Chapter 58 – SCORPIO on the ASCENDANT

THE '8-1' INTERACTION

The positioning of Scorpio's 30º arc on the 'east' of the h horscope is, arguably, a 'good' thing i.e. everyone has to have Scorpio somewhere in their natal chart... so why not have it in a place where it can be left behind? In other words, given that the ascendant is a “miserable surface” that anyone would want to leave behind, why not kill two birds with one stone?

Of course, if you converse with an individual who has the Scorpion on his/her ascendant, you will quickly realize that the question posed in the paragraph above is built on the assumption that Scorpio is “easy” to “leave behind”... and, soon enough, you will be 'leaving behind' this assumption. Indeed, we can even go so far to argue that Scorpio's 30º arc could become a 'black hole' that pulls a 'falling' development 'back up' into itself when the psyche (i) becomes disenchanted by the flesh-negating propensities of Sagittarius on/near the flesh-promoting propensities of the 2nd house cusp (ii) experiences Capricornian-repressive “delay-'n'-frustration” with its mental formations on/near its 3rd house cusp (iii) becomes too Aquarianly tricky for its own good when it is bottoming out through its I.C. & (iv) swims headlong into its Piscean dreamy-'n'-confused 'inner child' on/near the cusp of the 5th house.

There are two reasons why the FA-er might take more interest in the Scorpio ascendant than in the 'other 11' (i) it was Freud’s ascendant (ii) for Freudastrology, the 8th archetype is always in need of better understanding. Then again, as pointed out in the opening paragraphs of this chapter, we can still ask whether Scorpio's 30º arc might be easier to understand when is placed in the right hemisphere (e.g. near the descendant). Our answer, “yes”, comes out of our view that Scorpio is easier to understand after the psyche, now through its 4th house, has, if unconsciously, had a chance to differentiate Piscean a-ogamy from Cancerian endogamy.

Indeed, if Freud's biography is read closely enough, we realize that, for all his 'brilliant', fast-logical '11 Uranian' (Apollo on the I.C.) insights into the Oedipal complex (not forgetting that Freud's 1st foray into Oedipal dynamics came out of an 'analysis' of his very own 'family romance'), he was never comfortable with the '12-ish' idea of “oceanic feeling”... an idea that would be second nature to the individual with Pisces (not only on the ascendant but) anywhere in the 1st quadrant. To be properly fair to Freud, however, we need to acknowledge that, although he lived in a post-Darwinian era, very much more would be learned of Homo sapiens' neotenic character after his passing (in 1939).

Another problem that hinders the 'getting' of an 'eastern' Scorpio comes out of our notes at the end of 'Prelude: Vol.3' i.e. the all-important input that is provided by the 'auxiliating' 3rd house cusp is typically foxed by a (Capricornian) 'repression-factor' that blocks access to (inner or outer) sibling insight... again, when we turn to Freud's biography, we note his problems differentiating 'brother' from 'uncle' (and his 'delay' in outlining the developmental phase that sat between the 'oral/anal' and the 'oedipal' phases of development). In our discussion of Muhammad Ali, we made the point that his psyche seems to have (i) “split” in his (Libran-cusped) 3rd house & (ii) 'dissolved' in his (Scorpio-cusped) I.C.... and, in a not dissimilar way, we can see how Freud's psyche went on to “split” in his 3rd house (even if Capricorn's splitting
is very different to Libra's splitting) and, then, 'frothed' into his 4th house. The good thing about Sigmund's difficult '3-4 transition' is that the cusp 'rulers' (i.e. Saturn & Uranus) were 'pointing' Freud toward his right hemisphere... wherein, of course, we also find a 7th house Sun in Taurus.

Yet another problem with an 'eastern' Scorpio is the fact that the 'redeeming' function's (air) only representative in the lower hemisphere is '11' (... recall, in this regard, our notes on 'dark' film director, Oliver Stone who, like so many who have a water sign on the ascendant, is faced with the challenge of a 'frothy' 4th house). This problem might not be so imposing if the (noumal) airy 3rd house cusp wasn't placed in Capricorn, but because it so often is, the Scorpio ascendant-er does well when s/he takes his/her (inner and/or outer) Taurus-on-the-descendant partner seriously.

Perhaps the biggest problem of all, however, is the sheer paradox of needing to negotiate (adjectival) death when experiencing (noumal; re)-birth... as previously discussed in relation to the 'dark' film director, David Lynch. The remedy for this intense 'complex opposite' is a full development all the way around to the 'simpler' sign of rebirth... Aries is likely to be straddling the 6th house cusp. The trouble with this 6th archetype expression, however, is its own imminent threat of 'abduction' up into the 8th archetype i.e. Aries on the 6th house cusp might find itself 'jumping' over the descendant and being gobbled up by the (Gemini?) 8th house. Now, in recalling the auxiliation problems that exist in the 3rd house, we again see why a Taurean 'partner' can be so helpful. Freud's Taurus sun in the 7th house has much to do with why he was an analyst rather than an analysand.

Yes, dear reader, thus far, this essay has been dominated by a rather gloomy tone but, in keeping with Scorpio, we will end it with a sense of bright re-birth... the Scorpio ascendant is, arguably, the 'best' ascendant (even better than Virgo) insofar as the ascendant is something that needs to be 'self-overcome' (see 'Prelude Vol.3'). And, is there, dear reader, any zodiac sign that is more attuned to 'self-overcoming' than “I'm-cornered-so-i'll-just-have-to-sting-myself-to-death” Scorpio? The key to 'advising' this ascendant-er, therefore, is to remind him/her that s/he needs to build something within so that s/he has 'somewhere to go' when his/her mask 'dies'. To be sure, s/he won't always get as far in-away from his/her mask as s/he might like but, as our 'Example 58C' would probably agree, the further 'in' the better.

Because Pluto moves so slowly, the percentage of the 'other 11/12th' (i.e. those who don't have a Scorpio ascendant) to get a first hand experience of what it might be like to have a lifetime of it is not large, especially in the 21stC when Pluto's cycle slows... the 'average' duration of Pluto's passage is 20yrs (e.g. in Capricorn; where it is 'now') but it can take as few as 12yrs and as many as 28yrs to pass through a sign (e.g. later on in this century – a time that, curiously, is predicted for climate change to 'cause' havoc – the world will be dealing with 30yrs of Pluto in Taurus). Those of us who were born when Pluto was recently in Scorpio – “Gen Y” – have a chance of being the generation that will be 'called' to self-overcome for the sake of all other generations of the 22ndC. That is, of course, if God-(dess) is willing to support Homo sapiens in its 'desire' to self overcome. Who knows (?), maybe those bumheads from “Star Trek” have already booked (and karmically paid for) an Earth holiday... “get your filthy hands of us, you darn dirty Hominids!!”
In his first two decades of psychoanalytic theorizing, Freud was working on the assumption that understanding could only emerge from the psychical disorders that were 'reach-able' (via the analysand's “transference” onto an outer “object”)... the so-called “transference neuroses”. In 1914 (a centenary soon!), Freud decided to boldly go where no psychoanalyst had been before... to psychical disorders that seem to be 'caused' via (for want of a better term) “transference” to an “inner object” i.e. the unreachable-untreatable “narcissistic neuroses”. In doing so, Freud would open a Pandora's box of depth psychological theory wherein the clinical 'proofs' that had been so easy to come by with the “transference neuroses” (e.g. hypnosis) were now uber-difficult. And, so, the psychoanalytic Babel would slouch toward Vienna to be born. Still, as explained in our 'Interludes 3A/3B', Klein took some mighty steps.

Nonetheless, in earlier essays, we have found 'cause' (har, har) to 'complain' about some of the details of Kleinian theory e.g. (i) it is confusing, especially for the novice, to employ the term “ego” for the “(pseudo)-integration” of the infant psyche and (ii) overattachment to Freudian 'causality' maybe behind the Kleinian desire to dismiss Neumann's 12th archetypal mother-foetal “passive identity” altogether. FA's 'complaint' (about Kleinian analysis) leads to... (iii) although we don't deny Klein's views that an envious analysand will attack the analyst — the analysand attacks the “good breast” analyst because the latter is perceived by the former as the possessor of all the 'goodies' — we wonder whether the analyst might be too quick to jump to a conclusion that s/he is the “good breast” being attacked when it could be a case, say, of a “jealous” Oedipal attack on the analyst's “bad breast”...

As she pushed her infant psychodynamical insight further and further back toward the days and weeks after birth, Melanie Klein wondered whether the terms “(Oedipal) jealousy” and “envy” needed a sharper differentiation i.e. the “jealous” infant, because of his/her greed for the (“good breast”) caregiver, would phantasize the elimination of the (“bad breast”) that seemed to stand between the instinctual
aim and its object... whereas the “envious” infant, because of his/her greed for the “(eternal) placenta”, takes the extra step of phantasizing elimination of the “good breast”. In turn, when a Kleinian psychotherapist goes about 'building up' a “good breast” in the psyche of a regressed analysand, s/he may encounter a direct attack on his/her efforts via the analysand's 'gestational' attitude. (Freud, too, had already described this when discussing the attacks on depth psychology by those well-known gestational 'occupiers' of the intellectual womb... phobosophers).

This differentiation isn't a bad place to begin our psychological overview of John Lennon's 'nemesis'... there is no real evidence that Chapman had a desperate crush on Yoko; because John held negligible political power (gasbagging about the 'state' of the corrupt 'state' is not quite the same as being an 'organizing authority' for either the maintenance or the collapse of the 'state' e.g. Lenin), Lennon was no kind of “bad breast” in need of being eliminated so that the starving children of the world could be fed; after shooting Lennon, Chapman took no interest in robbing his apartment (he simply sat down with his copy of “Catcher in the Rye” and waited for the police to turn up). In short, we can say that Chapman's case is very much more one of “envy” than of “jealousy”. Perhaps, one day, Chapman's headstone will read “just an envious guy”?

Chapman can't, however, 'complain' about John Lennon in the way that we have 'complained' about Kleinian therapy... in other words, Chapman can't say that he was attacking John’s “bad breast” (i.e. John's hypocrisy) so that he could secure John's “good breast” (i.e. John's gift for song) because, by killing his “bad breast”, he had killed the “good breast” too. It is Chapman's 'global' attitude to Lennon that tells us that he is envious rather than jealous.

Therefore, even if we are to begin our reading of Chapman's horoscope at his I.C., we still roll back into his gestational 4th quadrant at the earliest opportunity. In light of the fact that MDC’s chart ruler – Pluto – had, by its transit, rolled forward from its natal position (conjuncting the M.C., if from the 9th house side) to his natal square of Neptune in the 11th house to Uranus-Jupiter in the 8th house at the time of Lennon's murder, we would probably have done so anyway. 1980, of course, was one of those 1-in-20 years when Jupiter 'catches (back) up' to Saturn to form a Jupiter-Saturn conjunction (this one has always interested the American astrologers as it seems to symbolize the death of their president). And, once again, in Chapman's chart, we can see that this conjunction 'stimulated' his 4th quadrant (near the cusp of his 11th house, trine natal Venus, to be exact). Whether it is a bigger player than transiting Pluto, however, is not an easy question to answer.

A much easier question to answer, however, is: did transiting Chiron play a significant role in the 'stirring up' of Chapman's 12th house natal Saturn in Scorpio? Answer: yes, although Chiron is natally placed in a “jealous” 3rd house, by the time of the murder, it had rolled up to an opposition to his “envious” Saturn (unhappily, Chapman has a natal Saturn-Sun opposition to boot). The reason that this question is much easier to answer is that Lennon's chart was being Chiron-buffetted too. Agreed, it is reasonable to suggest that FA is “jealous” of Lennon... after all, I attacked his “bad hypocrisy breast” in our “Aries on the Ascendant” essay. I leave it to you, dear reader, to decide whether I am (or am not) “just a grateful guy”.

1980, of course, was one of those 1-in-20 years when Jupiter 'catches (back) up' to Saturn to form a Jupiter-Saturn conjunction (this one has always interested the American astrologers as it seems to symbolize the death of their president). And, once again, in Chapman's chart, we can see that this conjunction 'stimulated' his 4th quadrant (near the cusp of his 11th house, trine natal Venus, to be exact). Whether it is a bigger player than transiting Pluto, however, is not an easy question to answer.

A much easier question to answer, however, is: did transiting Chiron play a significant role in the 'stirring up' of Chapman's 12th house natal Saturn in Scorpio? Answer: yes, although Chiron is natally placed in a “jealous” 3rd house, by the time of the murder, it had rolled up to an opposition to his “envious” Saturn (unhappily, Chapman has a natal Saturn-Sun opposition to boot). The reason that this question is much easier to answer is that Lennon's chart was being Chiron-buffetted too. Agreed, it is reasonable to suggest that FA is “jealous” of Lennon... after all, I attacked his “bad hypocrisy breast” in our “Aries on the Ascendant” essay. I leave it to you, dear reader, to decide whether I am (or am not) “just a grateful guy”.
Back in our chapter on the Pisces ascendant, we acknowledged Liz Greene's suggestion that the Piscean 'type', when fed up with the difficulties that are part and parcel of '12'-ish boundary-less-ness, may succumb to 'turntyping' i.e. s/he becomes, say, an 'unconvincing Gemini'. Given that birth isn't 'easy' even at the best of times, something similar could be said about the Scorpio 'type' i.e. the difficulties that are part and parcel of '8'-ish deathly (re)-birth could a/cause the Scorpio riser-faller to become, say, an 'unconvincing Libra' or an 'unconvincing Aquarius'.

But, what are we to say about the watery-ascendant 'type' who has a Sun in Libra? Can we really say that Margaret-the-thinker-who-can't-stand-feeling (… as Meryl protrayed it in "The Iron Lady", “be careful of what you think...”) qualifies as a 'turntype'? For (phylogenetic) FA, the answer is “no”. Longstanding readers of FA will already know that we prefer to bypass 'typology' disputes and move straight along to 'regression-progression' disputes. Will the Scorpio ascendant individual try to relieve his/her 'death-re-birth unease' via regression or progressive development? If we didn't know anything about the baroness prior to looking at her horoscope, we might have, upon noticing the location of natal Venus and Jupiter, suggested that she was an anti-clockwise developer...

The trouble is, of course, that just about everyone knows Margaret Thatcher as (yet) another national leader who was resolutely disinterested in motivation and dismissive of 'horizontals' i.e. her Scorpio ascendant was 'persona non grata'. The placement of Saturn on the ascendant speaks of exaggerated (compensated) unease not only towards death-rebirth but also exaggerated unease towards 'sporting' one-on-one personal confrontation. Even prior to looking at the 'pull (back) up' effect of Sun in Libra, there is already a 'force' that wishes to be 'clear' of the horizontal axis 'on' the horizontal axis... her marriage to Dennis is unlikely to have found its sense of 'felt' equality and 'intuitive' compromise. One of the telling episodes in the recent film shows Dennis, getting fed up with Margaret's animus-at-full-tilt, insisting that...
she hasn't even begun to differentiate her '6 duty' from her '10 ambition'... it is as if, after regressing to the Sun in Libra in the 11th house, she 'dismissed' this Sun – after all, it is haunted by Chiron's wound across the horoscopic diameter – and continued on descending to her Virgo M.C. whereon she could conflate the duty-conscious 6th & the ambition-conscious 10th archetypes (along with the 'dynamic' expressions of the 12th and 4th archetypes i.e. Neptune and Moon) and delude herself that, out of all the 40,000,000 Britons, she was the best qualified to lead them.

By this, we are not saying that she is the least qualified of the 40,000,000... no doubt there are anima-possessed men that would have made a much bigger mess of things than Margaret. That's the whole point of politics!!... we don't have a 'control Britain' against which we can measure 'experimental Britain' and, so, one wo/man's opinion about Margaret's qualification is as good as the next wo/man's opinion. The only 'better' opinion that the Freudastrologer can include is that the individual with natal Saturn on the ascendant is destined to experience some kind of karmic 'event' at every Saturn return i.e. Margaret's 2nd Saturn return would have 'materialized' a 'debt' around the issue of 'horizontals' and 'transformation of emotion'. This means that trying to hold onto 'vertical authority' will have every chance of 'blocking' the path to understanding this 'debt', leading, thereby, to unnecessary suffering both for the individual and whateve part of the 'world' s/he is 'responsible' for.

As Liz Greene reminds us (more about Liz on the next page), if the individual falls short of understanding the meaning of his/her Saturn return, s/he finds that the subsequent aspects of Saturn 'back' to itself (e.g. a square 7yrs later, the opposition 14yrs later) have their way of emphasising personal karma in increasingly difficult ways i.e. difficulty increases in respect of (i) the karmic 'events' and (ii) (given that, now, more houses and, possibly, planets are involved) the interpretation of difficult events. For example, 7yrs after Margaret's 2nd Saturn return (age 66yrs), Saturn had crossed her Capricorn cusp-ed 3rd house... the ruler of this cusp being Saturn itself means that this transit would have qualified as a kind of 'mini-Saturn return' telling her that her 'thinking for herself' needed 'work'. 'Thinking for oneself', of course, is a very different beast to 'thinking for Britons'.

In a way, then, Meryl-Margaret was 'correct' to complain about her doctors asking how she feels rather than how she thinks... it doesn't matter that Margaret is pigeon-hole-able as a 'thinker' (via, say, a Myers-Briggs typological test), it is more important to realize that her thinking is a sick king (queen?) in need of a 'primary' redemption from 'healthy' thinking (yes, OK, later on, she needs to be secondarily redeemed by her dumpling feeling, but first things first).

A healthy thinking function is one that can 'Godel' its way to realizing that, ultimately, 'intellectual truth' is always incomplete and generative of its opposite. The generation of thesis-antithesis doesn't provide the '3rd' that could generate the synthesis (Jung dubbed it, “tertium non datur”). Indeed, 'thinking about thinking' is a 'narcissistic short circuit' that needs to be 'broken' (well, dissolved, actually) by a '4th'... feeling. This means that the thinker needs to 'use' the opposite idea (e.g. “I am not the best qualified of the 40,000,000”) to open the way for feeling to dissolve the short circuit. This doesn't begin with 'feeling about feeling' (or even by 'thinking about feeling') but by 'thinking about emotion'. The path to the I.C. is now paved.
Astrology, as discussed in our mini-essay on Linda Goodman, presents as a '(psycho)-analytical', 'dividing', 'classifying' (i.e. 'airy') phenomenon (noumenon!!) yet, in order to 'get' astrology, the 'thinking' individual also needs to have developed his/her auxiliary 'intuitive' side... this is the 'bridge' with which the individual 'sees' the 'uncanny-ness' of astrology. Without an 'expansive intuition', the 'thinker' tends to use his/her 'sword' to cut astrology right out of his/her universe-view. Although I had suggested that Linda was 'fiery' and Liz 'airy', I neglected to mention there that they both had/have strong 'auxiliaries'. What about the 'opposite function'?...

The most interesting thing about Liz' horoscope from the Freudastrological perspective is that she shares Freud's ascending sign yet she trained as a Jungian. For this reason (i.e. Jung was the 'typologist'), the most interesting thing that Liz is likely to identify in her own chart is the lack of water 'beyond' the ascendant. Then again, Freud's chart isn't very watery 'beyond' the ascendant either. Although Liz' natal Sun isn't in the 7th house (unlike Freud), it is in an earthy sign (like Freud) in an earthy house. Both Freud and Liz have natal Uranus located in their 7th houses and they both have Mars in Libra in the 11th house. They both have prominent '10-5 interactions' i.e. Saturn/M.C. Leo/Sun. In other words, the horoscopic 'reasons' for Liz 'siding' with Jung aren't obvious until one notices the synastric contact between Jung's Sun in Leo and Liz' Saturn in Leo. But, what about the ascendant?...

In the introductory section, we suggested that a Scorpion ascendant could be 'good' insofar as there is chance of getting Scorpio 'over and done with' before being thrown into '2-3-4-5-6' ego developmental challenges. From the Freudastrological perspective, the premier reason that Liz (even more than Freud) was able to position herself on the analyst (rather than the analysand) side of the psychoanalytical ledger is traceable to Liz' (1st house amplified) Moon in Sagittarius i.e. over those critical 1st 14yrs of life, the 'natural ruler' of the centre of the lower hemisphere 'filled out' the lower hemisphere by progression i.e. it was an archetypal influence that that would
have helped Liz 'get-Scorpio-over-and-done-with'. Further, at around that time that she was 'confused' by Isobel Hickey (see “The Astrology of Fate”), Liz' progressed lunation cycle was now running around into the 4th quadrant i.e. it would have been a 'guide' as she was coming to terms with the transit of her 'chart ruler', Pluto (also transiting her 4th quadrant).

Of course, the only way that we could confirm the importance of Liz' Moon placement would be to find someone with more or less the same chart except for the Moon placement (say, born 3 or 4 days prior to her birthday) and compare lives in the manner of those who study identical twins who have been separated from birth (and, even here, we come up against the incommensurables of karmic inheritance). One thing I can confirm at the 1st person anecdotal level is that, 15yrs after reading Linda Goodman's 'uncanny' descriptions, I was advised to read Liz' books by a lady with Scorpio on the ascendant and Sun in Sagittarius in the 1st house...

Whatever the case for any 'ultra-objectivity', the fact that Liz' Scorpio on the ascendant (a '1-8 fire-water interaction') 'gives way' to the Sagittarius Moon (a '9-4 fire-water interaction') is sure to award her a more rounded view of fire-water than your 'average' (yeah, I know, whatever 'average' is) Scorpio ascendant-er. Although it is less prominent than the interactions noted above, we fire-water also crops up in the '5-12 interaction' as shown in the Saturn in Leo sextile Neptune in Libra in the 10th house. Therefore, Liz' (airy)-intuition has some 'contact' to feeling... even if, in the zodiac-horoscope-phase-shifted sense, Liz' chart is not very watery.

By the time of Liz' 2nd progressed new Moon (1996), Liz had finally returned to Freud in a substantial way with her chapter on “The Psychoanalytic Neptune” in her “Neptune: the Quest for Redemption”. I don't know about you, dear reader, but its timing was good for me... I was in the midst of my own psychoanalysis at the time i.e. I was starting to see that Jung's approach was not without value but, most of the time, it is better to work with parental-images-remembered-in-an-analysis and leave behind (at least for a while) fluffy Jungian abstractions such as “shadow”, “anima” and “animus”. Liz' book about Uranus (a transcript of a seminar), because it didn't have a chapter named “The Psychoanalytic Uranus (the narcissistic neuroses)”, isn't quite in the same league as her books on Neptune, Saturn, Pluto, Luminaries.... but it is still worth reading. Maybe, one day, Liz will write a Freudian 'supplement'?

Earlier in this mini-essay, we were noticing the similarities between Freud's and Liz' horoscopes. Perhaps the main difference is the vertical axis... Freud had Aquarius on the I.C., Liz has Pisces. This means that the ruler of Liz' I.C. was the subject of her 1996 book. In her natal chart, Neptune's placement in the 10th house tells us that there could be some 'confusion' around which parent symbolizes which end of the vertical axis... and, indeed, this has turned out to be a major controversy in 'Greene-ian' psychological astrology. Liz tells us that her inductive experience is the rock on which she stands (both Freud and Jung had done the same). For what it is worth (i.e. our inductive sample is but a small fraction of Liz'), we have no 'cause' to alter Liz' view that father images accord with the symbolism of the I.C. and the 4th house but, as longstanding readers know, we see outlines of a mother's embrace there too... the 4th house as the 'home' (yuk, yuk) of Freud's “family romance”. What bottomless sea of feeling (and emotion) lies underneath Liz' inductive rock?
I have to admit being a little confused when, at last year's Oscar ceremony, the makers of “The Artist” dedicated their victory to Billy Wilder... no doubt about it, Billy was great but how could they pass over the most obvious dedicatee, Charlie Chaplin? Indeed, even when film embraced the “talkies” (i.e. in the 1930's), Charlie was still commanding centre stage with silent classics such as “Modern Times”. Is it just another Hollywood case of “no-one knows anything”?

In his biopic of Charlie Chaplin, biopic-o-philic Richard Attenborough (i.e. “Gandhi”, “Young Winston”) took the narrative in astrological directions when he had Charlie (Robert Downey Jr.) making note of the fact that he was born within a few days of Hitler and, therefore, he 'knew' Hitler. In our earlier essay on Charles Manson, we had compared Manson's chart 'against' Hitler's because they shared a taste for nastiness... to be 'fair', therefore, we need, in this essay, to compare Charlie Chaplin's chart 'against' Hitler's precisely because they didn't share the same taste for nastiness (... although it should be said that Charlie had a reputation for being something of a tyrant when directing his films... he would even do more takes than David Fincher!!)

The main horoscopic differences between Chaplin and Hitler are (i) Charlie had a Scorpio ascendant (Hitler, Libra) and (ii) Charlie's natal Moon in Scorpio is, arguably, less besieged than was Hitler's (. it wasn't opposite Chiron)... but, no less arguably, it was besieged by a square to Saturn. Much of the difference between the two could come down Charlie being older than Hitler when their (respective) Moons progressed over their (respective) I.C.s... Charlie's extra 60 odd transits of the Moon over his I.C. before the progression may have offered more 'emotional context' when the progression began and, so, he may have been able to 'see' the M.C.

The I.C. is, in our view, the most important angle of a horoscope (in 2014, we will argue this further). When we look at Chaplin's chart against Hitler's, we realize that they have the same placement of their I.C. 'ruler' (i.e. in the 'unconscious' 12th
house). In other words they both had a need to deal with 'crazy Uranian ancestors' whenever the 'family soup' was entered. When Charlie was 6-7yrs old it was clear to him that his ancestry was crazy because it was being so 'directly' transmitted by his asylum-bound mother and his early-death-from-alcohol father. Charlie's 'answer' to all this would be to do the obvious thing... develop his 'talent' for making 'art' from comic situations. (Hitler, of course, was not artistically talented). This 'art' was built up out of his facility with his 'mask' i.e. his dead-pan facial expression was the key that raised his work above that of the other Keystone pratfallers (... Buster Keaton being, of course, Chaplin's equal in the dead-pan facial comedy stakes). To be sure, just as any other Scorpio ascendant individual, Charlie had to handle repeated (and uncomfortable) death-(re)-births in his 'mask' but his natal Moon positioned in the 1st house would have imbued his mask with a certain 'familiarity' and 'comfort'.

Now, of course, the other household-name Scorpio-ascendant individual who is featured in this website, Sigmund Freud, was not a comedic genius but those who know even a bare minimum about him will know that he was highly interested in the psycho-dynamia of jokes i.e. laughter was the 'result' of an unexpected 'release' of a “repression” (... these days, Freud's view tends to be 'translated' to “re-connection of a dissociation”; but, at least when it comes to making fun of “repressive tyrants”, Freud's pre-translated view is the most 'resonant'). In other words, in the same vein as John Cleese, Charlie would 'pick on' the easiest of comedic targets... the fact that tyrants take their 'wisdom' so seriously and, then, pit themselves so absurdly against the inevitable chaos that spills from their repressive cluelessness means that, despite the misery that they cause, they are still 'funny'. (How long did it take Sacha Baron Cohen to capitalize on Gadaffi's downfall?)

Meanwhile, we mustn't dismiss the overriding biographical fact that Charlie was very much more 'talented' than Hitler i.e. it was very much easier for Charlie to express his dismay about the state of the world in a way that the world would listen to without needing to regress to a political podium. Even if we do spot a regressive element in Charlie's life that was 'happy' about becoming some sort of Leo-M.C.-ed 'authority', his audience wasn't forced to obey Charlie's 'happiness', via a “modern times Gestapo”, after they left the movie-theatre.

All this leads to the question that we didn't fully confront when we discussed our first 'comic', John Cleese... whom or what is the best 'target' for satiric ridicule, the dictator or the collective that puts him there? In this, I am reminded of the “War on Drugs” (... err, you know, that abstract war that began a few decades before the “War on Terror”) i.e. the vice squads soon found that they were wasting their time getting caught up in catching the users and the 'little' pushers... by the 1960's it was clear that they had to go for the 'kingpins' (see, for example, based on fact movie-of-the-year William Friedkin's “The French Connection”). But, then, after catching a few of the 'kingpins', they found that there was an endless supply of 'sub-kingpins' to take their place. Going round in circles and back to the 'little' users.

In a way, Charlie's "little tramp" was the 20thC's most universal character. In the century of unprecedented 'unnecessary suffering', what else could the 'little guys' and 'little gals' of the world do but laugh at themselves and their situation. Who will get the nod for universal comic genius of the 21stC?