

STRAIGHT LINES OF THE GALAXY – introduction

RIGHT THIS MINUTE, IN A GALAXY NEAR-NEAR-BY

The history of organized religion is a sad tale of stunted imagination. Its most cited example is probably the Catholic Church's 'trial' of Galileo Galilei in reaction to the publication of his book, "A Dialogue of the Great World Systems" (1632), that was meant to give Copernicus' theory an airing. All that Pope Urban VIII needed to imagine was that the Sun could be a better symbol for God than the Earth and, therefore, it would make sense for the lesser symbol to orbit the greater. A more recent example is Pope John Paul II's statement that Freud's views were wrong. All that JPII needed to imagine-('connect') was that authoritarian statements, especially incorrect ones, increase the 'force' of the unconscious... the location from where the sexual instincts emerge. No sophisticated intuition is needed to 'connect' JPII's put-out-fire-with-gasoline attitude to what would emerge 30 years later.

Roll back 8 centuries and we come to Pope Lucius III's decision to establish the (foundation of) the Inquisition that, with the ugliest instruments of torture, aimed to discourage all alternative visions. Again, no imaginative sophistication is required to view the Gnostic-(Cathar) Demiurge as a Creator of sub-universal phenomena such as galaxies & solar systems that began to coalesce a billion years after the Big Bang. It is probable that the Milky Way, our galaxy, was the first galaxy to form and, if the individual can imagine a Demiurge, s/he would have no trouble imagining its stars as 'CNS neurones' i.e. there are approximately the same number of stars in the Milky Way, 100+ billion, as there are neurones in the brain of Homo sapiens. The Demiurge is not necessarily "evil" but, unlike God, its (his?) "consciousness" lacks 'connection' to the "integrative" bigger picture that allows an understanding of Sacred Marriage, even if, through the Milky Way's "central" black hole, God was 'pointing' to one.

If an imaginer imagines on, s/he would have no trouble seeing God 'pointing' to His Demiurge's lack of big-picture-consciousness via the "precession of equinoxes" i.e. the wobble of the Earth sees the Sun's springtime/autumnal equinoxes "regress" clockwise through the constellations, the very opposite of Christ's anti-clockwise Sun-Moon inter-cycle that is used to calculate Easter. The current Pope Francis may, of course, be very able to imagine all this... even if, at Catch-22-first, he would need to have the imagination to realize the True value of the imagination.

This 'value Catch 22' is amplified by the fact that imagination seems secondary to thinking by dint of the fact that we (and the Demiurge) require our (its) thinking function to, first, differentiate thinking from intuition i.e. thinking differentiates (to clarify), imagination connects (to combine). To use a geometric metaphor, we can say that, whereas thinking sees an A distinct from B, intuition/imagination focuses on the line that runs from A to B (thus relegating A and B to mere ends of a line) i.e. A & B are parts of something greater. To use a micro-physics metaphor, thinking pays more attention to the particle(s) and intuition pays more attention to the wave.

The geometric metaphor is helpful because it leads us to (... errr) 'think' more about lines e.g. the lines of the observable universe are curved (even the space within we might draw a line is curved) and the lines of the mind's-eye universe are straight. In this way, we realize that the zodiac is a 'connection' between the observable & the mind's-eye universes i.e. a full curve (a circle) divided by 6 lines (diameters). Just as

helpful is the fact that lines can be used to clarify the difference between developing imagination & stunted imagination i.e. a developing imagination makes connections in accordance with an organizing centre and the stunted (anything-means-anything) imagination makes random connections, like so...

... in this way, we realize that centred diagrams (mandalas) such as the zodiac are useful 'canvases' for the development of the imagination... and, later on, for the development of thinking-feeling-sensation (i.e. useful 'canvases' for “epistemology”).

Having introduced the astronomical organizing centres of our galaxy and solar system, we can now turn to the centre of the universe. If we apply the “no-boundary hypersphere”, we intuit it to be in a 'transcendent', mind's eye location. As indicated in the prior paragraph, the phenomenon that is easiest to imagine as the 'line' from our universe's centre to our Sun (making something greater out of both) is the black hole at the Milky Way's centre. A black hole is a 'mirror' of the universe i.e. “a black hole in reverse”. The Freudastrologer aligns this 'mirror' with (what we call) the '8th archetype' or, for short, '8' e.g. Scorpio, Pluto. When activated, it has something to do with the inadequacy of our 'inner Demiurge', something that we might have served us OK enough in the first half of life but, in life's second half, we need to relegate it in favour of a 'deeper' centre than that indicated by the Sun...

This is also what Jung would claim for astrological Ages. The Age's “morning” is meant for the development of the Sun-h/Hero (e.g. Christ, Buddha) but the Age's “afternoon” is meant for a 'relativization' of the Sun-h/Hero. And, just as individuals have midlife crises that bring up this 'relativization' question, so do Ages. The Age of Pisces' “midlife crisis”, about 1000AD, was negotiated with the same, unimaginative, stiffening attitude that we can see in so many post-2000AD individual 'midlifers'.

Jung would have said that astrologers who use the tropical, Sun-centred zodiac aren't so much “saved” from the Demiurge by Christ as “saved” by the Solar-h/Hero archetype i.e. a 'Jedi astrologer' could be just as fine an astrologer as a Christian (or Buddhist) astrologer. Indeed, given the sad history of the 2nd millennium, it might be fair to say that, by and large, astrologers are better off becoming Jedi knights than being Christians and/or Buddhists... at least they could make an assessment of their (respective) 'inner Anakin(s)' without losing touch with their mortal humanity.

OK, so what about the astrologer becoming an athiest like Freud? Our answer: because a human individual would have to become God to (g)Know that there is no God, we can't encourage this, even if it might be necessary for a while. Synchronicity would, in any case, probably have it that an athiest astrologer's clients were athiests too in a way that would (“may the”) “force” him/her to keep looking at the 'spirit vs. religion' issue. After all, this is what happened to Freud i.e. “Moses & Monotheism”. What a shame that Freud never commented on non-theistic Buddhism as he laid out the key challenges for the would-be psychoanalyst. OK, so what about(?)...

THE FREUDAstroLOGER'S 'PERI-CENTRAL' TASK

While we agree with a widely held astrological view that some birthcharts may be “easier to live” than other birthcharts, there is no birthchart configuration that would prevent anyone from being a Freudastrologer. If, dear reader, your birthchart reveals similarities to Freud's, to be sure, interpreting charts along Freudastrological lines should be “easier” for you, but a birthchart doesn't reveal anything about the “consciousness” that is interpreting it. There were, no doubt, others born in Central Europe in the afternoon of the 6/5/1856 who had never thought about the possibility of an added “unconscious” mind to the “conscious” mind that we (think we) know.

Let's exercise our imagination and consider Freud coming to a Freudastrologer for advice as to whether (or not) he might pursue a career as a psychotherapist...

... to his request, a Freudastrologer would reply that his/her 'central' task is less about career plans and more about life's fulfilment i.e. s/he points to, his (i) natal Sun sign/house placement, and (ii) how he might develop 'into' the natal Sun via an anti-clockwise development from his ascendant to his descendant and Sun (note that Freud's natal Sun is on his descendant) as symbolized by (iia) the daily cycle of the ascendant, (iib) the monthly cycle of the Moon & (iic) the yearly cycle of the Sun supported by Venus and Mercury. ('Support' coming from Mars and Jupiter can be questioned insofar as the former often fights for itself more than for the Sun; and the latter often loses interest in mundane phenomena such as “building an ego”).

The trouble with such pointing is that it will have a touch of authority about it and this leads to the Freudastrologer's additional (let's say, 'peri-central') task i.e. to analyse not only the analysand's but also the analyst's “superego” and the psychical vectors that are capable of stirring the “superego” up e.g. the “id”, the “ego ideal”.

This peri-central task requires us to consider the pre-ascendant, “gestational” 4th quadrant. Indeed, we begin with the M.C. to find out if there are indicators of over-identity with the mother. Fortunately, for Freud, we find Sunny Leo on his M.C. and

an 'empty' 10th house... but the idea of the 'empty' house always begs the question: is it as 'empty' as it first appears? Answer: no, just as “consciousness” is not indicated in a birthchart, neither is the size of the “unconscious”... a natal planet only turns on the light in the house that it occupies, it doesn't determine the house's contents. And, so, with the Sunny Lion on the M.C., we can only say that Freud has the chance to see how important the matriachal aspects are. He may not have been able to see that matriarchal authority, no matter how Sunny it may be, still has its 'use-by' date.

Yet, the fact that Freud did eventually realize that authority is severely limited – his realization that Charcot's instructions to hypnotized clients do not bring about lasting cures – means that he was able to see his M.C. in the right light. If he had one or more of the “difficult” planets in his 10th house – Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, Pluto, Chiron – it would have been more “difficult” for him to realize the problem inherent in authority. Yet again, if Freud did have a “difficult”-looking 10th house, the FA-er wouldn't discourage him from the pursuit of psychoanalysis... s/he would simply say something like, “overcoming difficulties can be a part of the road to fulfilment”.

Although completing a survey of Freud's authority complex would require the FA-er to consider his Capricorn (straddling the cusp of his 3rd house) and his Saturn (in his 8th house), we prefer to stick with the 'central' '(ii)' theme (see prior page) and move stepwisely and anti-clockwisely to the “gestational” aspect of his anti-authority complex, the 11th house. Because we find that this house is 'lit up' by dubious Mars, we could worry that this 'cancels out' his “easy” 10th house. But, again, all the FA-er would need to do here is 'warn' Freud about the masculine aspect of (what he would eventually call) the “ego ideal” and allow his practical down-to-Earth Sun in Taurus do the rest... provided, of course, that Freud had developed-around to it. Overall, we put down a large part of Freud's one-sided '1 fight' for atheistic science down to this '1-11-7 interaction' (we will get to 'interaction-ology' presently) and, because science looks to the “brave new world” rather than the revenants of the “fading old world”, his Freudastrologer could brush past the interpretation of his 12th house... even if, as noted above, no 'empty' house is ever quite as 'empty' as it appears.

Having arrived at the ascendant, we arrive at the point where the FA-er might consider presenting the following 'expanded' “squaring the circle” (i.e. the 'straight lines' of the inner mind's eye connecting the outer observable 'curved universe'; see the opening section) zodiac-mandala variant to the client...

THE FREUDAstroLOGER'S 'CENTRAL' TASK

... the dashed lines at the centre of the circle are the 3 basic crosses (crosses are variations on squares, meaning that the horoscopic angles are another expression of “squaring the circle”) that delineate the zodiac; the outer square describes the myth that corresponds to the hemisphere (e.g. the creation myth is 'left hemispheric' from Capricorn to Gemini inclusive); the inner square indicates the 'overlap' of the myths (e.g. although Aries is located at the 'centre' of the creation myth, it also corresponds to the 'beginning' of the hero myth). In relation to Freud, the Freudastrologer could point out to him that his Scorpio ascendant is his 'creative centre' for the 'beginning' of his 'heroic' development. And, just as Mars needs to fight for the Sun rather than for itself, so the ascendant needs to imagine a course for the Sunny house, the 5th (the Sun is its “natural ruler”), and the houses that follow on, the 6th & 7th.

The curious thing about the Scorpio ascendant is that it “intensifies” the shift from the collective-orientated 4th quadrant to the individual-orientated 1st quadrant but, as the individual hero drops to his/her developmental 'centre' (where s/he is now in position to begin his/her transformation), s/he re-enters collective orientation by stint of Capricorn-Aquarius-Pisces locating itself over his/her (as Howard Sasportas says it) “me in here” I.C.. Indeed, Freud's I.C.-zone is further '(re)-collectivized' via the planetary additions of Chiron in the 3rd house in Aquarius and Neptune (Jupiter) at the end of the 4th house in Pisces. This curiosity is expressed by Freud in the way that he could embrace Oedipus mythology as something that everyone who lived in ancient times, modern times and/or future times would do very well to heed while, at the same time, he would reject Jung's/Plato's common sense idea of a form-without-content “collective unconscious” that persists timelessly as a substructure to allow all myths, including the Oedipal myth, to appear similar in all individuals in all epochs.

We need to remember that this anti-clockwise development is both sequential and layered e.g. Freud's 11th house 'anti-authority thinking' would be 'feeding' down to his 3rd house whether Chiron in Aquarius was there or not, meaning that his Mars in Libra would have played its part his rejection of the collective unconscious. Note that Freud had no problem with a collective supraconscious (i.e. the “ego ideal” that the “superego” measures the “ego” by). The difference between the 11th house's and the 3rd house's approach to thinking is that the 11th house will object to authority “on principle” whereas the 3rd house sees authority as something to be negotiated. This is why a psychoanalytic treatment could be said to commence in the 3rd house. With his I.C. ruler, Uranus, placed in his 7th house (the house wherein the nature of authority shifts from being negotiated to being internalized, shared and understood) conjunct his Sun, Freud's FA-er would have 'reason' to be positive about any ambition he had to become a psychoanalyst (even if, at that time, there were none).

If the analysand's psychosomatic symptoms resolve as a part of development through his/her 6th house, we could say that his/her therapy is coming to an end i.e. s/he is ready for a fulfilling marriage in his/her 7th house. Freud's biographers tell us that his self-analysis took place in 1897... by then, of course, he had already married. This means that it was likely that Freud's marriage had a significant “unconscious” fraction but, of course, it's hard to imagine the first psychoanalyst knowing that s/he needed to have a “training analysis” that, amongst other things, would have brought about a “conscious” marriage (that reflected his/her 7th & 8th houses) rather than an “unconscious” marriage (that reflected his/her 3rd & 4th houses). Today, of course,

would-be analysts undergo their own analyses so that they don't 'infect' their clients with their own (respective) immaturities. Would-be analysts don't necessarily need to have achieved a successful 'outer marriage' but they do need to achieve a measure of success with their (respective) 'inner marriages'. Freudastrologically, this means a retrieval of >50% of the “projected” qualities of the sign on the descendant. So...

Let's exercise our imagination again in a more reflective direction and examine our own natal chart...

... as you can see from the sign on our descendant, we self-measure our 'inner marriage' through a Sagittarian lens. Our opening section, “Right this Minute, in a Galaxy Near-near-by” would be an example of our retrieval (if not more than, then almost) 50%. Whatever fancy the spouse holds in regards to a 'retrieval fraction' of the sign on his/her descendant, it will be 'tested' as transiting planets roll forward to transit the 8th house. For example, with Sagittarius' ruler, Jupiter, recently transiting our descendant, on 30/10/2019, we will need to wait until Jupiter transits to our natal Sun in the 9th house before we could confirm a self-measure. In that time, of course (2-3yrs), we can make additional measures of our Archer descendant by examining the transits of the Moon, Sun, Venus & Mercury (and, maybe, Mars & Saturn).

We have long noted that, like Freud, we have natal Mars in the 11th house, and, so, we need to remain thoughtful about our anti-authoritarian tendencies. Again, the reader could refer to our “Right this Minute...” opening. At least, as we 'f/Fall' down to our 3rd house – where, as noted above, rebellion morphs into negotiation – we find Mars 'feeding' a more conciliatory Jupiter. The cycle, like the road, goes on forever.

Indeed, over the next 8 years or so – Jupiter rolling around to its 2nd 'return' – we intend to round out this 'rung' by incorporating a study of how the 12 archetypes express themselves when they 'overlap/entangle'. We call this, 'interaction-ology'...

THE FREUDAstroLOGER'S 'POST-CENTRAL' (contemporary!) TASK

1. INTERACTIONOLOGY: introduction

Astrologers are 'scientific' insofar as they “reduce” complex phenomena down to their “elements”. Astrologers are also 'artistic' insofar as they “(re)-combine” the “elements” and look for the meaning and purpose of the recombination i.e. they are also “teleologists”. Although astrologers usually agree on the nature of the elements, they tend to disagree upon the meaning and purpose of the recombinations. Indeed, your local Jungastrologer would celebrate such a lack of consensus because it points to the journey into what Jung called “individuation”. The Freudastrologer, however, as a consequence of his/her interest in “collectivation” (see our “Conclusion: Freud's Missing Psychodynamic” in “Outline of Freudastrology” on the “basics” web-page), will look for a certain degree of “teleological/individuational” consensus.

Therefore, before we get too encensed with “individuation”, let's go back to the top of the prior paragraph and make additional comments on the astrologer's (if not 'scientific', then) “reductive” tendencies that tend toward consensus...

That the zodiac-mandala is a circle divided into 12 ($\times 30^\circ = 360^\circ$) sectors, points to the possibility of there being 12 archetypes. Freudastrology takes the view that 12 is, at least, the minimum number of archetypes. This means that we need to propose a term for the 4 astrological elements (i.e. fire-earth-air-water) and 3 quadruplicities (i.e. cardinal-fixed-mutable). Accordingly, we propose the term, 'proto-archetype'.

And, whatever that case, Freudastrology takes an additional step and takes the archetypes as capable of expressing themselves as Platonic, discovered-not-invented numbers e.g. the 1st sign, Aries, is the (zodiac) 'sign expression' of the archetype that the Freudastrologer calls '1'; the 2nd sign, Taurus, is the 'sign expression' that we call '2'; the 3rd sign, Gemini, is the 'sign expression' of '3' etc..

Whatever interim conclusion one might reach with respect to the number and grouping of archetypes, astrologers identify 4 'expressions' of the (proto)-archetype; planet-house-sign-aspect. Freudastrology takes the view these 4 'expressions' can be aligned with the 4 (proto)-archetypes i.e. fire/planet (the Sun is 'fiery' on its surface; the planets are hot in their respective cores), earth/house (the astrological houses are on Earth), air/sign (the zodiac is up in space), water/aspect (the angle that is formed between two archetypal interactions are either 'flowing' together or 'flowing' apart).

And, when this is digested, we take the second additional step of describing the 'basic interactions' i.e. with any archetype being able to interact with any archetype, it is clear that, if we only consider one interaction at a time, there are $(12 + 11 + 10 + 9 + 8 + 7 + 6 + 5 + 4 + 3 + 2 + 1 =) 78$ 'basic interactions'. Of course, astrologers mostly think-imagine in terms of 'multiple interactions' e.g. Saturn transiting an ascendant in Scorpio and forming an opposition to a Sun in Taurus (e.g. Freud in 1925) would be dubbed a '10-1-8-1//2-5-2-7 interaction'. The number of 'multiple interactions' is so high ($12 \times ++$) that a library would be filled trying to discuss them all (let alone the individualizing effects of destiny, chance, karma etc.). We can analogize this problem with the “particle zoo” that emerged in micro-scale physics, the “butterfly effect” of medium-scale physics and, as noted earlier, the matching of the number of stars in our galaxy to the number of 'CNS neurones' that combine to become “conscious” of the complexities embedded in the abovementioned three physical 'scales'.

With these “reductive” points made, we are now ready to return to our aim to reach a possible consensus in the “teleological/individual”, recombinative sphere...

In discussing only the 78 'basic interactions', we propose that we are taking the worthwhile middle path, hoping to strike a '7 Libran' balance. Rather than begin at '1-1' (e.g. Aries on the ascendant) and wind up at '12-12' (Neptune in Pisces), we will look at interactions that are 'topical' e.g. in January of 2020, transiting Saturn forms a conjunction to transiting Pluto (in Capricorn) and, so, we will discuss '8-10-(10)' in January 2020. Although Saturn-conjunct Pluto isn't exactly the same as, say, Saturn in Scorpio (e.g 2014), they are, at least, more similar than they are dissimilar.

While paying attention to this 'similarity-vs.-dissimilarity' issue, we also point out that, even when our focus narrows to a single planetary archetypal interaction, we encounter dissimilarity via the various "aspects" (conjunction = 0°; square = 45°; opposition = 90° etc.) over their 'inter-cycle'. For example, astrologers' adjectival use of "hard" & "soft". Nonetheless, 'inter-cycles' often maintain a 'thematic' similarity through the cycle and we often see a 'knock on' effect e.g. WWI 'dug itself in' during the Saturn-Pluto conjunction of 1915 and, then, the "last battle of WWI", WWII, 'dug itself in' during the waning square of Saturn-Pluto of 1939/1940.

We also pay attention to the degree of our topical interaction (e.g. Saturn-Pluto conjuncts at 23° of Capricorn) because the individual who has a natal planet close to this degree will be more drawn into the fray than another with, say, no natal planets in Capricorn and nothing much near the 23° ($\pm 23+15=8^\circ$) mark of any other sign(s). (it is fair, here, to admit that this is currently very relevant to this author as my natal chart reveals Venus in Capricorn at 23° square Jupiter in Libra at 23°). In respect of "orbs", FA sits in agreement with the larger majority of astrologers i.e. $<1^\circ$ = easy to register; within the 1° to 2° range = subtle; $>2^\circ$ = (often) more difficult to register.

No less important is the level of "consciousness" that the individual (collective) has achieved prior to a transit. There are two points to be made in relation to this...

The first, more general, point is the developmental issue that dominates depth psychological discourse i.e. the flexibility and strength (not hugeness) of the ego. We have discussed this at some length in "Outline of Freudastrology" (see FA's "basics" webpage). The more the individual can 'round out' his/her ego, the more options s/he has when under the pump of an interaction in the current patterns in the sky.

The second, specifically astrological, point is whether or not a particular birth-chart is 'primed' for a particular transit. This second point is itself dyadic...

To one side, the astrologer looks to the "rulers" of the signs that are significant contributors to the individual's sense of self-ego (i.e. the ascendant-self and the Sun-ego) because, whenever these "rulers" transit (and/or progress) to natal placements, the individual will be 'primed' to their personal significance; we use the example of English author, Graham Greene, in our opening essay, the '10-8 interaction', because his ascendant-(chart) ruler is '8 Pluto' and, being so, he would have been sensitive to any Pluto transit to any other planet...

To the other side, the astrologer looks to whether the individual might have the 'current sky' interaction in his/her natal placements (Graham Greene doesn't have a '10-8' interactions in his natal chart; but our second example does) because this also has a 'priming' effect; everyone else – those who aren't 'primed' – are more likely to reject the significance of the interaction. Now, before we go to '10-8', let's preview...

2. POST INTERACTION-LOGY: '7 re-balancing'

Longstanding readers will know that we always had a secret wish to be a movie director. I mean, who hasn't woken after a dream and said to him/herself, “hmmm..., wouldn't mind putting that one on the screen!” The next best thing for (at least, this) Freudastrologer(s) is to examine the charts of those who have had the talent and the wherewithal to do so. At first, we thought to re-review the household-name directors as representative of the 78 interactions... but, in the end, we thought that this was too lop-sided. Indeed, as a re-balancing 'remedy' for using no-quite-so-famous directors to exemplify the 'current' interaction of interest, we thought it smarter to re-view the household names with a sense of, as Jung would say, “wholeness”.

Because there will be 78 articles that will narrow focus to a single interaction, we have chosen 78 big name directors for our monthly 'remedy'. Although many of our readers will know most of the names on our list, many won't... and, so, we need to match them to their 'most psychological' films. Many will likely disagree with our ranking. We would too if we were to draw it up on another day... c'est la vie!

Because of the difficulty in comparing films from different decades, we break things up into decades. Directors' careers, of course, run across a number of decades so we list them in the decade in which their influence was peaking. A more relevant reason for providing this list is to admit that, despite our aim to consider horoscopes with a sense of individuating wholeness, we need to start somewhere and, along with most astrologers, we start with the ascendant and Sun because (i) the ascendant is a 'double up' symbol (not only does it symbolize birth-in-a-birthchart, it also speaks to the shift from the phylogenetic/collective-zodiac to the ontogenetic/individual house system) and (ii) the Sun is the 'drawer' of the tropical (= psychological) zodiac and it is the 'centre' of 'meaning' for the individual (in 'this life'). Half have fiery Suns...

DIRECTOR/prod*	Asc/☉	CLASSIC 'PSYCH' FILM	year	ch
pre-30's				
Charlie Chaplin	♍/♍	The Gold Rush/City Lights	1925	8
Buster Keaton	♈/♈	The General	1926	
Fritz Lang	♁/♁	M	1931	
30's				
Frank Capra	♈/♈	It Happened One Night	1934	11
*David O. Selznick	♎/♎	Gone With the Wind	1939	23
Jean Renoir	♎/♁	Le Grande Illusion	1937	25
Howard Hawks	?/♁	Bringing Up Baby	1938	
George Cukor	♈/♎	Philadelphia Story	1940	
George Stevens	?/♁	Swing Time	1936	
Ernst Lubitsch	♎/♎	Trouble in Paradise	1932	
James Whale		Bride of Frankenstein	1935	
Joseph von Sternberg		The Blue Angel	1930	
40's				
John Ford	?♁/♎	Grapes of Wrath/The Searchers	1940	7

DIRECTOR/prod*	Asc/⊙	CLASSIC 'PSYCH' FILM	year	ch
David Lean	?♁/♃	Great Expectations	1946	13
Michael Curtiz	♁/♁	Casablanca	1943	17
Orson Welles	♁/♃	Citizen Kane	1941	21
John Huston	?/♁	The Treasure of the Sierra Madre	1948	
William Wyler	♁/♁	The Best Years of Our Lives	1946	
*Walt Disney	♁/♃	Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs	1937	
Powell & Pressburger	?/♁	Black Narcissus	1947	
Marcel Carne	♁/♁	Les Enfants du Paradis	1945	
50's				
Alfred Hitchcock	♁/♁	Vertigo/Psycho	1958	2
Ingmar Bergman	♁/♁	The Seventh Seal	1957	5
Billy Wilder	?/♁	Sunset Blvd.	1950	12
Akira Kurosawa	♁/♃	The Seven Samurai	1954	15
Elia Kazan	?/♁	On the Waterfront	1954	
Donen/Gene Kelly	♁/♁	Singin' in the Rain	1952	
Vincente Minnelli	?/♃	An American in Paris	1951	
Yasujiro Ozu	?/♃	Tokyo Story	1953	
Joseph L. Mankiewicz	♃/♁	All About Eve	1950	
60's				
Stanley Kubrick	♁/♁	2001: a Space Odyssey	1968	1
Federico Fellini	♁/♁	8½	1963	10
Francois Truffaut	♁/♁	The 400 Blows	1959	20
Sergio Leone	♁/♁	Once Upon a Time in the West	1968	30
Mike Nichols	?/♁	The Graduate	1967	
Jean Luc Godard	♁/♃	Breathless	1960	
Arthur Penn	♁/♁	Bonnie and Clyde	1967	
Luis Bunuel	♁/♃	Belle de Jour	1967	
Robert Wise	♁/♁	West Side Story	1961	
70's				
Francis Ford Coppola	♁/♃	The Godfather	1972	3
Roman Polanski	♁/♁	Chinatown	1974	18
George Lucas	♃/♃	Star Wars	1977	21
Terrence Malick	?/♃	The Thin Red Line	1998	27
Woody Allen	♁/♃	Manhattan	1979	
Werner Herzog	?/♁	Aguirre, Wrath of God	1972	
Milos Forman	?/♁	One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest	1975	
Sam Peckinpah	♁/♃	The Wild Bunch	1969	
Luchino Visconti	♁/♁	L'Innocente	1976	

DIRECTOR/prod*	Asc/☉	CLASSIC 'PSYCH' FILM	year	ch
80's				
Martin Scorsese	♈/♈	Raging Bull	1980	4
David Lynch	♈/♊	Mulholland Drive	2001	24
Oliver Stone	♈/♈	JFK	1991	
Bernado Bertolucci	♈/♈	The Last Emperor	1987	
Louis Malle	♈/♈	Au Revoir Les Enfants	1988	
Alan Parker	?/♈	The Commitments	1991	
Wim Wenders	♈/♈	Wings of Desire	1987	
Peter Weir	?/♈	The Truman Show	1997	
Lawrence Kasdan	?/♊	The Big Chill	1983	
90's				
Steven Spielberg	♈/♈	Saving Private Ryan	1998	6
Robert Altman	♈/♈	The Player	1992	16
Quentin Tarantino	?/♈	Pulp Fiction	1994	26
James Cameron	?/♈	Avatar	2009	
*John Lasseter	?/♊	Toy Story	1995	
Michael Mann	♈/♈	The Insider	1999	
Robert Zemeckis	?/♈	Cast Away	2000	
Rob Reiner	♈/♈	Spinal Tap	1984	
Krzysztof Kieslowski	?/♈	Three Colours (trilogy)	1994	
00's				
Clint Eastwood	♈/♈	Unforgiven	1991	9
Ridley Scott	?/♈	Blade Runner	1982	14
Joel and Ethan Coen	♈/♈	No Country for Old Men	2008	19
Ang Lee	?/♈	Life of Pi	2012	29
Peter Jackson	♈/♈	The Lord of the Rings (trilogy)	2003	
David Fincher	?/♈	Seven	1995	
Christopher Nolan	?/♈	Interstellar	2014	
Zhang Yimou	?/♈	The House of Flying Daggers	2004	
Pedro Almodovar	?/♈	All About My Mother	1999	
post-00's				
Alejandro G'z Inarritu	?/♈	The Revenant	2016	28
Alfonso Cuaron	?/♈	Gravity	2014	
Guillermo del Toro	?/♈	The Shape of Water	2017	

... there are a number of websites with this kind of list (without, of course, the astrology); we used them to compile the following 'perhaps, on another day' listing...

10/20's	50's	70's	90's
D.W. Griffith	Fred Zinneman	John Carpenter	Spike Lee
F.W. Murnau	Satyajit Ray	Bob Fosse	James Ivory
Sergei Eisenstein	Nicholas Ray	Robert Bresson	Terry Gilliam
30's	Max Ophuls	FranklinJ. Schaffner	Jean-Pierre Jeunet
Victor Fleming	Cecil B. de Mille	Alan J. Pakula	Tim Burton
Rene Clair	H.G. Clouzot	Nicholas Roeg	Warren Beatty
Leo McCarey	Richard Brooks	George Roy Hill	Mel Gibson
Carl Dreyer	Alain Resnais	William Friedkin	Wachowski Bros.
William Dieterle	Kenzi Mizoguchi	R. W. Fassbinder	John Madden
Jean Vigo	Henry King	Hal Ashby	Harold Ramis
Lewis Milestone	Alex McKendrick	Robert Benton	Anth'y Minghella
Frank Lloyd	Edward Dmytryk	Michael Cimino	Kevin Costner
William Wellman	Otto Preminger	John Boorman	Jonathan Demme
Rouben Mamoulian	Delbert Mann	Peter Bogdanovich	Jane Campion
Cooper/Shoedsack	Richard Fleischer	Tobe Hooper	Curtis Hanson
Tod Browning	Henry Koster	George A. Romero	Frank Darabont
40's	60's	80's	00's+
Preston Sturges	Sidney Lumet	Robert Redford	Danny Boyle
Mervyn Le Roy	Andrei Tarkovsky	Sydney Pollack	Paul T. Anderson
Roberto Rossellini	M'angelo Antonioni	Barry Levinson	Lars von Trier
Vittoria de Sica	Stanley Kramer	John Landis	Michael Haneke
Carol Reed	John Schlesinger	Bruce Beresford	Alexander Payne
Laurence Olivier	Norman Jewison	James L. Brooks	Wes Anderson
Jacques Tati	Lindsay Anderson	Stephen Frears	Wong Kar Wai
Jean Cocteau	Blake Edwards	Philip Kaufman	Hayao Myazaki
Jues Dassin	John Frankenheimer	David Cronenberg	Ron Howard
Sam Wood	Martin Ritt	Claude Berri	William Peterson
Clarence Brown	Tony Richardson	Brian de Palma	Sam Mendes**
Robert Rossen	Peter Yates	R'd Attenborough	Spike Jonze**

