house. To make the most out of Judy’s 4th quadrant emphasis, of course, a hermeneutic FA-er would need to add Kleinastrology – a phase of superego development that is pre-I.C. – to his/her part-to-whole cyclic kitbag.

In ‘Straight Lines of the Galaxy: Introduction’, we applied Erich Neumann’s “creation-hero-transformation” mythological sequence to the zodiac cycle. If Joseph Campbell had examined Neumann’s pattern, he may have, with a hermeneutic alert, pointed out that his initial phase, “creation”, could be over-pinned by the initial phases of his own ‘more-holistic’ view of the hero myth that includes the phase where the hero is so ignorant of the hero’s journey that, when “called” to it, he can only respond to it with fear. As in Neo of “The Matrix”, this is a “refusal of call to adventure” and, as a result, the hero continues to loiter in collective expectations. Klein-astrologically, this translates to “paranoid-schizoid” ‘1-12-11-10-9 regression’. The schizoid “split” ‘back from’ ‘1’ doesn’t last... soon, a “compensatory” leap ‘back to’ ‘1’ is the path that leads ‘forward’ to a pseudo-heroic ‘3 rationalization’ (e.g. the uncertainty of scientists about what to do with the returning military anti-hero/anti-heroine in “Annihilation”). This is how we see the first phase of Dorothy’s heroism... she encounters the ‘sepia’ Wizard of Oz (Frank Morgan) at Gemini’s ‘3 cross-roads’ but she hasn’t yet developed enough Solar imagination to “follow the yellow brick road” through the entirety of her lower hemisphere and reach ‘7 Emerald City’, wherein she can converse with the ‘colourful green’ Wizard (Frank Morgan, again) with enough ‘5 confidence’ to challenge him.


In keeping with L. Frank’s Uranus-Sun in Taurus, Dorothy returns to her farm as a tornado brews. We could say that her ‘balance’ between ‘11’ & ‘5’ has evened out enough now that her ‘1-back-to-12/11/10 feedback loop’ is ready to be knocked out by a window frame. In turn, her entry into a ‘daydream’ might be “unconscious” but it is ‘better’ than the (empty)-wrong idea of “self-consciousness” that she had been using prior to this point in the tale i.e. Dorothy was “inertly identified” with the “Aunt Em” (Clara Blandick)/“Ms. Gulch” dyad. We see Aunt Em’ as potential “compensator” of Dorothy’s ‘10 superego-ic’ fear when Aunt Em’ attacks Dorothy’s projected ‘11 supra-egoic’ animus, Miss Gulch, by saying that she is “too Christian” to articulate her taboo thoughts about Miss Gulch’s inflexible and undevelopable attitude toward the natural ‘1-2-3-4-5-6-7 world’, as symbolized by the antics of Dorothy’s dog, “Toto”.

At this point, some will suggest that, when Dorothy is struck on her head, her loss of consciousness bespeaks another “regression” to ‘(10-11)-12’'s archetypal realm. Recall that, in Plato’s view, the psyche ‘absorbs’ the archetypal realm during the pre-natal phases of development but gradually ‘forgets’ it over the infant-to-child-to-adult phases of development (and, then, ‘remembers’ it when it is time for a senior initiation into Platonic philosophy). As a result, they will likely add that “Munchkinland” is an expression of the 4th quadrant. For FA, however, this is a moot point i.e. at many places

in this website we have pointed out that the ascendant-persona is, as Jung says it, “but a slice cut from the collective loaf”. The fact that the Munchkins (i) are lovers of colour and ‘5 Apollonian’ singing and, in concert with the “Good Witch of the North” (Billie Burke) (ii) happily point Dorothy in an anti-clockwise direction, and (iii) celebrate the death of the “Wicked Witch of the East”, tells us that Munchkinland straddles the 4th and 1st quadrants, especially ‘from-12-to-1’ and, therefore, the Munchkins are aligned with Pisces’ ‘anti-clockwise(= Solar)’ fish... this is the fish closest to Aries.

With Pisces’ “progression vs. regression” dyad now in mind, we can return to L. Frank’s (and Sigmund’s) natal Neptune in Pisces and take the view that this is the symbol for his (their) grasp of the “regressive” instinct to bury oneself somewhere in the ‘matriarchate’. Or, to put it more precisely, the annual journey of the Sun through their Pisces sectors would have highlighted (i) the “regressive” fish of Pisces – the fish closest to Aquarius – and (ii) the “regressive-ness” of Neptune. Of course, Freud would never have conceived this in the language of astrologers but L. Frank may have come close to conceiving it thus by virtue of his connections to Neoplatonic Theosophists. If Freud had been drawn to “The Wizard of Oz” – both L. Frank’s story and Sigmund’s “The Interpretation of Dreams” were published on the heels of their shared midlife Neptune-square-Neptune in 1900 – he may have noticed the parallel between Oedipus’ not-so-successful “compensatory” leap across his ascendant and into his 1st quadrant and Dorothy’s not-so-successful “compensatory” leap across her ascendant and into her 1st quadrant. If so, Freud might also have noticed that, whereas Oedipus can only make amends by castrating his ‘upper testicles’ (his eyes), Dorothy makes amends by improving her relationships to her ‘inner characters’. In turn, Dorothy becomes a role model of hero-(in)-ism for young women. Notice, here, that a woman’s ‘hero journey’ differs to a man’s insofar as, whereas a hero needs to ‘self-overcome’, a heroine faces the task of (not ‘en-’, but) ‘un-folding’ towards better ‘inner’ & ‘outer’ relationships.

We are at a point, perhaps, where it is likely to help if we summarize the first act of “The Wizard of Oz” as an extension of an earlier-presented schema...



... and, because the very first images of “The Wizard of Oz” show Dorothy and Toto running from Miss Gulch, we would align them with Campbell’s “refusal of the call to adventure” insofar as she returns to her farm hoping that her authority figures will solve her problem... only to find that either they don’t want her bothering them or they criticize her for not trying to build up her brains & her courage. With “Hunk” (Ray Bolger), “Hickory” (Jack Haley) & “Zeke” (Bert Lahr) being the characters that

Dorothy will meet again when she is in a sunnier frame of mind, we get another sense of L. Frank's sensing-Taurean Sun needing to add the succeeding functions, thinking, feeling and intuiting in order to make headway into his 2nd quadrant.

Before Dorothy's second chance to make better relationships to her other three functions of consciousness, the meaning-seeker will have noticed an interesting colour contrast between the ruby-red slippers that Dorothy, having inherited them from the wicked witch of the East, needs to walk the golden-brick road. For FA, this is another reference to the value of '1 initiative' in overcoming 4th quadrant "splits"... so, maybe the wicked witch of the East wasn't so wicked. Or, to be more precise, the wicked witch of the East would only become so if she were alive enough to discourage Dorothy from accepting that, eventually, synthetic gold will need to 'underpin' impulsive red.

The experience of colour has been used by the philosopher, Frank Jackson, as a way of highlighting the "hard problem of consciousness". In his musings on "Mary's Room", he describes Mary as a scientist who, like Dorothy, lives in a black and white world yet, unlike Dorothy, learns everything that is knowable about colour – photons, wavelengths, eyes, the visual cortex of the brain etc. – without being able to experience "redness", "goldenness" etc. because that is the state of her world. Then, however, just like Dorothy, she walks through a door that she had not noticed before to discover that her world had been 'prison' against direct experience. Jackson thought of his "Wizard of Oz" scenario as a proof that physics & chemistry will never be enough to fully know the world. Therefore, even if, at a point in the future, philosophers of "consciousness" were to prove "consciousness" to be a non-primary "epiphenomenon", there's nothing in it that would negate "consciousness" capacity to be an 'antenna' of nuance.

For FA-ers, Jackson's "thought experiment" is less important in terms of what it proves and more important in terms of how it assists astrologers to differentiate '9', '10' & '11' from '12' i.e. the skeletal laws of physics and chemistry can be appreciated (and, for a tyrannical "reductionist", they could be enforced) from a place of complete matriarchal "identity" but, as the psyche 'descends' from '11' into '12', the "qualia" of subjective experience become appreciable. Yes, a '12 experience' might be dreamy but that won't prevent it from its role in readying the psyche for '1 self-awareness' & its need to use the extraverted aspects of the (four) functions to carry this "self" to the patriarchal "conscious ego". In other words, '12' lacks the "consciousness" to generate "self-awareness" or "ego-knowledge", but it is still a pre-requirement for these "(epi)-phenomena". The Munchkins might lack something in the "consciousness" stakes but we notice that they have a richer "culture" than the "reaction formational" Kansans.

Indeed, we can turn to another philosopher, Wilhelm Dilthey, to affirm that an appreciation of culture is an important pre-requirement for "individuation" because, as Dilthey explains, comparing cultures in a non-imperialistic (i.e. non-assumption of superiority) way opens the way to a compassionate acceptance of differences between individuals. The "repressive-eliminative" superego gives itself away when it carries on as if everyone else (and other cultures) is (are) an inferior version/s of itself. To be sure, Pisces may not be quite the horizontal sign – i.e. not Aries or Libra – but Pisces' direct contact to Aries symbolizes a capacity to 'value' equality. Then, the lower hemispheric journeyer, if "unconsciously", gains a sense of '7 Libran' "equality" that, in any case, becomes more "conscious" when, in the month prior to Easter, the Moon becomes full in Virgo. Further astrological affirmation arrives courtesy of an inspection of Wilhelm

Dilthey's natal horoscope... he had Pisces on the cusp of both his 9th house and his M.C. and his "chart ruler", the Moon, turns up in the philosopher's 9th house. Although his Sun wasn't placed in '9', it was at least placed in the sign that puts great 'value' on '9' i.e. Scorpio. Overall, then, the "The Wizard of Oz"'s shift to colour symbolizes less the input of the '(11)-12 raw archetypal view' and more the input of the photonic '5 Sun' in Pisces... this helps journeyers 'see' all the way through to '7 green Emerald City'.

It is, of course, (... errr) a no-brainer to conceive the "straw man" representing Dorothy's now developing '3 Geminian thinking', the "tin man" representing her now developing '4 Cancerian feeling' and the "lion man" representing her now developing '5 Leoneic intuitive courage'. The fact, however, that Dorothy winds up something of a "Parsifal" when she reaches the '7 Libran Emerald City', tells us that her relationship to her three friends is faulty in some way. Indeed, there were glimpses of this faultiness when we the Wicked Witch of the West (+ North) making the diametric leap from her '10/11 lair' 'down' to '4-5' and chiding Dorothy. Indeed, the wicked witch is also able to make the diametric leap from '12' to '6' insofar as she '12 drugs' Dorothy after she befriends the cowardly '5 lion'. Psychologically, then, we can say that, instead of being "related to" '3-4-5-6', Dorothy is too "passively identified with" '3-4-5-6'. And, so, in order to make her right hemispheric relationships "real", Dorothy has the additional task of addressing the vestiges of her "animus possession"... for Freudians, this means dealing with her "castration complex" i.e. the witch's broomstick is her attachment to her phallus and, to become, fully feminine, she needs to discover Scorpio's fornix.

At first, it may seem that L. Frank and Freud sharply diverge in respect of sex & gender but Freud would have understood L. Frank's intention to keep them off the storytelling table because the story is primarily about relationships. In any case, Freud took view that the sexual educator 'follows' the child's curiosity and, if a child is happy to conceive of witches as sex-less beings, then the educator can conclude that the child is not yet ready to be confronted with the birds and bees. Alternatively, if a teenager were to watch "The Wizard of Oz" and lack curiosity about the sexual trickery that is implied by "flying monkeys", the educator is justified to have concerns that such a teen might be setting him/herself up for sexual teen-trouble born of sexual naivete.

The witch's use of the hourglass is a nice reference to thermodynamic time i.e. Dorothy's biological clock will tick on into her fertile years whether she likes it or not, just as it ticks on for the woman who is closing in on her post-fertile years whether she likes it or not... to push her toward a deeper understanding of the link from biological fertility to spiritual fertility. All this, to be sure, is not Dorothy's current problem and, so, it is no wonder that, after she returns to (not '7... ', but now) '9 Emerald City', the wizard 'transcends' the story – transiting Jupiter was, after all, in Sagittarius in 1900 – to leave Dorothy behind so that she can focus on re-immersing herself in a synthesis of her imaginary world and her real world. Hence, the advice from the Good Witch of the South as to how to make better relationships within '4's 'me-in-here home'.

Whenever we think of last scene of "The Wizard of Oz", we think of a girl who has become comfortable in the bosom of her family and, accordingly, we think of the Moon, Cancer & the 4th archetype in general. Yet, to grasp the richest meaning of the '4th archetype in general', the hermeneuticist in us thinks of '4' in relation not only to '10', '11', '12', '1' etc. but also to the 'greater-than-sum-of-parts' whole, the "Toto".


HERMENEUTICS II: CHAPTER-WITHIN-(HIS)-STORY

META-NARRATIVE or META-META-NARRATIVE

Having noted, in ‘Hermeneutics I’, the hidden meta-narrative in “post-modern philosophy” – the “post-modernist”’s “incredulity towards meta-narratives” becomes a meta-narrative of its own – let’s now ask the question: is it, in any case, fair to apply the term, “meta-narrative”, to narrow visions of the cosmos, such as the already-noted John Lockean “blank slate”? Wouldn’t it be more accurate to view these as ‘fractured chapters’ of the meta-narrative, “assumption is the mother of all f...”? In turn, would this mean that a philosopher would become ‘more philosophical’ if s/he were to search for the ‘meta-meta-narrative’ that exposes the anomalies of ‘meta-narratives’?

With Freud taking the view that religion was a very much bigger problem than philosophy, he might have counselled against any focus on philosophical searches. Yet, given the fuzzy boundary between philosophy and religion – take, for example, that Karl Marx had drawn on Locke’s “blank slate” idea in noting that the godless religion, “communism”, could be imprinted on the psyches of all newborns (and seal the “end of history”) – we stand by our view that philosophy and religion are neck and neck in the ‘very-much-bigger-problem’ stakes.


At this point, sharp-eyed readers will point out that, in addition to Locke, Marx had drawn on one of the, if once removed, ‘fathers’ of hermeneutics, Hegel i.e. Marx ‘mixed’ Lockean “materialism/physicalism” with the Hegelian “dialectic” to come up with “dialectic materialism”. And, so, as we had done with Jean-Francois Lyotard, it is well worth looking at the Freudastrological superego-ig-id indications of the author, along with co-author, Friedrich Engels, of “The Communist Manifesto” (1948)...



... despite the fact that, unlike Jean-Francois, Karl lived prior to Freud’s meta-psychological formulation and, therefore, couldn’t have benefited from it. Now, if we begin, as we had done with Jean-Francois’ chart, with the narrow focus on Karl’s ego-generating Sun-conjunct-Moon in Taurus (trine Jupiter) & Mercury in Gemini in

the third house, we could generate some optimism that Karl could have built a flexible, adaptive ego. Yet, as it had been the case for Jean-Francois, hesitancy comes flooding in when we notice the outer planets that are involved in his superego-ig ‘short circuit’ i.e. Uranus-Neptune in Sagittarius in the 10th house square to Chiron-Pluto (and an, if wide, square to Saturn) in Pisces. The fact that Karl’s Mercury in Gemini in the 3rd house indicates an opportunity for a “post-modern” respect for the 10,000 things (and 8+billion opinions) tells the counselling Freudastrologer that his ego development was stuttering even prior to his I.C. transition. In turn, the Freudastrologer, if s/he had an H.G. Wells time-machine, would advise Karl to focus on his 1st personal predicament and leave the challenge of grand philosophical overviews to one side. For example...

If Karl had made his way ‘past’ his I.C., he may have paid more attention to Hegel’s own ‘short circuiting’, ‘triphase’ conception of history i.e. from thesis, across to anti-thesis, halfway back to synthesis. For the Jungian psychologist, Hegel was (at least) one phase ‘short’. Jung would probably have used a cooking metaphor to invoke the ‘4th’ corner that, in turn, generates the ‘5th’ centre i.e. ‘true synthesis’ is a result of ‘mixing’ at the 4th corner that allows a ‘5 centre’ to ‘cook’ all corners; as follows...




... noting that a truly synthetic attitude requires that it can find a way to bring the eliminative superego into the discussion e.g. is a superego justified in pointing out to ‘mixers’ that statements such as “nurture and its antithesis, nature, work together” are too pathetically anemic to qualify as ‘synthetic (= fertile)’ explanations?

One especially significant function of a ‘centroverted’ and developed ‘5 centre’ is its capacity to retrieve “projections”. In turn, the FA-er would, at some point during his analysis of Karl, ask him if he wonders about the degree to which he is “projecting” his own religiosity onto the masses whenever he pronounces, “religion is the opiate of the masses”, especially in reflective light of the fact of the archetype of not only opiates but also masses, ‘12’, qualifies his superego (‘12 Neptune’ in his 10th house square ‘8 Pluto’ intensifying ‘12 Pisces’). Non-retrieval leads to ‘mixing’, not to ‘synthesizing’.

If, alternatively, Karl had the H.G. Wells time-machine and had jumped into the 21stC, he would likely shore up his “defenses” with “science” i.e. the only way that we can find out if his theory (that, in any case, was misinterpreted in the 20thC) was a plus or minus for Homo sapiens would be to scan the multiverse for a “control Earth” that proceeded through the 2nd half of the 19thC without “The Communist Manifesto” & “Das Kapital” and, then, compare the two histories. Of course, it would be entirely possible that other political theories could have taken root that may have had a greater ‘11-1 impatience factor’ than communism and eventualities such as the Cuban Missile Crisis might have become WWII. One of cinema’s more intriguing “alternate class war” tales was released at the “Neptune return” of the “The Communist Manifesto”...

‘HERMENEUTIC TRILOGY’ B: THE HUNGER GAMES (2010/12-15) ☹☹


When, in the 3rd part of the trilogy (naughty cash-grabbing Hollywood decided to split it into 3rd & 4th parts), the audience is introduced to the rebel outpost, “District 13” (similar to “Zion” of “The Matrix”), it couldn’t help but notice the left-wing-ish, “peoples’ army” uniforms pointing to a socialist philosophy underpinning the rebel’s ultimate aim to restore democracy. Freudastrologers can’t help but ‘like’ this uniform insofar as socialism & democracy share the non-synthetic ‘mixture’ stage; as follows...



throughout most of this 3rd part, the anti-heroine/heroine, “Katniss” (Jennifer Lawrence), fumbles about inside her superego, yet it also deserves to be noted that her superego is informed-enough by ‘synthetic’ vectors that she ‘intuits beyond’ the ‘short circuiting’ thesis-antithesis-‘mixture’ problem that Hegel & Marx could not.

The turning of ‘mixtures’ into ‘syntheses’ is a function of fire. Hence, Suzanne Collins sees the point of ‘firing’ things up. We see both a controlled fire in the heroine’s outfit and an uncontrolled fire chasing her down a mountainside... and, so, the FA-er is directed to the fiery ‘1-5-9’ trinity and, then, might first inspect the horoscope of...

Jennifer Lawrence
15/8/1990 3.20pm
Louisville, Ken



In light of the facts that (i) we have yet to find the birth time of author, Suzanne Collins, (ii) the split directors’ credit, and (ii) Jennifer having ‘9 Sagittarius’ on her ‘1 ascendant’, it may be more instructive to consider the degree that Karl Marx (thrown by FA’s ‘time machine’ into the 21stC) might have “projected” his strongly Sagittarian mother image onto the “(twenty) teenies” biggest star and, then, consider the degree to which his “projections” might have been “positive” or “negative”. If he had been

in therapy, we guess that he would at least acknowledge an “ambivalence” toward her. Let’s note that Suzanne Collins, part of the early 1960s ‘Tarantino (mini)-generation’, has a natal Moon placed in ‘9 Sagittarius’ and a natal ‘5 Sun’ in ‘5 Leo’.


Because 1/12th of the actresses who might have been cast in the role of “Katniss Everdeen” would have had Sagittarius on their (respective) ascendants, we can’t say that this was ‘the’ reason that Jennifer was cast in the role of the archer-heroine. Nor can we put her casting down to the transit of Pluto through her 1st house because, for the same reason, all the other Sagittarius rising stars would have experienced the same “intensifying” transit (e.g. Scarlett Johansson). Although it is a ‘masculine’ archetypal dynamic, we put more stock in her Sun in Leo in the 9th house that is “intensified” by making a T-square configuration with Pluto-opposite-Mars. Her chart ruler, Jupiter, transited this T-square in 2011-12 and, it wouldn’t be off the mark to suggest that she intuited a way to ‘connect’ her T-square tension to Suzanne’s famous character.

Now, in all likelihood, Karl would have rubbished this ‘hero/ine’s journey’ as he would have rubbished all & sundry ‘hero/ine’s journeys’ insofar as, in his Hegelian view, individual heroic posturing, however successful/unsuccessful, is inconsequential confetti on the march of history. Indeed, not only do we concur with Hegel/Marx about this, our depth psychological eye also spots that most analysts ‘feel’ it, as evidenced by the oft-heard, intra-therapy lament, “what’s the point (in making sacrifice X, Y, or Z)? it isn’t going to make any difference”. As Freud would have said it, the popularity of the ‘hero/ine’s journey’ is a (compensatory) “defense” against the ‘feeling’ that one is nothing more than fodder for the cannon of history. If Karl had sought Freud’s view of “The Hunger Games”, he would likely have heard that the successful movies are so because they achieve in the wishful imagination what reality could never achieve. The point, however, for FA is not escapism, per se... rather, as we noted with “The Matrix”, because there are 8+ billion of us, we need to keep finding ways to twist an archetypal story in billions of ways. In turn, the ‘resonating’ individual gets some new clues as to how s/he might deal with both his/her uniqueness and unique circumstances.

So what are the twists of “The Hunger Games”? Despite Jennifer’s star power, the story, in any case, also has a hero, “Peeta Mellark” (Josh Hutcherson). To be sure, at first, Peter has a whiff of the anti-hero, not only through his seeming dishonesty but also by the very nature of the games insisting on one survivor... a fact that he is only too ready to remind Katniss of. Astrologically, this points us to the Sagittarian straight shooter in need of getting a better relationship to ‘9’s (geometric) opposite ‘auxiliary’, ‘3 Gemini’. This begins at the same time that we get a whiff of Peter being a hero when he informs Katniss that he doesn’t want to be a pawn in the game... although he can’t do much about being fodder, he still has the choice to be or not to be himself (we’ll get to Hamlet soon). In other words, Peeta is less a ‘mixture’ of a volunteer soldier fighting for a (dubious) collective ideal (e.g. communism, democracy) and a draft dodger and more a ‘synthesis’ of these two. This helps him to overcome his ‘12 hypnotic trance’.

The most in-the-face twist, for FA at least, is Katniss’ difficulty forming “real relationships” with potential mates because the autocracies, both behind her & ahead of her, (i) care more about “appearances of real relating” than the “reality of love” & (ii) are lovelessly able to ‘12 confuse’ the ‘personal 1-2-3-4-5-6-7’ sequence. Katniss of “District (Mars-Pluto) 13”, like Dorothy of Kansas, needs better “inner relationships”.

'HERMENEUTIC FILM' B: SILVER LININGS PLAYBOOK (2012) ☹☹☹




Born 60yrs after Alfred Hitchcock and 30yrs after Stanley Kubrick, David O. Russell has the natal ‘double up’ of Sun in Leo (Venus and Uranus are in Leo too) and, like the two great directors, David’s ‘leading ego intuition’ experiences the ‘blocking’ effect of Saturn in Sagittarius (call it, a ‘trailing ego intuition’) that, if unencumbered, would have told him “whereto his ego is going”. It is no surprise to learn that he grew up in an atheist household... his father having Russian Jewish heritage and his mother having Italian Catholic heritage. Like Hitch and Stanley, David took interest in mental illness but, unlike his forerunners, he would look on its bright side with a portrayal of a “narcissistic” disorder – “bi-polar” – heading for a loving, “erotic” redemption...

“The Silver Linings Playbook” works despite “Tiffany”’s (Jennifer Lawrence) impulsive criticism and judgement of the bi-polar madness of “Pat” (Bradley Cooper) because, earlier, she admitted to Pat that she herself wasn’t a little bi-polar in the way that she had self-treated her (reactive) “depression” i.e. she invokes the archetype of the “wounded healer”. By beginning their relationship in a state of mutual negativity, they ‘dance’ past the phase of narcissistic idealization that, in most relationships, lays ground for a relationship’s destruction when the unrealistic balloon bursts. David’s ‘5 intuitive Leo’ nose for burst balloons is a feature of the films that flank “Silver Linings Playbook”, “The Fighter” (2010:☹☹) and “American Hustle” (2013:☹☹).

The sober attitude of Tiffany & Pat to idealization is nicely symbolized by their happiness at scoring 5 out of 10 for their dance routine. In other words, the best ‘level’ of success for the ascendant’s persona/self is a ‘balanced’ success that helps life’s series of ‘births’ into the 1st quadrant but doesn’t go so far as “sticking” the individual to a ‘10-out-of-10 (ideal)’ of persona/self that, later on, would have a great deal of difficulty admitting that it is ‘11/12^{ths} wrong’ and in need of ‘self-overcoming’. To this end, David has Tiffany winning over Pat’s superstitious, OCD father, “Pat” (Robert De Niro). In fairy tales, the archetype of ‘winning over’ is often ‘carried’ by a “helpful animal”...

‘ESSENTIAL HEROES’ A: SHREK (2001) ☹☹☹☹



When “Shrek” (Mike Myers) teaches “Donkey” (Eddie Murphy), “stars don’t tell the future, Donkey; they tell stories”, we realize that Shrek is the world’s first 3D animated psychological astrologer. As we do so, we realize that psychological astrology feeds into the most important products of “(ego) consciousness”, free will & choice...

Although it is easy to find books on Freud’s theory that focus on his supposedly “deterministic” view of the human psyche, it would be inaccurate to pin him down as a fully-fledged “fatalist”. Accuracy is better served if Freud’s theory is conceived as a (to use his own term) “connected series”: at one extreme are those who, via a “reaction formation” against his theory, are “fated” to confirm it; at the other extreme are those who, having ‘absorbed’ Freud’s theory in a heartfelt, subjective way, go on to uncover their respective “freedom” to make “choices” based on their respective intuitive grasp of whereabouts (in Freudastrology’s developmental zodiac cycle; scroll back up) their respective superego-ic “policemen” have placed their respective id-ic “Shreks” “under arrest”. Shrek has no interest in rescuing any princess, let alone one, “Princess Fiona” (Cameron Diaz), “fated” to marry a ‘(not)-prince’, “Lord Farquaad” (John Lithgow), but, somewhere in the instinctual belly of his growing wisdom, he knows that he is an “onion layer” of a bigger onion story. As we discover, the fact of Shrek being a combo of anti-hero and hero – ‘part Oedipus’; ‘part Perseus’ – has much to do with why he can source enough “free will” to do a job that, on his “surface layer”, he would rather not do. By acknowledging his ambivalences, Shrek has a chance to occupy the ‘centre’ of Freud’s “fate-to-free-will series” and tell Donkey about astrology’s contribution...

Because the positions of the planets can be predicted with the greatest degrees of accuracy and confidence, there will always be a temptation in astrology to predict their acausal, synchronous Earthly expressions. An astrological philosopher, however, could remind those who are so tempted that the Earth and the Heavens operate within differing spatial-temporal scales i.e. even without the controversy of “consciousness”, basic “chaos theory” reminds teleologists & reductionists alike that, in the terrestrial

meso-scalar realm, a heavenly '(immaterial) standing wave' may not be very different to a "butterfly flapping its wings in Beijing". For example, a hard aspect from Uranus across to Saturn could be expressed as a barely remembered dream, a castration of a pet, an argument with a neighbour, a skirmish at a political rally, or a world war.

Moving 'down' another step to the micro-scalar realm, we begin to realize why predictions and "consciousness" don't really go together i.e. when a "conscious" being aims to locate 'micro-particles', s/he realizes that s/he increases "unconsciousness" in respect of their 'waveform'. Still, it may turn out that s/he would have been better off aiming for the opposite i.e. "consciousness" of 'waves' instead of their 'particles'. If a time-travelling medieval alchemist stumbled into the 20thC and, then, onto this basic tenet of nuclear physics, s/he would very likely have called this a "nigredo", the "black (Lunar) tide of mystic mud" that leads to a royal road through endogamy.

Fairy tales have much to do with the "fate vs. free will" question insofar as the etymology of "fairy" is the Latin "fata". Although Shrek reveals his wisdom to Donkey in the midst of his story, he begins it in a much more "fateful" way i.e. he decides that the fairy tale, "Love's First Kiss", is toilet paper. This is a common psychological state of many who enter therapy i.e. the individual has 'pseudo-solved' Plato's challenge to find his/her "other lost half" with the idea that there's no point setting out on the quest for (Lamarckian) co-operation because one sees oneself as too much of an ogre. Marie Louise von Franz, the premier interpreter of fairy tales, tells us that a "consciousness" that grinds to a halt is, in any case, better seen as a species of "unconsciousness". So...

As noted in our horoscope of "Shrek"'s author, William Steig, we don't have a confirmed birthtime... but, as we like to do, our first guess is Cancer on the ascendant, in part because this is the ascendant of "Dreamworks"' principal green-lighter, Steven Spielberg. A bigger part of our guess sources to our view that William's natal Neptune in Cancer, if emphasized by being placed in the 1st house, would make sense of Shrek's swamp home being invaded by the full complement of fairy tale characters (we need to note, however, that it is Shrek's parents who are the invaders of the book). We learn that this has happened because Lord Farquaad had intended to enlarge his 'kingdom' by evicting the occupants of the collective unconscious i.e. although it is unmentioned back-story, we can guess that Farquaad had seized power in the archetypical '11-back-to-10' narrative of democratic numbers and, in order to keep the strength, he realizes his need to reduce the number of the less fortunate and 'clear a path' through '12'. All Farquaad manages to achieve, of course, is the '1 anger' of someone who had, up until this time, only wanted to be left alone. Einstein's "spooky action at a distance".

If we move beyond our guessing at William's birthtime, we arrive at his certain natal Moon-conjunct-Saturn-square-Pluto (across Pisces-Gemini). Whenever we spot a Moon-Saturn conjunction, we know that the transit of Saturn and the "progressed" Moon will remain in proximity... although, by the time that Shrek was published and the movie rights were negotiated, the 1990s, his "progressed" Moon had pulled ahead of Saturn i.e. his Moon was "progressing" through Pisces when Saturn was transiting Capricorn. Meanwhile, his natal Saturn-square-Pluto tells us that, irrespective of the decade, William would always have been sensitive to the tendency of those in authority to live inside a fictional "false self" and "deny" the laws of entropy.

Now, at this point, the sharp-eyed depth psychologist will know that *both* Shrek and Farquaad are "in denial" about the passage of time... Shrek assumes that he can

enjoy his Lunar creature comforts indefinitely in a not dissimilar way that Farquaad assumes that he can eternalize his Saturnian power trip. Depth psychologists call this the “shared substance” that is ‘fated’ to bring to two together and, by doing so, afford both the opportunity to retrieve their mutual “projection”. Yet, because their “shared substance” is a psychodynamic (not a content), these kinds of opportunities often tend to remain submerged and, as a result, the hero is forced to learn his lessons “the hard way”. For Shrek, this involves ‘becoming Farquaad’, battling the archetypal parent-mother-dragon and rescuing a princess who has been locked in an ‘animus tower’.

This is the point where a longstanding reader might notice a “regression” from ‘(12)-1-(2)’ to ‘11-10-(9)’ and, in light of the “hard problem of consciousness” & “good vs. evil”, s/he might also wonder if Shrek is neglecting his ‘capacity’ to realize that his ‘12 block time’ fantasy needs some additions to become “good”. This might not appear relevant to an animated fairy tale but Jung’s distinguished protégé, Marie-Louise von Franz, would counter that the fairy tale ‘is’ the best context for consideration of “good vs. evil” because they speak to the rawest ‘level’ of the collective unconscious and, as such, bypass the confusions that the religions often instill. Either way, at this stage, we only need to say: there is no answer until there is ‘enough’ information. Given that the information bank doesn’t begin to build until “Shrek III”, we can satisfy ourselves, at least in “Shrek I”, that Shrek’s “regression” to the mother-dragon is an expression of the more impersonal levels of the unconscious and, of course, only “God” can judge what is going on when “karma” becomes ‘12 impersonal’. Nonetheless...

Other longstanding readers might see Shrek’s journey to the ‘animus tower’ as part of a more ‘diametric’ coming to terms with the mother-dragon i.e. “progressing” from ‘(12)-1-(2)’, Shrek finds his “Han Solo”, ‘3 brother-Donkey’, and is able to ‘see’ what ‘10’ is up to from ‘4’’s perspective. (Recall that, in “The Wizard of Oz”, Dorothy also gains ‘sight’ of ‘10’ from ‘4’). We can support this alternate view when we realize that Shrek has entered ‘4’’s “family romance” – (not brother, but) father-Donkey and mother-Dragon – but the fact of Shrek not having a clue of what has gone on between the parental couple pulls us back to the interpretation we had presented in our prior paragraph. For FA, the key question that is posed in respect of a donkey-dragon union is the degree to which it might symbolize infertility because of the species barrier and, at the end of “Shrek II”, we discover that the answer remains ‘up in the air’.

All this brings us to a corollary of the Freudastrological overview of the zodiac i.e. with the ‘11 raw animus’ being ‘flanked’ by matriarchal ‘10’ and ‘12’, the ‘animus tower’ has as much to do with the mother imago as with the father imago. So, although we see Princess Fiona as “over-identified” with a masculine principle that leads her to rigid ideas about how her life-(story) should play out, this principle is itself subject to something matriarchal, especially if there is a (hermeneutic) ‘context’ of “regression” from the 1st quadrant signs. “Progression” is re-instated when Shrek sets off back to Farquaad’s ‘11 republic’ and, as a result, Fiona’s humanity, if ogre-ish, begins to make itself known... soon complicated by a series of ‘(12)-1 mask/persona’ mis-hearings and mis-takes that tell us that we are still in ‘Act I’ of Plato’s quest for the “other half”.

It might appear that the trials & tribulations of the “masks” are resolved when, in the final scene, Fiona’s & Shrek’s “(love’s) first kiss” reveals Fiona’s “inner beauty” but a True “happily ever after” would demand a good deal more investigation into the source of Fiona’s “animus identification”. Fortunately, the runaway financial success

of the film made this investigation inevitable and, in “Shrek II” (2004), we learn that the matriarch who has taken control of Fiona’s destiny, is not only matriarchal, she is also magical. Although a Jungian’s primary association for the word, “magic”, is the archetypal realm, it shouldn’t take long for him/her to move along to the dyad that is the loudest ‘echo’ of “fate vs. free will” i.e. “destiny vs. love”...

Although we don’t discover why Fiona’s father, “King Harold” (John Cleese), had become beholden to “Fairy Godmother” (Jennifer Saunders) until the conclusion of “Shrek II” – she had been behind his magical transformation from frog into prince – we become aware during the first act that Harold, when a young prince, had entered into a Faustian pact with her. Eventually, we learn that Harold did not care to ‘work through’ the 12 steps that lead from frog to king... he preferred to be the subject of a magic trick, a flick of a ‘3/11 switch’, and be crowned without having to consider the meaning that emerges when ‘4-5’ is imagined from 12 different perspectives. Without this consideration, it is no wonder that Harold’s daughter and Fairy Godmother’s son, “Prince Charming” (Rupert Everett), are “possessed” by narcissistic entitlement.

Because Shrek is forced out of the parental castle, “Far, Far Away”, and into a quest, we could, at first, worry that Dreamworks’ animation team, headed by Andrew Adamson, had succumbed to repeating the plot of the first film. It eventually becomes clear, however, that, rather than “regression” to ‘11-10’ followed by “progression” to ‘(12)-1-(2)’, “Shrek II” deals in “progression” to ‘4-5’ followed by “regression” to ‘(2)-1-(12)’ i.e. Shrek is forced, from his swamp, forward to the mystery of his wife’s royal “family romance”... and, because Shrek is powerless to resolve this ‘4-5’, he is forced back into ‘3 sibling’ “projections” onto the rivalry between Donkey & “Puss in Boots” (Antonio Banderas). Then, Shrek, with a touch of ‘3 theft’ of a ‘2 valuable’ material potion, re-instigates the problem of ‘1 appearances’... he drinks the potion in the hope of becoming a handsome Prince Charming that might appeal to Fiona and her father. In Jungian words, we can say that Shrek’s “anima possession” has blocked him from seeing Fiona’s “animus possession” and, as a result, it is more accurate to view Shrek’s “animus/anima syzygy” as the culprit that turns a chance for growth into “arrest”.

From a developmental perspective, a magic potion symbolizes more than a lazy attitude to the inner challenge. It also symbolizes over-valuation of the physical world that sources to the infant’s phase of wishing for his/her mother to satisfy his/her needs and the baby making the dodgy induction that his/her wishes had ‘caused’ the mother to react. In turn, we begin to see the importance of the mother realizing that the world behind her is much less interested in her child than she is and, therefore, she is faced with the task of forcing his/her child into articulating his/her needs. If the mother can enact her task with a ‘sense’ of graduation, her child gets a clear ‘idea’ of where his/her mother stops and where the world begins. Thus, FA takes the view that psychoanalysis has two ‘beginnings’, (i) ‘3’; often, the first year of analytic hours are invested in the development of a vocabulary that makes the “brick road” “yellow enough” (i.e. the 12 passages of the Moon through the 3rd house; Mercury’s triple ‘dance’ around the Sun) to give the analysand the time s/he needs to why the term, “the talking cure”, has stuck for, now, well over a century, and (ii) ‘4’; the second year of analytic hours often begins with the analysand ‘3 reporting’ his/her ‘mixtures’ of ‘2 sensations’ & ‘4 feelings’ that we all know as “emotions”. Even after a year, the analyst might keep psychodynamic interpretations to him/herself because, in this phase, the analysand has more to gain

from expression than from understanding. In “Shrek II”, Puss is the symbol of Shrek’s growing understanding of the value of diatribe – recall Shrek constantly howling at Donkey to shut up – yet, consistent with ‘3’, the ‘gain’ is partnered by the “castrative” ‘loss’ of the incoming sibling rivalry. To resolve this new partnership, a different kind of magic is required i.e. the kind that Shrek fans can witness in...

“Shrek III” also has a magician, “Merlin” (Eric Idle), but there are a couple of critical differences (i) a return to the immaterial: Merlin insists that, before Shrek can be gifted a magic ride back to Far, Far Away, he needs to take a “journey to the soul” wherein he will be able to “atone with the father (within)” by becoming a better father than his own ‘Chronos-father’, and (ii) the introduction of the ‘patriarchate’: Merlin, unlike Fairy Godmother, is masculine. As a sidelight, we also notice that Merlin is able to kickstart ‘sibling co-operation’ that allows Shrek to co-operate with his atonement i.e. when “Arthur” (Justin Timberlake), the rightful heir to the throne, is about to be executed by the wrongful non-heir, (not)-King Charming, Shrek finds the Christ-like willingness to submit to a “voluntary sacrifice”. Compare this to Shrek’s “involuntary sacrifice” of “Shrek II” i.e. still being submerged within the ‘matriarchate’, Shrek had not yet retrieved the “projection” of his power complex. The “death” at ‘4’ allows for the “re-birth” at ‘5’ of his adopted son. Because of the ‘11 eccentric’ aim of (not)-King Charming, the stab at Shrek’s heart is Charming’s downfall, his “Freudian slip”.

The key Freudastrological idea that “Shrek III” reinforces is that the ‘spiritual feminine’ is no less important than the ‘masculine’ in the development (into)-through the right hemispheric ‘patriarchate’. And, given that feminine ‘4 Cancer’ is the first archetype/sign of the ‘4-5-6-7-8-9 sequence’, the ‘spiritual feminine’ could be counted as more important than the ‘masculine’ i.e. Shrek’s “voluntary sacrifice” means that Fiona & her mother, “Queen Lillian” (Julie Andrews), need to take the lead. Although Fiona is married, she is still psychologically incestuous enough to ‘need’ to find a way ‘through 4’ and, then, ‘through 6 (maidenhood)’ to become the anima guide for Shrek as he is ‘resurrected’ into his exogamous mojo. It is no surprise, therefore, to see Fiona discarding her earlier wish to hang about waiting for her rescuer and, voluntarily, she takes her inner journey through the ‘4 subconscious’ catacombs of Far, Far Away.

Although the ‘patriarchate’ begins with a feminine archetype, it concludes with a masculine archetype, ‘9 Sagittarius’. For FA, this reflects the overall aim of spiritual transformation i.e. the shift from circles/cycles to (tangential) straight lines that carry the transformed away from “karma”. In “Shrek IV”, however, Shrek is yet too much the father in need of supporting his wife and children to worry about overall aims that are ‘slated’ for ‘life’s evening’. As a result, we see “Rumpelstiltskin” (Walter Dohrn), with a gift of “karmic” trickery in the style of “It’s a Wonderful Life” and “Random Harvest”, forcing Shrek to realize that his particular version of “Groundhog Day” is, at this point in his life, appropriate because “conscious” devotion to children helps to guard against kick-starting a “family curse”. To be sure, keeping a stiff upper lip at a family celebration might not help Shrek much to transcend the physical universe, but it does help his children to minimize their (respective) “karmic footprints”. The “final chapter” of “Shrek IV” is premature, of course. We haven’t even got to his midlife! If we had input into a “Shrek V” script, we would have to work out how to do “Jung for kids”. The magic trick of “V” would be making the 2nd law of thermodynamics funny.


HERMENEUTICS III: NOTE-WITHIN-MELODY

FROM THE PARTICLE-WAVE DYAD TO MUSIC

Meso-scalar electrons express as both matter & energy-as-“standing wave”. If we ‘raise’ this meso- to Einstein’s macro-scalar “curved space”, we can imagine a ‘full space-curve’ (i.e. a circle) forming a ‘standing circular macro-wave’. When “standing waves” are produced in a material medium (e.g. a plucked string), we hear additional, ‘harmonic’ frequencies. Given that an astrologer ‘hears’ ‘immaterial music’ when s/he is ‘synthesizing’ an interpretation, his/her ‘visual’ focus on the sidereal zodiac fades and his/her ‘auditory’ focus on the Sun-Earth axial ‘immaterial wave’ (i.e. the tropical zodiac) amplifies. In turn, we could say that the “studiers” (“-logos”) of the “stars” (“astro-”) might do better to call themselves, ‘macro-musicologists’...

Not only do standing waves generate integers, they do so in a way that connects ‘3’ to ‘4’, ‘5’ and ‘12’ i.e. divide the circumference into ‘3’ ($120^\circ + 120^\circ + 120^\circ$) and the musical notes, the ‘(perfect) 4th and 5th’ of the diatonic scale (or, the ‘6th and 8th’ of the chromatic scale) are generated. The “cycle of 5^{ths}” that leads the ear from a particular frequency to a ‘distant’ octave, is a 12-step cycle. Transpose these 5^{ths} ‘back down’ to the first octave and the musician has a chromatic scale at his/her fingertips. Physicists do not restrict standing waves to this 1-to-2-dimensional scenario... although difficult to imagine, 3D geometers have been able to show that standing waves can rock & roll the night away in 3 dimensions. As ‘perfect interval-philic’ John Williams would say it, “your trust in ‘the Force’ will amplify when you hear a perfect 5th & an octave”.

As noted in ‘Hermeneutics I’, post-Cartesian, “modern philosophy” has lacked the synthetic attitude of the “hermeneutist”, primarily because it has been dominated by the eliminative, superego-ic, Lockean attitude that, over the intervening centuries, came to underpin the “philosophy of science” i.e. Karl Popper’s 20thC definition: if a scientific proposal isn’t falsifiable – isn’t measurable – it isn’t science. A good example of an unmeasurable phenomenon is “consciousness”, the ‘meta-scientific’ concept that could yet be ‘as fundamental’ as energy-mass-space-time (‘ene-ma-spa-ti’); like so...




... noting that, at the “Big Bang”, there was only energy with no matter, time, space but, over time and with the materialization of (... errr) energy, our high entropy universe ‘sacrificed’ itself into space over three phases, micro-quantum, meso-“chaos theoretical”, macro-gravitational, assisted by a ‘synthetic’ “consciousness” that also, by definition, had to “be there” to “cause” the ‘shift’ from its 1st to its 2nd phase. In the same way, the ‘5 Sun’ was ‘out there’ prior to ‘1-2 Mars/Earth’ to set up phenomena such as the immaterial zodiac & material a/biogenesis, recalling that two spheres are

required to generate the natural ‘fiery (Martial)’ 12-cornered tetrahedron as two cells and four bases are required to generate natural ‘fiery’ life (as we know it, Jim).

The trouble for physicists in all this is that they are presently trying to “reduce” the number of ‘dimensions of time’ to zero insofar as they are envisaging a “Holy Grail of Physics” equation without (symbols of) time. Einstein had initiated this search with his equations that envisage time as a dimension of spacetime wherein there is no ‘flow’ and, therefore, no relation to our psychological experience of (i) life preserving cycles (e.g. best ‘time’ of day to run-hunt; best ‘time’ of year to plant-harvest), or (ii) death-bound thermodynamics (e.g. increasing physical entropy). And, despite the problems that such a reduction would (... errr) “cause” for Darwinists, physicists take the view that there is no time-flow ‘out there’. Rather, “tense” is merely a mental construction.


The good news for astrologers with regards to these post-Einsteinian musings is that, because “causality” is a function of (thermodynamic) time-flow, “causality” is also a mental construction and, therefore, Jung’s “acausality” becomes the better ‘fit’ for the anticipated “Holy Grail” equation of what is t/True ‘out there’. Then again, an elimination of time does seem anomalous. Anomalies/incoherencies concerned...



Popper’s ‘gestational’ view was usurped by Thomas Kuhn, with his 1962 opus, “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions”. Although Popper was correct that scientific experiments are acts of self-criticism, scientists are ‘anti-philosophical’ insofar as they don’t criticize the “paradigm” within which their experiments are performed and, as a result, they never try to “falsify the(ir) paradigm” until, at least, their “progress” is undermined by too many anomalies. Arguably, the linchpin anomaly in the history of science was the Michelson-Morley experiment (of 1887) that pointed to Einstein’s eventual overthrowing of Newton. Thus, Thomas’ question was: is the “falsifiability principle” itself “falsifiable”? In turn, FA’s question is: how did Thomas view himself in the history of the philosophy of science: as a ‘9 expander’ or ‘11 revolutionary’? Is there a movie trilogy within which we might couch FA’s answer: “both”?

‘HERMENEUTIC TRILOGY’ C: DAWN OF THE DEAD (1968-1985) ☾☾

As we indicate in Thomas Kuhn’s 0° Aries chart, Jupiter ‘connected’ Uranus in Pisces to natal Jupiter in Libra in the early 1960s. This is our astrological rationale for the ‘9-11 answer’, both. Although his “paradigm shift” does sound like revolution, there is no reason why a new paradigm can’t appear in a more incremental way and, indeed, this is what is proposed by his contemporary, Hans-Georg Gadamer. Before we consider Kuhn’s contemporaries, let’s take our, now regular, cinematic sojourn...



The “father” of zombie movies made his first, “The Night of the Living Dead”, in 1968, in the year of “H.A.L.” and 6 years after Thomas Kuhn poked his philosophy-of-science bear. 6 years on again, in 1974, philosopher, Robert Kirk, brought “H.A.L.” & George together when he coined his term, “philosophical zombie”, to point out how difficult it would be to (dis)-prove that “H.A.L.” (or his variant) was-(is) “conscious”. 4 years later, George released the 2nd apocalyptic part of his zombie trilogy and, ever since, we have had a veritable flood of zombie films flooding with zombies. Given that (i) almost all zombie flicks involve ‘viral’ transmission, (ii) Homo sapiens is now dealing with a new virus, and (iii) many commentators note the ‘viral-ish’ spread of (dubious or otherwise) information about the virus, it wouldn’t surprise to see many more.

If, dear reader, you have trouble handling the gore that dominates your typical zombie film, you might also find it difficult to “integrate” Melanie Klein’s description of the savage infant ripping and tearing at his/her mother’s ‘insides’. This “biting-the-hand-that-feeds” dynamic is the problem that we had all faced as infants and, to some degree, continues to haunt. The degree to which one finds zombie flicks, at turns, funny, scary, sickening and/or thought-provoking, has something to tell us not only about the Kleinian “integration” but also about ‘12-to-11/10 anti-culture’. And, so...

The trouble with so many of the recent zombie films (e.g. “WWZ”) is that they don’t point to the question of “consciousness” as wittily as George had. Indeed, recent films seem to borrow more from, say, Ridley Scott’s “Alien” (1979) than from “Dawn of the Dead” insofar as the zombies are very smart and very agile, the exception being

Edgar Wright's spoof, "Shaun of the Dead". Indeed, with Zac Snyder's "Army of the Dead", where we see "alpha zombies" communing and reproducing, George's 'zombie non-ethic' – non-centred, non-relating, non-cultured, non-conscious – is, well, dead.


Oddly, then, George's movie might be better compared to "The Wizard of Oz" than to his flood of "(grand)children". As noted in 'Hermeneutics I', the "Munchkins" are "(relatively) unconscious", but their culture bespeaks a living centre. George adds the corollary, when the centre 'dies' (or, as Yeats might say it, "is so moribund that it cannot hold"), we are left with a "H.A.L.-ish", simulation of "consciousness" that can do little more than throw astronauts into space or wander supermarkets and consume. (Maybe not a Snyder, but definitely) a George A. Romero zombie would be unable to open a pod-bay door... "H.A.L."s pretense of relationship is all superego and no ego.

Although, as discussed elsewhere, the main dynamic archetypal expressions of centering are the Sun & Moon, the hermeneutist would also want to bring Jupiter to his/her centering table. After all, the 'dyadic' sign it rules, Sagittarius, looks both (i) 'down' to the 10,000 parts of Gemini (ruled by Hermes; note that this god is the source of the term, hermeneutics) & (ii) 'tangentially out' to a position wherefrom, in theory, it could survey the whole and, as it does so, notice any symmetry and/or existence of a centre. This is why, when we are considering meditations on "centres not holding (not even there)", one does well to consider Jupiter's 12yrs cycle, from 'home-Sagittarius', 'down through' the left hemisphere, and 'back up' to its 'home return'. For example, we could say that Thomas Kuhn's 1962 opus, the expansive re-birth of the philosophy of science, had been incubating through the years of Jupiter in the 4th quadrant 1959-1961. In 1974, Robert Kirk would do the same and kick off expansions into the science of "consciousness"... even if, in reference to Popper, it must be 'meta-science'.

In his birthchart, George has the strong '11'-ish theme of 'eccentricism' i.e. Sun-Mercury in Aquarius square Uranus in Taurus. Over the 1972-78 stretch, with George aiming to up his zombie ante-, transiting/centering Jupiter would counter this theme by offering its full 'left hemispheric' connection... through Capricorn and then down through Gemini. In turn, Freudastrologers who take interest in zombies, philosophical or otherwise, might reflect on the importance of Cancerian "memory", irrespective of (i) its level of fictionality, &/or (ii) how it might support any 'rise' through Leo-Virgo-Libra-Scorpio. 4yrs on from "Dawn of the Dead" (i.e. Jupiter in Scorpio), Ridley Scott added to the brew... the possibility of an exogamous, Scorpionic 'zombie relationship' was explored in "Blade Runner", nicely revisited by Denis Villeneuve 35yrs later.

As helpful as Jupiter was to George's overview of his 'zombie (non)-ethic', it is well worth noting that the "progression" of the Sun-Moon is no less, and usually more, important for the hermeneutic interpreter. Although his natal Sun is placed in the sign of 'bare patterning' – Aquarius – its "progression" through Pisces in his teenage years through to midlife would have brought a Solar-centering light to the problem of Pisces being too "unconscious" to bring forth developable culture. Indeed, in 1978, George's Solar "progression" came into (i) conjunction with his "progressed Mercury", and (ii) opposition to his "progressed Neptune". As we had noted for "The Wizard of Oz", we need the light of the Sun to make sense of '12's dichotomy: anti-clockwise hypnotism is 'better' (a 'lot better') than clockwise hypnotism. George's 'physical zombies' offer an interesting contrast to the 'psychological zombie' that also was a feature of 1978...

‘HERMENEUTIC FILM’ 2B: THE DEER HUNTER (1978) ☹☹☹




As revealed in the birthdate above, Michael was born one year prior to George, almost exactly to the day i.e. the astrologer would immediately know that they shared the ‘double 11’, Sun in Aquarius square Uranus in Taurus natal configuration. Given that George’s and Michael’s films were very different in tone and scale, an astrologer’s eyes might first focus on key differences between their charts (beyond the unavailable house pattern) and, with this interest, his/her first port of call would be his Moon in Leo (probably) conjunct ‘8 Pluto’ (probably) generating a T-cross to Uranus-Sun...

Whereas George’s zombies, in typical P.T.S.D.-style, have no memories of their earlier lives and relationships, we find that Michael’s ‘zombie’, “Nick” (Christopher Walken), ‘8 intensely’ indulges his memory of his P.T.S.D. event... having survived an enforced ‘game’ of Russian roulette, he goes on to frequent Saigon’s Russian roulette parlours, as if he has some proto-understanding that he might be healed by returning to the scene of his trauma. In other words, Nick is only half-correct... the sufferer also needs to understand the emotional dimensions of the trauma and, if he doesn’t, your local psychotherapist would describe him/her as a ‘self-medicator’. Indeed, by the end of the narrative, Nick is ‘self-medicating’ in the more concrete way... chemically.

Michael had his audience compare Nick with ‘brother-(Oedipal)-son’, “Mike” (Robert de Niro), who also has ‘enough P.T.S.D.’ to frequent Saigon’s Russian roulette parlours but his different constitution is able to withstand the trauma well enough to return to his Pennsylvania home and torture himself with Oedipal guilt i.e. he fancies Nick’s fiancé, “Linda” (Meryl Streep). His guilt is strong enough to drag him back to Vietnam and into a search for his ‘brother-father’ figure... and, upon finding him, he find that he must ‘play’ it out in the most concrete way. Mike does recognize the value of jolting Nick’s memory back to action but, when we notice a glimmer of recognition in his eyes, it appears to be just another jolt toward his fate. Therapists know, only too well, how critical moments of 8th archetypal ‘re-birth’ are. So, then, what about(?)...

ESSENTIAL (ANTI?)-HEROES A: HAMLET (1609/1948) ☹☹☹☹



Although modern hermeneutics began with the problem that had been laid out in religious texts – how does one go about portioning literal history vs. allegory? – the secular source of hermeneutics begins, arguably, with the Bard i.e. science tells us that everything can be explained with reductive objectivity – and, therefore, it appears that there is zip to learn from the subjective trials & tribulations of someone like “Hamlet” – but, is this true? On the objective side, a scientist might say, “well, if Hamlet wasn’t up to securing Ophelia as wife and bringing along the pitter-patter of Darwinian feet, he is simply not sexually ‘fit enough’ for he or his offspring to (‘deserve’ to) survive”. As Hegel might say it (if he had jumped forward in a time machine to 1943), “Hamlet’s problems don’t add up to a hill o’ beans... history will always march on, selecting for the stronger, faster, smarter, more decisive and more sexually engaged and, therefore, Hamlet would do better to commit himself to his own realization that, if he is holding any kind of quintessence, it is a dusty one”. On the subjective side, the hermeneutist, whether s/he is religious or secular, would defend the back-‘n’-forth from being to not being because of its potential to make a psychological ‘space’ within which something creative could begin to ‘cook’ e.g. is “being” such a good idea if the “be-er” is “being” with his/her superego-ig? is it better “not to be” until one has developed an ego?

The (relatively) secular hermeneutics of 20thC philosophers such as Heidegger, Gadamer and Ricoeur is, in significant part, a response to the reductive idea that there is zippo to learn from examining literature, no matter how revered and long-lasting it proves to be. Yep, there’s that combo of words, “to be”!!... for reductionists, they mean nothing but the common man’s idea of ontology but, more importantly, their meaning is not increased one iota when they are combined with the second combo of ontological words, “not to be”. The hermeneutist will counter that there is more to learn from this stuff than from reduction because the latter is a one-way ticket to the Palookaville of ‘parts’ and, of course, they can back it up with Godel. “To be or not to be”, by contrast, sets the imagination off into many directions, some of which lead to those a whole that

is “greater than the sum of its parts”, noting, all the while, that any ‘whole’ that is no more than the sum of its ‘parts’ is unlikely to be ‘whole’ in any case... a hermeneutist, therefore, is devoted to sorting out the ‘fake vs. true whole’ issue e.g. mandalas.

One direction that a study of “Hamlet” would inspire is that which takes us to the ‘most ontological’ question ever asked (by proto-hermeneutist, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz): why is there something rather than nothing? The naughty cosmologists who claim that our universe appeared out of nothing neglect the ‘something’, “quantum field theoretical equations”, that had to “be there”. That is, these scientists are deists and, in a sense, Platonists. Ever since Leibniz’ ‘fiery’ insight, there has been a need for hermeneutics in all walks of life, not excluding science (and, yes, post-modernism).

It may be a gross oversimplification, but there is a tendril of truth to the notion that, whereas Jung’s focus was on the “patient hero” (e.g. Perseus has the wherewithal to wait for the gods pack his kitbag), Freud’s focus was on the “impatient anti-hero” (e.g. Oedipus’ rush of blood leads him to kill his father without even knowing it). One of the reasons that, in the minds of the literati at least, “Hamlet” remains the pinnacle of drama is that the titular character is so exquisitely perched between heroic decisive patience and anti-heroic dithering impatience. For depth psychologists, then, the play points to (further) “integration” of Freudian and Jungian psychology. And...

With the “most revered” play of all time being directed by the “most revered” actor of all time, Laurence Olivier’s film version of “Hamlet” has grounds to be known as the greatest film ever made. When compared to other versions – Akira Kurosawa’s, Tony Richardson’s, Kenneth Branagh’s, Franco Zeffirelli’s – Olivier’s version stamps itself with greatness by virtue of Laurence’s connection to the ‘dysthetic’, superego-ic creepiness that, with the possible exception of “Ophelia”, ripples through not only all of the characters but also all of Olivier’s corridor-laden, labyrinthine sets. Notice the similarity between the final shots of Olivier’s “Hamlet” and Kurosawa’s “Ran”.

With all the hubbub of the first act – some characters seeing a ghost while other characters remaining skeptical; then Polonius & Laertes warning Ophelia away from Hamlet’s romantic advances to her – it is clear that the Bard was ‘resonating’ with the 12th archetype e.g. ghosts often appear just before ‘1 dawn’, the 12th house is the house of (unresolved) “impersonal karma”, wherein “epigenetic” “collective/family curses” come home to roost; thus, we have indicated the positions of Neptune in Shakespeare’s natal chart. Like the Bard himself, we can only assume that his creation, Hamlet, also had/has an active 12th archetype in his (imaginary) natal horoscope.

Although some will prefer that we distinguish between a “collective curse” and a “family curse”, these two tend to run together insofar as, every time a step is taken ‘back’ through one’s generations toward the ancestral source of one’s “family curse” (that, in the ‘now’, is being expressed by the “identified patient”), another step is being taken ‘out into’ the collective in any case. And, yes, many of our Western readers who struggle with Eastern-isms like “impersonal karma” may need us to stick with more ‘scientific’ Western-isms... and, for them, we provide the term, “epigenetics”, to point them in the direction of ‘gestational psychology’ i.e. the 4th quadrant, the ‘zone’ between ‘8-(9) nature’ and ‘1-2-3-4 nurture’, is the ‘karmic-epigenetic zone’.

With Hamlet’s “to be or not to be...” soliloquy taken these days to (... errr) be the centerpiece of the narrative, it is not off the mark to identify the overarching theme of the play as “self-division”. In Freudian words, therefore, the overarching theme of

the narrative is “lack of (integrative) ego”. From a history-of-philosophy perspective, Hamlet’s soliloquy is noteworthy in that its “systematic doubt” might have influenced Rene Descartes’ whom, 20 years on, would make the philosophical most out of his own “conscious” self-division. What FA calls ‘philosophical triplism’ is evident at the very beginning of the soliloquy when Hamlet speaks of two ways to leave suffering behind: take up arms against the outer “sea of troubles”; or, unsheathe a bodkin against one’s inner lack of “quietus” i.e. suicide. Without a passing mention to what religion has to say about suicide, Hamlet then worries that death has enough similarities to sleep that “what dreams may come” upon death could be a species of suffering much worse than the existential suffering of life... and, with Hamlet sharing his audience’s concern, he has every right to assume, “thus conscience makes cowards of us all”. Not quite all...

Beyond Hamlet’s audience, however, “all” loses its meaning... suicide is still in the top tier of “causes of death” (1-2%) and, of course, if the statisticians were able to access the unconscious – the realm of Freud’s “mis”-(hap), note that the final scene of “Hamlet” provides us with a veritable orgy of mishaps – suicide percentages would be significantly higher. With Klein’s insights into the unconscious, we can see the outline of the ‘gestational’ superego scolding the ‘newborn’ self over its tendency to “bite the hand (breast) that feeds” to the point that the superego is ‘victorious’ and, as a result, it ‘annihilates’ the self. This ‘victory’ is often a long time coming, however, and it may need a “trigger” in the outer world, such as a paternal apparition. The appearance of the ghost of Hamlet’s father “triggers” the latent “split” in Hamlet’s psyche i.e. during his pre-pubertal phase, he was unable to “synthesize” the ambivalences that had built up in his “father (archetypal) complex” and, for a (superego-ic) ‘stopgap’, he cobbled together a dubious ‘mixture’ of paternal-fraternal ‘rationales’ that were never going to ‘develop through’ his I.C. to a mature “integration” of his ‘inner father (image)’.

If Hamlet were in psychotherapy, it would be the therapist’s task to expose his ambivalences toward both his biological and step-father(s). The main stumbling block that this therapist would face would be showing Hamlet that the human propensity to ‘cherry pick’ one’s retrospective ‘mental constructions’ is as much his propensity as it is anyone else’s. Perhaps, there was something rotting in the state of Denmark that his father had needed to address and that he had naughtily “avoided”? Perhaps, Hamlet’s father needed “to be” but was “not being”? Even though there was no hope of proving what had gone down before his demise, there are always “repressed” memories to be retrieved in those who have inherited the avoidant attitudes. In short, Hamlet stands to benefit from conceiving himself as the “identified patient” of a “family curse” that could be sourced to a sibling rivalry of (not only a parent, but also) an ancestor. This would fit with the Bard’s Gemini on the cusp of the 12th house and Hamlet’s soliloquies fit with his Pluto in the 9th house ‘feeding down’ by both (i) the ‘9-10-11-12 sequence’ and (ii) the ‘9-12 square’ between Pluto and natal Venus in the 12th house. If, however, we wished to consider sibling rivalry in ‘this life’, we turn to the 3rd house... a house that Freud, if he were an astrologer, would (... errr) think of as “castrative”...

At this point, it is worth noting that, despite having an older half-brother who had been the ‘right age’ to bed his mother, Freud didn’t have much to say about sibling rivalry. Astrologers, however, have a hard time avoiding the fact that the house of the sibling, the 3rd house, is adjacent to the house of the “father complex”, the 4th house... and, therefore, when the issue of father comes up, astrologers will keep a hermeneutic

eye on any brotherly complications and, in doing so, it wouldn't hurt to go back to the Bard's own sensitivity to the brother. We get off to a flyer when we notice that William had kingly Leo on the cusp of the 3rd house. The fact that the house is "empty" doesn't mean much to the Freudastrologer – FA agrees with traditional astrology and inspects the cusp's ruling 'planet' (see 'Interaction-ology: Introduction'); in the Bard's case, a Sun in Taurus (opposite a Moon in Scorpio) – and, so, we need to keep looking...

Even before we inspect William's Sun, we notice that the planet of "confusion", Neptune, tracked from Leo into Virgo in the early 1600s i.e. the years of him 'brewing' his masterpiece. By 1609, transiting Neptune had entered into opposition to William's natal Pluto in Pisces in the 9th house to, thereby, render an astrological 'resonance' to the famous soliloquy. The 12th archetype pops up again in this context because William also has the abovementioned natal Venus in the 12th house square Pluto, meaning that 1609 was also the year of Williams Neptune square Venus... and, of course, our flying resonant start keeps its wings with the madness and subsequent drowning of Hamlet's exogamous, (ex)-love interest, "Ophelia". Given that Hamlet unconsciously murders Ophelia's father, "Polonius", by skewering him as he hides behind a curtain, tells the Freudian that Hamlet's Oedipus complex is swimming along archetypically...


Then again, there is something 'meta-Oedipal' about Hamlet i.e. he is more the inheritor of an Oedipal victory – that of his uncle, "Claudius", over his father – than being an Oedipus himself. Indeed, given Hamlet's misogynistic ranting, he is more the 'anti-Oedipal' "Orestes", desiring (at least, a good) father and the removal of mother. Hamlet only begins to show any kind of "split" over the feminine in the final act when he stumbles across Ophelia's funeral... the first glimmer of the 'hero' – if Hamlet can be seen as one – accessing his exogamous feeling. If Ophelia had remained 'dry', she could have become Hamlet's (outer) anima-guide as he 'descended' into his incestuous labyrinth and, so (even if it appears reprehensible to those living on the surface), the depth psychologist sees a "split" of the feminine into "whore" and "mother" as a first, useful developmental step toward the "anima"'s full differentiation.

With this idea, the depth psychologist would need to 'expand' the overarching theme of "Hamlet" from "self-division" to "insufficient self-division". In other words, the tragedy of the title character is his failure to 'keep dividing' himself so that, when the time came to '(re)-unify' he would be able to do so in an "integrative", rather than a "conflative", way. If Hamlet had been in psychotherapy, he might have been gently led away from his obsessive ruminating about his father and toward better rumination about his mother and the feminine in general. For example, whenever Hamlet started to go off into 'masculine' areas such as "how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and how admirable! in action how like an angel! In apprehension (i.e. intuition) how like a god! the beauty of the world; the paragon of animals; and, to me, what is this quintessence of dust!!", his (at least, Jungian) analyst would be keen to remind him that a quintessence won't be dust if it is made up equally of masculine and feminine elements. A Freudastrologer would have led Hamlet from his 'Geminian' back-n-forth into his 'Cancerian' sense of 4-ness that provides a deeper sense of the plusses and minuses that qualify mother, sister, wife and daughter.

In light of William's literary gift being developed to its full, there is little doubt that his psychological birth was significant. Perhaps, at each of his Taurean birthdays, he was, like Christ on the Cross, sensitized to the full Moon (sometimes only his natal

Moon; other years both his natal and transiting full Moon) and, in turn, given a vision of his upcoming lower hemispheric journey in the form of a play. The fact that he had Cancer on his ascendant – the Moon in Scorpio in his 5th house, therefore, is his “chart ruler” – symbolizes the value he would have placed on any birthday vision. And when, in July, the Sun rolled into Cancer, William would have been ready to launch into his first drafts. Let’s also note that, in 1609, the transiting Sun came into a conjunction to William’s “progressed” Moon-Mercury conjunction in Cancer.

Astrologers who take an interest in acting will already know that William and Larry share a natal Sun in Taurus but, of course, there is more to their mutuality than just that...



... having made note of William’s Moon in the 5th house, one’s eyes go straight to Larry’s Moon (also) in the 5th house that is the lower hemispheric angle of a T-cross with Saturn in Pisces in his 11th house & Pluto in his 1st house. It was during the 1940s that Larry’s ascendant had been ‘zapped’ by Uranus... and, by 1948, it was ‘zapping’ his Pluto into a confirmation of his acting “genius”.


The (let’s say it, “semi-conscious”) reason for “actors wanting to direct” is that acting is a ‘part’ (as in, “acting the part”) while directing carries the ‘part(s)’ into the desired ‘whole’. Astrologically, we could imagine Larry at his ascendant ‘acting’ (not for an audience, but) for a producer willing to rally ‘2 finances’ for the production and keeping ‘3 tabs’ on where the 10,000 (add your zeroes) monetary units are spent. Then, inspired by the ‘4 I.C. father’, the director gets going with the filming in his 5th and 6th houses of the “inner child” and the “workaday routine”. Perhaps in the middle of the night, the producer will call him to remind him of his fiscal ‘10 responsibility’ to get it made within the budget... because it is never clear that enough of the ‘11-12 crowd’ is up to sitting through a film that they (i) already know how it ends & (ii) studied dryly at school. With Chiron in the 10th house, it may be that Larry liked everything about directing until the producer started to hassle him: “how dareth this guyeth telleth me how to trimeth down the greatest play every writtenth!”

HERMENEUTICS IV: NOW-WITHIN-ETERNITY

HERMENEUTICS OR META-HERMENEUTICS?

Having, in ‘Hermeneutics I’, characterized ourselves as ‘very hermeneutic’, do we, when moving on to consider the birth chart of a hermeneutist, need to characterize ourselves as ‘meta-hermeneutic’? If, dear reader, you have been able to stick with our line, you will probably view this question as rhetorical. So, what can we say about the (arguably) most revered “philosophical hermeneutist” of the 20thC?...

Hans-Georg Gadamer
11/2/1900 8.45 a.m.
Marbug, Germany



... although his “piece de resistance”, “Truth & Method” (1960), was published prior to Thomas Kuhn’s “Structure of Revolutions” (1962), it would take a semi-cycle of Saturn for Hans-Georg’s book to be translated and go on to influence philosophers of the English-speaking world. It is also worth noting here that, with his reaffirmation of the “science of subjectivity”, Hans-Georg would, in 1979, win the “Sigmund Freud Prize” for academic prose i.e. psychoanalysis could be defined as, “the analyst is the ‘midwife’ for the analysand ‘giving birth’ to a (what could be called his/her) ‘gestating’ hermeneutic attitude”. If Freud were alive, he might have wanted to adjust the phrase, “science of subjectivity”, to the “science of inter-subjectivity/transference”.

If, as we had done for Jean-Francois Lyotard and Karl Marx, we begin with a brief ‘take’ of potential ego-developments, the FA-er would have immediate cause to worry in ways that weren’t as obvious with our earlier examples i.e. yes, a natal Sun in the 12th house might be interested in the “qualia” of the Platonic realm yet, as noted in our ‘basics’ essays, developing this interest toward a first personal “consciousness” has more than a few challenges to meet; yes, his Venus in the 1st house, at first, appears ‘better’, but then we see that it is the ‘base’ of a worrying T-square featuring Neptune in Gemini on his I.C. in opposition to Chiron in Sagittarius on his M.C. (itself conjunct Saturn in Capricorn in his 10th house i.e. ‘10-10-10’ is a tripled up ‘10’!).

Taking, now, a broader overview, our eyes scan down to Hans-Georg’s Pluto in Gemini the 3rd house. This is one of the signatures of his intense interest in language and, to be sure, with the death-rebirth capacity of ‘8’ bearing some resemblance to the

“hermeneutic cycle” (that, for Hans-Georg, was more “hermeneutic spiral”), we view this placement as symbolic of, at least, the ‘beginning’ of his interest in hermeneutics. Although we would not view the planets that are placed opposite to Pluto, Sun-ruling Uranus & M.C.-ruling Jupiter in Sagittarius in his 9th house as the ‘end’ of his interest in hermeneutics, we do see why he was compelled to write his famous book and have it published at his second “Saturn return”... Saturn’s transit through his 9th house in 1957-59 would be followed by Neptune’s transit through his 9th house as his popularity amongst the anglophone, “(over)-positivistic” philosophical world spread.


Moving anti-clockwise, we see his very hopeful ‘basis’ for ego-building (in turn, philosophy-building) – Moon in Cancer in the 5th house (agreed, its “yod” formation to the 9th & 12th housed planets would lead to some head-scratching) – but, before we roll across to this Moon, we (re)-notice the chart-ruling Neptune on the I.C., signifying an idealization of the father’s (father-image’s) anima. Hans-Georg’s biographers tell us that his father was a secular-leaning scientist... but, when we also learn that Hans-Georg’s mother died when he was 4 years old, there is reason to entertain the idea of the father-(image) picking up both ends of the M.C.-I.C. axis (to the point, even, of it being a basis for its own ‘hermeneutic cycle’). With Hans-Georg’s Mars/Sun/Mercury in the 12th house also awash in an ontogenetic cooing “raw anima”, we start to see why he did not follow his father into the reductive (and, to its extent, “reaction formative”) natural sciences and, instead, followed his father’s anima into the humanities... “She who must be teleologically obeyed” ‘ordered’ him to spin a ‘hermeneutic tapestry’.

Although, by itself, the Moon is a symbol for instinctual need (contrasting with the Sun’s purpose), it is fair to view a Moon in Cancer as no great “teleologist”. Then again, if we place a Moon in Cancer in the fiery 5th house and remind ourselves that, by virtue of the dynamism of all heavenly cyclers, we can cover this Moon with a layer of purposeful paint. So, for the sake of ‘4 comfort’, Hans-Georg would have looked to having (either/both inner &/or outer) children about. Our guess is that, with his Sun-Mercury-Mars submerged in the 12th house, he would have felt that his magnum opus would spend a long time gestating and, therefore, he would have desired to have outer children because they would be easier to come by. And, this is what happened... Hans-Georg devoted much of his earlier life to family life. His biographers also tells us that he was somewhat intimidated by his teacher-father, Martin Heidegger but, overall, we get a sense that Hans-Georg’ was more the heroic, less the anti-heroic, philosopher i.e. his 9th house ruminations were well supported by the Moon in Cancer underneath.

If there is a criticism we might level at philosophical hermeneutics, it would be the Jungian (and, yes, Freudian) criticism that it underplays “individuation”. Always looking at the ever-widening horizons of the humanities could have a dissolving effect on the individual as s/he searches the realms for a place within them wherein s/he can discover his/her ‘anti-statistical’, 1st person “purpose”. This was one of the challenges we had hinted at earlier that leads the FA-er to wonder if Hans-Georg was beholden to his natal Sun in Aquarius (= the Promethean interest in mankind) to the degree that his Sun’s “progression” into Aries and Taurus – he lived a long life – didn’t have the individualizing effect that it might have in others who had/ve a natal Sun in Aquarius more ‘easily’ placed. The fact remains, however, that he is a key philosopher for those who care for time’s cycle. Hence, our move-buff eyes turn to ‘5 playing’ with time...

‘HERMENEUTIC TRI+LOGY’ D: STAR TREK (2009-...) ☉☉


J. J. Abrams
27/6/1966 ?6.30am
New York, NY



If there is a theme that covers the three new “Star Trek” films, it is that H.G. Wells-ian issue of time: the first film has “Spock” (Leonard Nimoy) and his “shadow”, “Captain Nero” (Eric Bana), rolling back from the future through a worm-hole to, in turn, ‘create’ the alternate universe of the current trilogy; the second film has “Kahn” (Benedict Cumberbatch) as a “shadow” of the whole “U.S.S. Enterprise” crew rolling forward from an imprisoned past of time-suspended animation; similarly, in the third film, we see “Krall/Captain Edison” (Idris Elba) using a fountain-of-youth medication to keep him rolling through the decades without any thermodynamic deterioration so that he can cause all kinds of havoc & become the “animus-shadow” of “Uhura” (once Nichelle Nichols; now Zoe Saldana), the character with whom he is constantly arguing his point. Amongst all this ‘5 play’ with time, of course, is the TV show’s conceit that starships travel faster than the speed of light (a lot faster than a speeding bullet). This phenomenon, that could be called a ‘macro-scalar quantum leap’, is straightforwardly linkable to “sudden change” that, in turn, astrologers link to the 11th archetype... the advancing technology of which, as posited in the first film, is the province of Spock.

If we trace history for man’s desire to ‘5 play’ with time, we scroll back at least to the ‘shift’ from the “Age of Reason” (say, the 18thC that leads up to & through the 1781 discovery of Uranus) to the “Age of Romanticism” (say, the early 19thC that leads up to & through the 1846 discovery of Neptune). In ‘trekkie-speak’, we could translate this historical ‘shift’ into: from the ‘age of Spock’ to the ‘age of Kirk’. It is historically fair, then, that the first film focuses on Spock’s dedication to (Enlightened) ‘11 reason’. When, however, we look to the narrative, we notice that Spock is also dedicated to ‘10 responsibility’ and ‘10’s “due process”’. In this sense, the Freudastrologer would argue that Spock has slabs of unborn ‘10-11 reaction formation’ that, sooner or later, will be in need of some ‘midwifery’. Indeed, this is the dynamic that comes to a head after he learns of his mother’s death. Just like Nero, Spock is unable to psychologically process his grief for his family & race but, unlike Nero, Spock has enough heroism to recognize

that he needs to experience a few ‘cycles of time’ away from the handle of power. This insight into the need for patience tells us that, like Hans-Georg Gadamer, he was likely born with a Sun in Aquarius that was without too many (“hard”) aspects to too many difficult planets. It can often be the case that a difficult “complex” that includes a Sun in Aquarius symbolizes devilish haste that astrologers would more likely anticipate in, say, ‘11-(11)-10-9-8’ and ‘11-1’ interactions, as was discussed in relation to “Dorothy” of “The Wizard of Oz”. If we overlay our earlier diagram (see; ‘Hermeneutics I’) with happy aspects that indicate ‘patient 11’, we add 3 (thick-solid) arrows; as follows...



... with the curved solid arrow showing how a Sun in Aquarius, being also an ‘Earth in Leo’, has an easier time of it setting a course for Leo, whereas, say, Mars or Saturn Aquarius might get ‘caught up’ in mistaken heroism or refusal of a “call”.


Then again, in the third part of the trilogy, we do see a hint of anti-heroism in Spock insofar as he is scripted to back away from his exogamous desire for Uhura in favour of returning to “New Vulcan” and joining in with the project of re-building his species. Perhaps this will be dealt with in the fourth installment, if there is one...

This leads us to our ascendant guess for the director, J.J. Abrams. The issue of (dis)-loyalty to family dynamics is very characteristic of the director who, by virtue of “Super 8”, appears to be J.J.’s primary inspirer, Steven Spielberg. With Steven having Cancer on the ascendant, there is some cause to imagine J.J. with the same. Whatever that case, he definitely has Mars in Gemini square the Uranus-Pluto conjunction that is a characteristic feature of the 1960s i.e. ‘8 intensity’ for ‘11 sudden change’. He was born within a year of “Star Trek”’s television debut and within 2 years of “H.A.L.”. The jump cut from the “Dawn of Man” to the ‘Blue Danube space dance’ is cinema’s great ‘8 intense’ ‘11 sudden change’ and, ‘8-11-ed’ as he is, J.J. would likely concur.

J.J.’s natal Mars in Gemini, intensified by ‘8-11’, is easy to spot in the second film when we see “Captain J. T. Kirk” (once William Shatner; now Christopher Pine), an intuitive individualistic ‘type’, undergoing death & rebirth courtesy of an injection of Kahn’s ‘shadow blood’ i.e. “integration of the shadow” is not only a significant issue for everyone, it jumps a quantum or three for those who have natal planets in Gemini. Perhaps it wouldn’t be a bad thing if there was a fourth installment so that Kirk can have a ‘true’ I.C. atonement with his father. Did Quentin say that he wanted to direct?

In noticing that the first film was set in Iowa, the movie-historian could wonder to what extent one or all of “Star Trek”’s writers are fans of another movie that takes ‘5 playful’ liberties with ‘11 jumps’, both this way and that, through ‘12-4-8 time’...

‘HERMENEUTIC FILM’ D: FIELD OF DREAMS (1989) ☉☉☉




When frustrating Saturn “returned” to its natal placement in the final degrees of Scorpio, Kevin Costner’s acting career seemed to be as dead as the character that he played in “The Big Chill” (1983). 7 years on, however, his career would ‘resurrect’ so well that he won a bagful of Oscars for his directorial debut, “Dances with Wolves”. If Kevin had sought a Freudastrological reading during the gloomy years of Saturn’s transit through Scorpio, we would have been tempted to point out that his chart lacks the signatures that we have seen in, say, Laurence Olivier’s chart and, therefore, that he may have been barking up a wrong tree. Then again, if we focused on his transiting chart ruler, we might have bitten our tongue about ‘acting signatures’ and pointed out that he might need to keep ‘building’ for seven more years and something “will come” when Saturn transits his daunting Jupiter-Uranus-Neptune-Sun-Chiron T-cross.

The most remarkable thing about “Field of Dreams” is that the movie’s run at the box office reflected the movie’s theme i.e. the word of mouth that made the movie a success is the same word of mouth that, as we see in the final scene, leads to “Ray”’s (Kevin Costner) dream field turning into a pilgrimage destination. More remarkable still is the fact of the Iowan movie setting being sustained because it too has become a pilgrim’s destination. A baseball field is, of course, a mandala. The materialization of an immaterial pattern is an important stepping stone to appreciating the fact that, in the long run of the journey from the matriarchate to the patriarchate, the individual’s stepping stones undergo a gradual shift from the material to immaterial.

It would be interesting to note the ascending signs of those who make the trip to the field and get a lot out of doing so. It wouldn’t surprise us if they too, like Kevin, featured centroverted signs, Leo-Virgo-Libra-Scorpio, on their respective ascendants because they would place the immaterial-focused, introverted signs, Sagittarius-(via “compensation”-Capricorn)-Aquarius-Pisces, on/near the “atonement-with-father” I.C.. Would we find many, like Kevin, with Sun-Chiron intent on “easing his pain”?

‘ESSENTIAL HEROES’ B: GROUNDHOG DAY (1993) ☹☹☹☹



At first, with “Groundhog Day”, it would appear that we are now shifting from the ‘11-ish’ theme of ‘sudden jumps’ through (space)-time with “Star Trek” and “Field of Dreams” to the ‘12-ish’ theme of being ‘stuck’ in (a ‘block’ of)-time. If, however, we examine “Groundhog Day” more closely, we realize that it ingeniously brings each of the ‘(arche)-types’ of time to its narrative table. We certainly get a strong sense of ‘12’ when, every 6.00am dawn, the prior day has been ‘dissolved’ as if “Phil Connors” (Bill Murray) is moving through any time-cycle or time-line only in his imagination i.e. in “reality”, Phil is in a motionless, Edenic, Einsteinian ‘slab’ of ‘12 time’. It is not long, however, before we realize that each day is different by virtue of the ‘choices (?)’ that Phil makes and, therefore, ‘4’'s time-cycle begins to take on more “reality”. Before we look at thermodynamic ‘8 time-lines’ in “Groundhog Day”, the philosophical question of whether (or not... or, to what degree) Phil is “truly” making ‘7 choices’ pushes to the front and centre of that philosophical moldy-oldie, “fate vs. free will”...

In line with many scientists, Freud thought that “fate” (“determinism”) had a much stronger hold “in reality” than any “free will”. Insofar as Freud was a therapist, however, he would have looked for developments of “free will” in his analysands. In other words, whereas the un/pre-analyzed psyche was/is ‘stuck’ close to the “fate” pole of a “connected series” that, at the other end, has “free will”, the success of therapy – of “making-the-unconscious-conscious” – leads the analysand to have the opportunity to move to the “free will” pole of this “series”. In terms of “Groundhog Day”, we could say that Phil ‘thought’ that he was making choices in the earlier days of his new found ‘divinity’ – as he informs his weather-report producer and (soon-to-be) love interest, “Rita” (Andie McDowell), that he is “a god” – yet, Freud would counter that Phil was doing no more than playing out ‘scripts’ that (i) had been written by his parents, and (ii) were inaccessibly ‘stored’ in his “unconscious”. The film’s front & centre example of a ‘(not-quite Phil) script’ that Phil plays out is his trial & error method of seducing, first of all, “Nancy” (Marita Geraghty) and, then, Rita i.e. as a 3-4-5yrs infant, Phil

had learned to (and/or possessed a dubious innate skill to) obtain “inside information” about his mother without her knowing the extent of his ability and, so, little Phil would exploit this information to gratify his various wishes. The therapist (and/or “God”) is able to forgive Phil’s calculating deceitfulness because he hasn’t yet learned that he is using the script that had been written by his ‘superego-ig-id complex’ to Darwinianly survive. Indeed, urges to gratify wishes are so difficult to de-potentiate because wishes are subtle, entangled “conflations” of passing whimsy and desperate survival. The key insight offered by Harold Ramis’/Danny Rubin’s screenplay featuring two seductions is that Phil’s first ‘success’ with Nancy unconsciously reminds him of his ‘success’ with his mother and, as a result, he is further “inflated” in a way that “determines” his lack of success with Rita. As Freud explains, if there is anything worse than Oedipal defeat it is Oedipal victory. Deceit is never going to bring about a “real relationship”.


From the “fate vs. free will” moldy-oldie, our philosophical eyes move quickly along to another moldy-oldie: w/Who writes Phil’s ‘scripts’? is it the parents? is it an ancestral ‘curse’ that has grown teeth over the generations to ‘land in’ Phil’s forgotten “family romance” (a variant of “impersonal karma”)? was it written by Phil himself in one of his prior incarnations (“personal karma”) and, therefore, his ‘stuckness’ and its sequelae are a challenge that Phil’s soul had set itself in the “pleroma”? is it written by God or a god, not so much because of what Phil might have played out in his recent or deeper past and much more because God or a god has ‘asked’ him to suffer through a novel exploration for h/His sake? The fact that the analyst doesn’t know is “benefic” insofar as, in the longer run, it is a question for analysts to answer. When, however, the astrologer enters the frame with its traditional links of ‘10’ to personal karma and ‘12’ to impersonal karma, the question becomes sharper... so sharp, indeed, that this is where Freudastrology encourages astrologers to refrain from being conclusive and dedicate themselves to an ever-expanding hermeneutic context. In short, an expanded context generates the answer: all of the above (unless one is fully psychic, it may take all of one’s life and even a reincarnation to know their ‘proportions’).

Let’s, then, begin with “personal karma” and its relation to ‘10’. If we take our imaginary example chart of Harold Ramis (again, we have no birth time) and conceive his character, Phil Connors, as one of his ‘inner imaginary incarnations’, we look first to his ‘ontogenetic superego’ – Harold’s M.C./10th house – to find Taurus on the M.C. with Uranus in Gemini opposite Mercury in Sagittarius. This configuration fits nicely with Phil’s ‘authority’ as reductive-scientific weatherman... indeed, the first scene has Phil personifying the wind that, within a day or so, will trap him in Punxsutawney. It may be that, if the M.C. has anything to say about personal karma, it might be saying it about the mother’s personal karma that she ‘dumps’ on her child. In Phil’s case, we examine a mother (image) who would be proud of her son’s authoritative prominence in the scientific weather game. Bill Murray, himself a kind of reincarnation of Buster Keaton’s deadpan, was perfectly cast as a man who struggles for career prominence that, on the one ‘aware hand’, is worth it and, on the other ‘not-so-aware hand’, is not worth it. The ‘not-so-aware hand’ is the “Self” beckoning from Punxsutawney.

Freudastrology agrees with traditional astrology in respect of ‘10’ “dynamic” expression, Saturn, being more directly linked to “personal karma” than is the M.C.. In Harold’s imaginary chart, we notice an acceptable placement of natal Saturn – in Cancer in the 11th house – insofar as it aligns to (i) Harold’s fascination with ‘4’’s time-

cycle, and (ii) Phil’s apparent disinterest in any camaraderie until, at least, we see him taking part in a musical group at the resolution of (... errr, yes) his karma. It is never stated how many ‘groundhog days’ Phil experiences, but many have suggested that it may be as many as 30yrs of them. Going, at least, on the degree of skill of Phil’s piano playing, we could speculate a duration about halfway between an ‘average’ course of analysis (i.e. not the Woody Allen kind) and a full cycle of Saturn e.g. 18yrs.

If we stick with the idea of a Saturn cycle, we can stick with the idea of karma and inquire further into what karma is. The simplest definition – the law of cause and effect that stretches across lifetimes – might also be a little inadequate but it does link us to our yet-to-be-discussed third (arche)-type of time, ‘8 thermodynamic’. Thus, we encounter an apparent discrepancy i.e. is “personal karma” symbolized by ‘10’ or by ‘8’? For FA, this question is best answered by sticking with our basic precept of anti-clockwise cycling... paying close attention as we do so to developments of the feminine i.e. of the “anima”. For this task, let’s re-view one of our zodiac-cycle interpretations from our ‘Psycho-quadratics IIB: Pneumatic Gender’ (see, ‘Basics’)...



... with our key addition/alterations (the thick arrows/bold case) in the arc that runs from ‘8 cause-effect’, through ‘9 connecting pons’, across to ‘10 neutral mother’, meant to convey the “anima development” going into its 5th phase. Specifically, in the same way that ‘6 Virgoan’ Persephone undergoes a development, via her ‘7 marriage’, into ‘8 Hades’ to transform into a version of ‘8 Sophia’, so does ‘8 Sophia’ undergo a development, via her ‘9 expansions’ within the immaterial realm, into ‘10 matriarchal negativity’ in order to transform the ‘negativity’ to ‘neutrality ± (karmic) resolution’.

Given that there are always exceptions (that prove the rule), FA takes the view that, by and large, the natal location of Saturn symbolizes the individual’s unresolved karma from prior incarnations and the 1st cycle of Saturn symbolizes a new ‘layer’ of ‘this life karma’ because, when the individual is younger than 30yrs of age, the issue

of responsibility tends to tip either too far toward or too far away from responsibility (or, as we see in irresponsible leaders, finding a way to take on too much and too little at the same time). The chances for resolving both the new and old the 'layers' is a task that becomes possible in (respectively) the 2nd and 3rd cycles of Saturn. Then again, it is not these Saturn cycles alone that symbolize the resolution of personal karma... the Saturn cycle merely provides the 'perimeter' of karmic resolutions. The key resolvers of personal karma are the interactions of Saturn with the individual's natal & cycling 'rocky' planets, not the least of which is the "progressed Moon". Needless to say that, whenever opportunities to resolve karma are not taken, new karma is generated. It is easy to get caught in the 'hell' of non-resolution... all the hell-bound individual has to do is bunker down inside his/her "paranoid schizoid position" and conceive the world as a dyadic place that has "nothing but" winners and losers i.e. Phil sees himself as a winner who shouldn't, therefore, have to put up with the knockabout nonsenses being indulged by a loser '11 group' of amateur, groundhog-observing weather-men.

Perhaps the most important inclusion in our above zodiac interpretation is the function of '8-(9)-10 Sophia' in her "hermeneutic" role of, first, 'parting', and, second, 'wholing' (or, at least, 'connecting') the 'top' of the zodiac. Specifically, Sophia can tell us that '8' is the root of not only cause and effect but also of increasing entropy while '10's primary concern is to "defend" against not only cause and effect but especially also against increasing entropy. After all, '10' has the role of providing a stable 'bone-womb' for the upcoming '1 re-birth'. In other words, '10' gets mixed up in cause and effect in the "negative" sense i.e. not wanting potential causes having potential effects. This is reason why '10 Saturn', by itself, is more likely to generate karma than resolve it. In turn, we get a sense of the role that '9's "anima", Sophia, has been assigned in the individual's challenge to 'neutralize' '10'. For Phil, it is a case of joining a band of musicians not as an "overcompensation" (i.e. not as something like, "OK, I have some karma in the 11th house, so I better join some groups!") but, rather, as a way of making '11' into a non-issue. The key for Phil, as it would be in any non-imaginary character, Harold Ramis, or you or I, is making sure the Sun in cooking up plenty of "integrative pluralism"... so let's look closer at Harold's (imaginary) Scorpio-Sun on the I.C....

One of the reasons that we guessed for Harold's birthtime as 12.20am was that it brought the three water archetypes into 'complex interaction'. Specifically, it placed natal, Sun-ruling Pluto in the 12th house (an '8-12' interaction) and Scorpio on his I.C. (a '4-8 interaction'). As indicated in our horoscopic depiction, Pluto (if not transiting his I.C., was at least) transiting his Mars-Sun conjunction in Scorpio, thereby linking up the 12th house to the 4th house. As our longstanding readers know, we see '4' having a role in putting flesh on the immaterial soul, '12' having a role in dissolving the flesh from the materializing soul and '8' as the crisis point between these two 'imperatives'. Because of our basis in anti-clockwising development, FA also sees '8' having stronger intentions for the soul to grasp its immaterial-ness and, so, transits and "progressions" that involve expressions of '8' point the individual in immaterial directions... usually, by 'arranging' difficulties on the earthy plane. These difficulties (arche)-typically take on the form of increasing physical entropy (i.e. chaos & disorder) but, psychologically, they are actions by the "Self" to burn off "identifications" that have outlived their 'use by dates'. Now, because Harold has Sun in Scorpio, he would be sensitive to this issue so long as he had developed to and with his Sun. Not all individuals with natal Sun in

Scorpio are sensitized to a Sun in Scorpio's urge to burn away "identifications" with Solar father images so that 'deeper' Solar father images can eventually 'rise'... yet, it seems, through his mighty screenplay, that Harold was more than so sensitized.

Thus, we must now address an apparent oddity in Harold's biography i.e. '8's affinity with Western timeline-*philia* (Harold was 'Westernly' brought up in Judaism) was 'doubled up' in the years leading up to "Groundhog Day" yet it was in these years that Harold took on an Eastern Buddhist time-cycle-*philic* viewpoint, courtesy, as the biographers report it, of his 2nd marriage. At this point, readers who have a thorough knowledge of Jung will know that Jung worried about Westerners tilling the spiritual soil that lies underneath the Easterner's feet... and, so, we could worry for this in our current example. Then again, we don't know how much Harold kept one secret foot in his Western tradition. If he had done so, he might have found himself in a "positive *massa confusa*" i.e. by awarding the East-West split an equality in his "consciousness", Harold would have constellated the "3rd (integrating)" synthesis in his "unconscious" and, if he was patient enough, this "3rd" (or, as we explained above, "9th") would have its chance to join up with the synthesis-antithesis dyad. The key ingredient for the use of (what Jung called) "the transcendent function" is that which FA ever recommends when '8' is active, patience. We could say that, almost as much as an understanding of "love", Phil Connors needs an understanding of the virtues of "patience".


In Freudastrological terms, religious patience is a function of suffering through 1½ cycles of the zodiac-(horoscope). Specifically, the Old Testament Commandments can get one through to the 10th archetype of 'self-responsibility' (mothers also have to be responsible for gestation) but the fact of there being no 11th or 12th Commandments brings in the need for Christianity's "thou shalt" that are meant to guide one through both sides of left hemispheric narcissism (masochistic and sadistic) without generating too much "cause-effect (karma)". The trouble with Christianity and Buddhism is that their world-negating statements (e.g. illusions of "Maya") can go 2 ways (i) 'bad': for fear of succumbing to infantile sadistic narcissism, the individual becomes "arrested" inside his/her gestational narcissism (this can happen even if s/he has suffered through a cycle of the zodiac obeying the Commandments) or (ii) 'good': the individual arrives at the point where s/he understands that the veil is worth knowing about in respect of the '1-2-3-4 extraverted' sequence of archetypes but, in order to avert the paradoxes of world-negation, the individual doesn't apply any Maya-type insight to the '5-6-7-8 centrovverted' archetypes. In short, s/he needs to acquire a "quintessence" that is better called a "seventeen-essence". In terms of, say, the "progressed Moon" (or Saturn), this points to a 44+yrs journey... agreed, a lot longer than the 18yrs that we had originally proposed for Phil Connors. Then again, Phil might have been '9 lucky enough' to draw on transiting Jupiter... a 1½ cycle-journey, in the big red giant's case, takes 18yrs.

But, who knows? Maybe Phil was cycling through 180yrs of 1^{sts} of February? Maybe Eastern reincarnations both precede and succeed the Old Testament... thereby transforming it into a 'Relatively New Testament' (and, therefore, the New Testament is not the 'Newest Testament')? This would, of course, be what a hermeneutist would say about the state of our divided 21stC world of China & the U.S.A. bracing for their Bronson-Fonda "Once Upon a Time in the East-West" showdown. We know that the leaders of both nations are 'gestational' by sheer definition of nationalism. "♪Help".

HERMENEUTICS V: MONTY-WITHIN-PYTHON


META-HERMENEUTICS: QUINTESSENCE OR ‘NONESENCE’?

Our aim of ‘Hermeneutics IV’ was to establish a degree of plausibility for our neologism, ‘meta-hermeneutics’. If, dear reader, you are still with us in this, we expect that you won’t have too much trouble accepting the following ‘quintized quadratic’...



... that schematizes the difference (and eventual “integration”) of what we will now describe as ‘surface hermeneutics’ – that which is primarily focused on language; practiced by Hans-Georg Gadamer – and what we will now call ‘depth hermeneutics’ – that which is primarily focused on symbols; practiced by Freud & Jung.

The vertical axis of the schema, of course, recalls the ‘anti-hermeneutic’ (or, at least, ‘hermeneutic resistant’) reductive science that has sprouted in the wake of John Locke. And, in line with our prior schema, the base of quadratic (... errr) ‘symbolizes’ the zone that is occupied by those who are prepared to go back and forth between the ‘surface’ and the ‘depths’ without necessarily cooking an “integration”. Fortunately, for FA’s explanatory aims, the 2010s has provided us with an (apparent) example...



By training, Jordan is an academic psychologist. He explains that, when he was a university student and, later, applying for tenure, he was told to have zip to do with Jung because it would hurt his career. It seems that this threat had a backfiring effect on his red-rag Bull ascendant because Jordan kept up his Jungian studies and looked

around for a teaching post that could tolerate his (if not “integration”, then at least) ‘mixing’ of the surface & depth traditions. This is nicely symbolized by Jordan’s natal Mercury-Sun in Gemini straddling the 2nd house of material self-worth. And, it seems that Jordan’s “anima”, “positively projected” onto his wife, and nicely symbolized by a somewhat endogamous Venus in Cancer on the I.C., would keep the anti-clockwise heroic flame alight. Despite this, we can’t get too carried away because his natal chart also reveals “complex” interplay of his superego with his ‘ig-to-id-to-ego sequence’...

Having ‘double 10’ Capricorn on the M.C. & ‘10-11-11’ Saturn in Aquarius on the 10th house side of the 11th house cusp points to a significant superego (Jordan had, in 2021, completed 2 cycles of Saturn). The interesting thing about his natal Saturn is that it is involved in 2 “complexes” (i) his natal Mercury in Gemini & Moon in Libra ‘interact’ with Saturn in Aquarius via an airy “grand trine” and (ii) his natal Mars in Taurus opposite his Neptune in Scorpio ‘interact’ with Saturn via a “T-cross”. For FA, the first “complex” points his ability to authoritatively articulate all points of view in a ‘mix’ that admits a possible synthesis (his natal ‘5 Sun’ in Gemini is widely conjunct his Sun-ruling Mercury) and his second “complex” points to his battle with alternative superego-ic viewpoints. Jordan’s Mars in Taurus in the (relatively “unconscious”) 12th housed ‘feeds’ his Taurean ascendant with uncertain degrees of “compensation”.


Because of the subtleties of depth psychology, most trained depth psychologists follow Freud in his understanding of “the public” as a variant of a heavily “defended” analysand i.e. “resistance” is, as Freud said it, “a storm in a teacup”. Psychoanalysts have enough on their plate dealing with those who, as the “change-the-lightbulb joke” goes, “want to change” i.e. their clients. If Jordan was in analysis, his analyst would look into his motivations for expending libido on those who don’t want to change i.e. it is hard enough already with those who want to change! Jordan might counter-argue that he has an over-abundance of psychological energy and, if he didn’t expend it, he would put himself at risk of self-harm. Fair enough, but what do his dreams say?...

Indeed, interpreting dreams is only the starting block of ‘meta-hermeneutics’. The deeper layers of the psyche can express through waking visions, the body (psychosomatics), relationships & “events”. These expressions open up the dyad, coincidence vs. synchronicity. As Jordan knows so well, this dyad is another one of those Freudian “connected series”, reductive coincidence and one end and teleological synchronicity at the other. It has been the eternal favourite past-time of academic psychology to have none of that synchronicity crap and, to Jordan’s credit, he is philosophical enough to know that “confirmation bias” can work both ways i.e. the academic psychologist who spots what s/he thinks is a “confirmation bias” (trying to prove it with damn statistics) is succumbing to his/her “confirmation bias”. Pots calling kettles and all that.

From the Freudastrological point of view, an individual who is making appeals to authority (and who does not have personal planets in the 10th house), is succumbing to his/her superego until proven otherwise (FA is even pretty cautious with individuals who do have natal personal planets in their 10th houses). With only difficult Saturn in (admittedly, near the 11th house cusp of) his 10th house, Jordan could be counselled to focus on the ‘mix vs. integration’ issues in his own endogamy-exogamy dyad. Through 2022-2024, this focus would gain the extra support of a “progressed Moon” in the 6th house and bring extra circumspection to that crown-of-thorny issue, proselytism...

‘HERMENEUTIC TRILOGY’ V: ANGELS & DEMONS (2009) ☾☽

OK, so what about someone who does have a personal planet in the 10th house? As noted in our prior section, we remain cautious, especially if it/they has/ve difficult aspects. In this spirit, we now consider a director who, like Laurence Olivier, has/had to handle Chiron in the 10th house; conjunct Moon opposing Uranus in the 4th house...



... and, in addition, the transit of Pluto across his Sagittarian-cusped 9th house as he looked to mounting Dan Brown’s trilogy (now quintilogy) onto the silver screen.

Born in the U.S.A.’s mid-west, “little Ronny” had the Norman Rockwell-esque appeal to find himself cast in the film version of “The Music Man”, something that he would (sort of) repeat as a young adult in “American Grafitti”. The directing bug was already biting by then and he would direct his first feature, “Grand Theft Auto”, when only 23yrs old. Although his natal Sun is submerged in Pisces 12th house, it does have the ‘advantages’ of (i) being creatively open to the 12th archetype’s qualitative cultural dimension (ii) via a conjunction with natal Mercury, being well equipped to articulate & differentiate what, for many others, would be called “contaminants” and, perhaps, most advantageous of all, (iii) is “dynamized” through its T-square configuration with the other two (double)-fiery planetary expressions, Jupiter and chart-ruling Mars.

Although he began directing at an atypically young age, he was typical insofar as his prominence was delayed until midlife... “A Beautiful Mind” (2002: ☾☽) won a bagful of Oscars when he was 48yrs old. The ingenious way he handled the big reveal in this tale suggested that he was the right director for the big reveals of Dan Brown’s “Cluedo”-type page-turners but, as Hollywood’s history tells us, “The Da Vinci Code” was a major sleep-fest. (For what it is worth, we are no big fans of it either because of its over-literal over-interest in the Knights Templar). This criticism wasn’t lost on Ron because the funniest joke of “Angels & Demons” has the heroine, “Dr. Vittoria Vetra” (Ayelet Zurer), tearing out a page of one of Galileo’s original texts, “no time”. Perhaps Hollywood and Ron would have done better to film the books in order i.e. “Angels & Demons” is Dan’s first book and its plotting is both far more concise and interestingly


referential of the numbers, 4 & 5, that help the psyche toward “integrative pluralism”. The four elements had, for 2000+ years, been considered as fundamental as had, say, the 10 Commandments. As with any movie that dallies with religious hypocrisy, there were complaints & prohibitions... to themselves become a set of angels & demons that would tug at the moral inquiry now instigated by hypocritical words & actions. If the complainers & prohibitors had seen the film, they would have realized that it was pro-Catholic Church. The villain of the story, “Father Mackenna” (Ewan McGregor), the secretive power chaser, is the renegade priest who wants to bring back the “make war not love” Middle Ages... the priests of the conclave, even if their funny hats are red & not white, are the “good guys” who need no more than a ‘master depth hermeneutist’ (yep, there’s no is no professor of symbology at Harvard), such as “Robert Langdon” (Tom Hanks), with “anima” in tow, to discover the truth and inform them of it.

If there is an irony to Dan’s (not)-trilogy-(anymore), it is that it is pro-Catholic hierarchy insofar as its very preposterousness draws attention away from existential problems that are far from preposterous. In cinematic terms, the “Angels & Demons” is the “diversion” from (the) “Spotlight”. Films provide hope but hope’s t/True centre within an entrenched institution will ever be the individuals that comprise them...

Although we could break the classifications down further, we notice six broad classes of priests, with three classes somewhere toward the ‘anti-love’ pole of the ‘love-anti-love connected series’ and three classes somewhere toward the ‘love’ pole of this ‘love-anti-love connected series’. The three classes of ‘anti-love’ – (i) the perpetrators, (ii) those who have covered up the perpetrators, and (iii) those in either total or partial “denial” (with lip services, “it isn’t such a big problem”; “the good we do out-weighs the bad”, “all walks of life experience this problem” etc.) – lend themselves to a debate about which of the three is the most ‘anti-loving’. Few, however, would debate whether they belong to any of the three classes of ‘love’ – (i) external transformers, those who leave the Church, yet continue to look for ways to heal it from the outside, (ii) internal transformers, those who stay within the Church believing that that this is the position that would be more effective for healing, & (iii) those who leave and reject interest in healing something without (i.e. the Church) to, instead, focus on the healing that which God is ‘asking’ all inner men e.g. an ex-priest’s, if temporary, “denial”. The first two classes of ‘lovers’ have to work out what a healing involves and, of course, from FA’s perspective, there appears to be a need for coherency with “Mother Church” and the gender that runs it. Those who would counter this view – e.g. “women are just as likely to engage in abuse as men” – have a point but whether this outweighs (i) the coherency noted above and (ii) they haven’t been allowed, is the obvious reply. As it would be for any system of organization that is predicated on morality (not, say, on efficiency), one instance of abuse is, by definition, one too many. It is very difficult to imagine greater damage to civilization than that generated by corruption of its moral dispensary. The only moral organizations worth having are those that protect the most vulnerable and even some of history’s nastiest amoral military strategists have been known to sidestep advantages that come at the cost of the enemy’s women & children. No doubt...

Any priest who hands in his frock, collar and funny hat may need to endure a period in the wasteland... but, in amongst this heroic endurance, he might be able to tell himself that at least he’s having a better time of things than the protagonists of...

HERMENEUTIC FILM 4B: THE FISHER KING (1991) ☹☹




We are sure that we aren't the only ones these days who feel guilt whenever we laugh at Robin's great clown. At least, in "The Fisher King" (1991: ☹☹), an admission by Monty Python illustrator and dystopian visionary, Terry Gilliam ("Brazil"; 1985 ☹☹ and "12 Monkeys"; 1995 ☹☹), that Robin was very much the American version of the madcap Brits, we get to see the "depression" that sits underneath his clownish character, "Parry". It is in the movie's 2nd act the narrative provides us with the event that sits underneath Parry's "depression"... his wife was killed in a terrorist bombing that was incited by "Jack" (Jeff Bridges) a shock jock "identified" with his superego.

We have seen that the 8th archetype has something to do with the replacement of physical entropy with spiritual extropy. When '8 Pluto' is one's chart ruler, it helps to learn about this before midlife (at midlife and beyond it, everyone needs to discover something about it). Pluto transited Robin's ascendant in 1980s when his star was on the rise, but the FA-er wouldn't rate this transit above Pluto's natal influence and, as indicated above, Robin had Pluto on a Leo M.C. '10-8-(5) interaction', telling us that he would have been sensitive to the archetype of the "lose all hope, ye who enter here" as it interacts with "death-rebirth" in wrongheaded kings. Kings who have succumbed to their (respective) superegos can do nil else but allow themselves to be replaced.

The main activity in the weeks & months of Robin's death was Pluto engaging with this natal T-cross – Neptune-Jupiter-Uranus-Mars – from the 2nd house, meaning that Pluto had 'generated' a grand cross. Would it have been enough for an astrologer to point this out to Robin in the hope of avoiding a "permanent solution to a temporary problem"? Given the (hermeneutic) context of his degenerative physical illness, Robin might not have been able to 'hear' it. He may have decided that spiritual extropy was a convenient idea that only the healthy could indulge. He may have laughed as much at the Freudastrologer as we have laughed at his clown, especially if he had read the 'philosophers' from whom our next screenplay authors had drawn...

ESSENTIAL HEROES III: THE LIFE OF BRIAN (1979) ☉☽☿♃



Now that we are concluding this series (oops, cycle) of essays on hermeneutics, it is appropriate that we are thinking of cinema’s “post-modern philosopher”, “Brian” (Graham Chapman), who pleads to his parroting mass, “you don’t have to follow me! you don’t have to follow anybody! you are all individuals!!” As we typed it in our first essay, “for the post-Nietzschean post-modernist, we exist in a fractured world with 8+ billion opinions of how the world ‘is’, all incomplete, flawed and terminally relative”. We can’t get too carried away, however. Brian is different to other “post-modernists” insofar as he has no motive to educate... he simply wants to be left alone. Similarly, we can’t say that we have enough information about Brian to know whether he might be a good candidate for psychoanalysis. If, for example, Brian’s natal Sun is placed in Pisces, his motives to be left alone might be sound. One thing that we can say is that “The Life of Brian”’s financier, George Harrison, had a natal Sun in Pisces – we’ll pick up the thread of his astrology below – but, the fact of “post-modernism” being Brian’s “default defense” when put under pressure tells us that he could be a good candidate.

We don’t go so far as to insist that post-modernism is able to generate mental illness by itself. We do go so far, however, as to see the beginnings of post-modernism in the protesting religions that came in the wake of Luther... even if there aren’t quite 8+ billion of them. It is possible to theoretically understand why the Catholic Church would oppose the splintering of interpretations that came in the wake of Luther. It is, however, not so easy to accept the Catholic Church’s methods of opposition. Jungians, if, of course, they were about in the 16th-to-19th centuries, would have been educating the popes about the synchronistic meaning of Luther’s opposition e.g. they would need to relax enough to allow a hermeneutic cycle from ‘meta-narrative’ to ‘sub-plot’ and, then, back again to ‘meta-narrative’. “Repression/oppression” is anti-Love.

As our longstanding readers are aware, FA can’t ignore the fact that the cyclic character of the zodiac points to Eastern religion and its basis in reincarnation. This zodiacal fact leads our focus on Christianity to the pre-Protestant ‘sub-plot’ that was

written by the Christian reincarnationists of the 12th-13thC, the Cathars. Our readers will also be aware that we don't "identify" as Cathar because the Jungian in us would interrogate ourselves about the meaning of being persecuted in ways that the Cathars didn't. To be fair and balanced, if we were going to question the persecutors, we would also have to question the persecuted. As a result, we "identified" as 'fake Cathars'... but, even with this, we flinch at the notion that we are "identified" with anything...

Overall, the aim of the Jungian religious educator is to be Socratic enough that those whom the educator might be trying to educate can put the "identification" issue at the top of the list. For example, if a Cathar were to 'complain' to our Jungian self, "why don't the persecutors leave us alone?", we would direct him/her to the glee with which the Michael Palin-peasant of "Monty Python & the Holy Grail" declares, "see the violence inherent in the system!". In other words, there is something the individual unconscious that revels in (what we call) "narcissistic masochism"... and, at a deeper level of his/her unconscious, s/he may also be reveling in "narcissistic sadism".

Now, if we switch out of 'intra-religious' disputes and move across to the 'trans-religious' dispute between "religion" and "science", one doesn't have to Jung to notice that this "narcissistic sado-masochistic" dynamic remains relevant. Therefore, if there is no attempt to include depth psychology in the "religion-vs.-science" debate, it won't be worth the toilet paper that it won't be written on, let alone the lack the philosopher who is needed to point out the dime-a-dozen epistemological "category mistakes".

This issue of debate doesn't stop there. As Brian would realize the hard way, there is an inescapable hypocrisy: reasoning with unreasonable people proves that the reasoner is (also) unreasonable because it is unreasonable to reason with unreasonable people. At first, I thought it was a bit odd for Michael Palin and John Cleese to bother themselves enough to argue the point with two of England's better-known proselytes (it is part of the DVD extras on "Life of Brian") but, with a second take, I would agree that any publicity is good publicity and, after all, it is likely that felt that they needed to help George get some of his investment money back. The losers of the debate – those who would insist that those who made "Life of Brian" were (to use Cleese's inflection) "blashPHEEmers" – lost because it made the neutral more likely to see the film. Your local autocrat knows only too well that allowing debate is the surest way to undermine their power. If a "smart autocrat" doesn't have the power to ban a film or an artwork, s/he cuts his/her losses and resolves to say nothing about it.

And, so, we arrive at Jung's famous epithet, "thank God I'm not a Jungian!". It is also the epithet that forced us to return to Freud and look at other ways one might not be a Jungian. Agreed, FA is Freudian but we expect very few Freudians would be interested in the way in which we have gone 'beyond' Freud. Indeed, we hope that we have gone far enough 'beyond' Freud that Freudians will insist that FA isn't Freudian! Yippee!!! The key idea is to not "identify" as anything because, short of NASA firing a rocket into Pluto that could blow it to smithereens, Pluto is going to come along and f... you up, not because Pluto is "malefic" but because your "identification" is ready to be "malefic" to your soul. "Identification" is the surest psychodynamic (perhaps we do better to call it a 'psycho-static') to put a stop to emotional & spiritual growth

Proselytism, laced with not insignificant degrees of "reaction formation", isn't restricted to the religious sphere. As noted in our essay on Karl Marx, the only way to 'know', in a 'scientific' way, if the world would be better off without religion is to refer

our Earth's history to a "control Earth" that had ventured through the last two, three or four millennia sans religion... thus, 'science' would have access to the material that, according to its' self-definition, is critical to its process i.e. evidence. Even if one could attain such evidence, it wouldn't amount to any kind of "proof" because it would have to be classified as "anecdotal". In hermeneutic words, the cycle into 'true' knowledge about the worth of religion is not available to science and to contaminate science with unscientific strutting and fretting isn't helpful to the neutral individual who wishes to 'know' whether (or, not) the world would be better off without science.

It was Jung, of course, who pointed out that, if we do manage to blow ourselves to bits in the upcoming decades, your local 20-20 hindsight would answer: "yup, the world would have been better off without science!!". At this stage, however, those who love their technology are thinking in more optimistic directions. In the meantime, the neural "centrovert" sees the whole shebang as a cosmic joke. Even Freud would admit that jokes are "hermeneutic" insofar as they give the mind an opportunity to expand its context. Specifically, laughter is the expression of the suddenness of this expansion. "Hands up all those who don't want to be crucified!" – with God the one laughing the loudest. It is not only plans that make God laugh... proselytism does it too. So...


From the "most revered" drama, "Hamlet" (see; 'Hermeneutics III'), it makes good balancing sense to jump forward to the "most irreverent" comedy. Rather than begin with the horoscopes of the "Monty Python" troupe of writers, we begin with the "Beatle" who 'donated' his resources to get it made... George didn't care if "The Life of Brian" was banned from the theatres or made no profit. All he wanted to do was to see it. Looking at George's horoscope, we see that he was coming into his 4th cycle of Jupiter... meaning that, instead of '9 transcending' his cycle, George's Jupiter would take the route of '10 responsibility' and subsequent '11-12-1-2-3-(4) descent' through his ontogenetic matriarchate. This would mean that, for the 4th time, it might hook up with his Sun in Pisces in his 4th house (Jupiter is his Sun's "traditional" ruler). Indeed, Jupiter would opt for a 5th 'descent' in 1991 but, in 2001, a few weeks after his 5th "Jupiter return" and with Neptune, his "modern" Sun-ruler, hovering around his I.C., George 'rode' Jupiter off-up-into his "my sweet sunset".

We stand by our focus on transiting Jupiter in George's horoscope because, at his prior "Jupiter return" (1966), he would begin to pull back from "The Beatles" and immerse himself in Eastern, specifically Hindu, spiritual practices. For a while, "The Beatles" accommodated him – e.g. "Within You, Without You" on "Sgt. Peppers..." – but, in 1968, he would take '10 responsibility' for his solo career and, by 1973, George had immersed himself in film production. With "The Life of Brian"'s 1st draft coming into existence in 1975, the finished film of 1979 is a Jupiter-cycle "culmination".

If Jung had been alive in the 1970s, he may have balked at George's spiritual 'shift to the East' but there is a sense in which Eastern spirituality provides Westerners with kind of "de-identification" process that, in turn, allows one to assess the proper and improper use of one's 'source religion'. Agreed, the "spiritual tourist" might find him/herself skipping out of his/her frying pan into the fire of "identification with one's itinerary" – a fine example of Monty Python's "pointless swaps" (to be sure, George's drug-fueled 1970s point in this direction) – but the chance remains for a 'return to the West' and another "de-identification" (this time) from the East. The zodiac-horoscope helix 'expands' this idea out to an 'onion-skinning' "de-identification cycle" that could

be a lifetime in the making. Or, maybe, even an “Age” in the making. Either way, it is the hermeneutic way to make it the least number of suffering lifetimes in the making, another argument that one could direct to your local ‘reasonable Cathar’.


The problem that “Life of Brian” exposes, however, is that the 2,000yrs has not been enough time for the collective (of either of the hemispheres) to “de-identify” from their religious and political “identifications”... so, the prospects of achieving this over the upcoming 2,000yrs are not good. Right from the “blessed are the cheesemakers!”, “it is not meant to be taken literally; it refers to any manufacturers of dairy products”, early scene of Freudian ‘mis’-hearings of the Sermon on the Mount, the basic problem of the superego – even when comprehended correctly, it will only ever be a ‘stopgap’ – is not available to collective interest because factions are too immersed within their respective authoritative appeals about what is (believed to be) important to be worried about ‘authority-in-itself’. Fittingly, the Pythons decided to segue this scene with a fist fight i.e. the “compensations” of ‘10-11 Capricorn-Aquarius’ continuing to make noise as ‘1 Aries’ gears up for a fresh re-start. Brian’s own (arguable) Sun in Pisces has zero interest in the goings on because he has spotted a potential love-interest. Before getting a chance to introduce himself, however, his mother Mandy is dragging him off to the tried-and-true organized religious opportunity to “project” one’s “shadow”, stoning. As ever for the Pythons, the member whom they would most often cast when the time came to express “repressed authority” was/is...



As Brian heads off to stoning, we overhear the father-figure of his love interest, “Reg” (John Cleese) telling his followers that, “what (the s/Sermonizer) doesn’t realize is that the meek are the problem”, arguably echoing W.B. Yeats’ lament, “the best lack conviction, given the time to think”. Psychologically, the “meek” would be translated as, “those who have thought about their respective ‘projection-spinning’ capacities to the degree that that they lose their conviction to follow one or other flanks of politics... and, in amongst this realization, they realize that, in the long run, via their (what could be called) ‘Eastern-Hegelian proto-hermeneutic knowing’, yin eventually overcomes

yang and, then, vice versa, so, in the meantime, the only thing to do is to hope that the next overcoming won't be as violent & evil as overcomings have been in the past". If "the meek" were to try to counsel Reg, "Reg! at Delphi, there's an oracle that preaches 'nothing in excess; know thyself'", they would not likely get very far because, unlike aqueducts, abstractions aren't substantial enough to warrant any concession. Indeed, the counsellor is merely increasing the chances of an evil violence being turned toward the counsellor. Thus, Freud had characterized himself as a "midwife" of that which is 'gestating' in the analysand's "unconscious" i.e. his/her yin. Part of this task involves assessing the risks of 'psychological prematurity (and/or Caesarian)'. In other words, the analysand doesn't introduce the concept of "projection" to the analysand whenever the analysand is in its throes, the pathognomonic sign of which is strong emotion...

The trouble with emotion, however, is that it doesn't always 'show'. This is the reason that Marie-Louise von Franz discusses e/Evil in terms of a "hot vs. cold" dyad that, when applied to our Freudastrological spirit, needs an expansion to its quadratic and, if necessary, to an 'octonic'. Hence, we expand Marie-Louise's dyad as follows...



... to help clarify why depth psychologists have felt the need to introduce the term, "anti-love", to point out that a non-growing attitude to emotions (and spirit) is not necessarily 'evil'... to be a party of the latter requires one to have a high capacity for growth and to refuse it. This is probably why jokes on evil behaviour – e.g. stoning – can work because they are not laden with a back-story that reveals the capacities of the individuals who succumb to it. Evil behaviour is different to an evil individual.

Now, when it comes to 'hot-showy' "repressed emotion", John is one of the best at portraying it... "Basil Fawlty" being, perhaps, his pinnacle. As for cinema's master portrayals of 'cold-hidden' "dissociated emotion", many will likely nominate Anthony Hopkins' "Hannibal the Cannibal" as the standout example although there are colder portrayals and other very interesting portrayals that shift from 'cold' to 'hot' e.g. Jack Nicholson's "Jack Torrance" in "The Shining". Whomever the film-buff prefers, this detour has been taken to recall Jung's view that, given the difficulties of assessing the capacity for growth in others, the "meek" can only inherit the earth when individuals spend more time looking at their respective shadows than at others' i.e. "individuate".

So, instead of "♪ always looking on the bright side of life", the Freudastrologer would "always make room for the bright side of life" and, yes, Eric would remind us that this doesn't have a meter that would lend itself to the song. Nonetheless, if Brian were to enter therapy, he might experience therapy as a species of crucifixion because he would want to get off the cross but he can't. The passage of Saturn through the 4th house might take 3 years (a lot more than three days). Aw... Jesus had it easy.

