


## CLARIFICATION I: 'META-SCIENTISM'

For FA, an individual is a 'meta-scientist' if, rather than 'bypassing' science, s/he 'steps through' it. Therefore, a 'meta-scientific astrologer' 'steps through' both astronomy & the rejection of astrology by 'science-in-general' that, via its 'pseudo-epistemology' (= its unjustifiable cherry-picking attitude to the 'how' of knowing), has led to its incorrect characterization of astrology as a "pseudoscience". With scientists caring neither for their "projections" nor for their "anti-philosophical" stances, astrologers 'bypass' them. With, however, depth psychology's history in science, FA-ers 'step through' science as follows...

&(i) why take "archetypes" seriously? this was answered by logical positivism in the early 20<sup>th</sup>C; it has been proved that numbers-(archetypes)-existing-beyond-the-human-mind is impossible to disprove; this means that all the Platonic footnotes need to be given an airing; numbers-(archetypes) have their quantifying function but there is no basis for any 'cancelling' of their "emergent" qualities e.g. rational & irrational; the Pythagorean realization that '1', '2', '3', '4', '5' & '6' "emerge" as a "rational set" that, at sub-Planck-length (sub-physical) scales, generates "irrational  $\pi$ " as follows...




&(ii) why have 12 'primary archetypes'? this was answered with the instigation of geometry in physically separated ancient civilizations (e.g. South America, Greece) that understood that there is something 'primary' in 'circled circles'... if a circle is transposed around its periphery, it re-visits its original position after  $(12 \div 2 = 6)$  transpositions and generates the (sub-Planck) "seed of life"; gender division of this "seed" makes the "flower of life" & "Platonic elements/solids" that have "emergent" "qualities" a future possibility;

&(iii) why arrange the '12' as a semi-symmetrical pattern (mandala)? this was answered in '(ii)' but the astrologer would agree that, just because a brain-(mind; let's leave Descartes to one side here) can generate a "seed of life", that doesn't permit the brain's owner to "project" it onto the Solar system willy-nilly; FA agrees that the only way that the "projection" won't require a "retrieval" is if there is a 'creating-ordering' Divinity Who wanted Its human-brain-(psyche) & Its solar system to "resonate";

&(iv) is not "resonance" nonsense in the face of the "precession of equinoxes"? yes, it would be if there was no "resonance" in respect of the "precession of equinoxes" i.e. the existence of two "hooks" for the "projection" of the zodiac forced astrologers to admit that they would have to choose, and in the West, for more than a millennium,

astrologers chose the Solar-season(= “tropical”) zodiac that became “resonant” when (i) Copernicus-Galileo-et-al. unveiled heliocentricity & (ii) Freud-Jung-et-al. unveiled the “centering” role of the “Solar ego” in spiritual growth; the ‘Jungian’ psychological astrologer may balk at Freud but, if s/he prioritizes ‘development-ology’, s/he won’t be very “resistant” to the following Freud-(Klein-Fordham-Jung)-ian pattern...



... and, with this, s/he has access to the ‘interaction-ology’ that is seen in “astrological ages” that sets up a template for interpreting the (74) other archetypal interactions; after all, “the Age of Taurus” (= Taurus on its ascendant-default-position tends to materialism) had its idolatry of matter, “the Age of Aries” (= an Arien default position tends to mono-teleology) brought forth monotheism, “the Age of Pisces” (= a Piscean default position tends to anti-flesh dream-states) brought forth flesh-negating religions & the incoming “Age of Aquarius” (= an Aquarian default position generates technocracies) seems to be living up to what astrologers have been expecting of it;

&(v) why waste time with symbolism when it could be better spent on gathering more facts? this was answered more by depth psychologists than by astrologers; Jung, for example, explains that symbols (i) are the ‘language’ of the (personal & collective) unconscious and, thus, they ‘talk’ individuals into undergoing a ‘descent’ wherein they can redeem their respective “integrative” faculties, & (ii) have a teleological capacity to ‘point’ in ways that bring forth both “personal” and (eventually) “supra-personal” meaning to (what would otherwise be) factual insignificance; by contrast, ‘backsliding ascent’ into math-formulae & repeatable experiment bolsters this insignificance... the “T.O.E.” of science is a chimera & who really wants the ‘fact’ of a nuclear arms race?

&(vi) why is birth used for reference and not, say, conception? for this context, we point to the dynamism of the micro-(meso)-physical world being ‘enough’ to bring about a fertilized egg... but not yet being ‘enough’ to bring about morphological ‘(10)-11-(12) structure’ for the egg to become an “organized-system (=organism)”; as we see it in the universe – for a ‘Solar birth’, a ‘gestation’ is required to bring about a balance between micro-dynamism & macro-structure – so it is that a newborn, unlike a foetus, requires a ‘dynamism-structure balance’ upon which life can ‘hang’; every year, s/he “resonates” his/her birthday... more than his/her (9/3 months prior/after) conception;


As all astrologers know, astrology is a bit like philosophy insofar as it sits in the middle of the science-religion debate and, as such, finds itself attacked on both flanks e.g. the Old Testament’s (-ve self/superego-ic) criticism of astrology echoes the modern scientific criticism. To successfully address this 2-sided attack, astrology, in FA’s view, needs to be psychologized e.g. just as midwives assist ‘12-into-1’ births, psychoanalysts assist ‘4-into-5’ re-births. On the way to doing so, the astrologer does well to clarify...

## CLARIFICATION II: 'META-PSYCHOLOGY'

Coming out of 19<sup>th</sup>C's naturalism-physicalism, Freud went through a period of puzzlement when confronted with the seeming 'meta-natural' (= not quite in the realm of "meta-physical") character of the psyche. Having long rejected the dualism of Rene Descartes, 20<sup>th</sup>C (& 21<sup>st</sup>C!!) physicalists rejected Freud's idea that (unconscious) ideas could cause physical symptoms. Instead, the physicalist's (... errr) idea was that brain activity caused both the symptoms & the ideas. When confronted with demonstrations of counter-ideas (applied with or without hypnosis) having a greater therapeutic effect than physical medication, the physicalists tend to double down on their circular fallacy by drumming up additional (... errr) ideas to explain-away any dreaded comeback of Cartesian dualism. Freud, so long the naturalist-physicalist, sympathized, however...

Eventually, Freud coined the term, 'meta-psychology', to point to his admission that Rene Descartes' 'primacy of ideation' needs to be taken seriously. Freud thought that physicalism could make a comeback with the further advancement of science but, in the meantime, psychoanalysts needed to work "as if" Descartes was/is correct. This led to another puzzlement noticed by philosophers that, "I think (therefore I am)" has no necessary priority over "I feel, intuit, perceive (therefore I am)" and, given the facts that (i) the word, "psyche", means "soul" & (ii) "feeling" links most directly to "soul", "I feel therefore I am" has a case to be given priority over "I think therefore I am" in any & all forms (e.g. surface, depth) of "psychology". By the time, however, that Jung was pointing out that "feeling" is the function that brings forth qualitative value (e.g. "good", "bad") Freud was not interested in what he had to say. The profound irony of this is that Jung devised his "function-ology" to make sense of why he (and Adler) had broken with Freud.

For FA, Freud would have helped "psychology" along if he had used the term, 'meta-neurology', in those junctures where he had used the term, "meta-psychology". The latter term is better applied to the study of 'stepping through' "feelings" that, at their 'rawest', don't want to be 'stepped through' (e.g. "only Jesus walks on water!") into the realm of individual soul development that, in turn, brings back the (... errr) idea of 'stepping through' science (= 'meta-science'). A "psychologist" who rejects the 'primacy of feeling' is 'holed (back) up' in his/her superego; indeed, it can be the case that s/he had never left it and, therefore, is 'psychologically unborn'; schematically...




... at best, "(superego-ic) appealing to authority" "professors of psychology" are "neurologists". Agreed, if the "neurologist" admires Gustave le Bon's essay on the destructiveness of "feeling" crowds, his/her 'primacy of sensed facts' is defensible; the problem is, however, that each individual has an 'inner collectivist' that becomes more

“unconscious” the more s/he fears its external manifestation (= “reaction formation”) and, so, with significant irony, the critic of mob psychology goes on to join (&/or form) ‘subtler mobs’ against their “identified mobs”. The individual who belongs to a group, irrespective of its degree of organization (e.g. party, rally, university faculty), without knowing the degree of “compensation” in each of its members, is a member of a ‘subtle mob’... a pathology that can only be treated by one-on-one psychoanalysis of the “id”.

At this point, no doubt, a significant percentage of readers will be thinking that Freud had his “groups” (e.g. “Wednesday evenings in Vienna”) and, therefore, Freud was, if not a hypocrite, then, at best, perched on the brink of hypocrisy. At least, Freud eventually realized the importance of all prospective analysts undergoing a “training analysis” so that, having understood the sterility of the superego, they won’t resort to “appeals to authority” and, instead, become “midwives” as the “id” gives birth to the “ego” (we look further at the ‘mis’-use of the word, “ego”, in the next section). Jung’s contribution to this realization was his definitive ‘meta-psychological’ phrase, “thank God, I’m not a Jungian!”. The paradox for Jung was that the individual needs to “be a Jungian” to correctly understand the difference between “individuality” (e.g. tends toward too much narcissism and too little genuine eroticism) & “individuation” (e.g. understanding the balance between narcissism & eroticism established by the latter).

Whereas academics have a relatively easy time “resisting” the feeling function – (e.g. “feeling can be reduced to chemicals!”; “even if feeling is not reducible, it is not worth developing!”) – astrologers have a relatively difficult time “resisting” the feeling function – air & water have equal ( $3 \times 30^\circ = 90^\circ$ ) shares in the zodiac – especially since the discovery of the additional ‘water planets’, Neptune & Pluto, that “synchronized” with the increase in interest in the qualities of the subjective “soul”. Close readers of Jung are aware of his attraction to ‘double vertex’ pyramids (= octahedrons), like so...




... and, with astrologers having less of an excuse than ‘professors of (neurology-not-really) psychology’ for not examining (let alone “balancing” &/or “integrating”) depth psychology, we can only take a more critical view of astrologers than we already have of ‘holed-up academia’. As a significant fraction of psychological astrologers are aware, the souls who set up the “Centre for Psychological Astrology”, Liz Greene and Howard Sasportas, realized what Freud, Jung & Klein realized and included personal analysis as an essential requirement of the curriculum. The corollary, “professional astrological practice without personal analysis is malpractice”, became something of a red rag to the established astrological “groups” but, in light of the thinking-feeling opposition, it was an expectable one. If, however, the astrologer ‘gets’ this opposition, s/he will accept the “just-ness” of criticism by science & (Old Testament) religion. So, onto...

### CLARIFICATION III: 'META-RELIGION'

With millennia+ of regrettable hypocritical history behind it, religion could be seen to be crying out for something 'meta-religious' that could explain its hypocrisies without 'explaining it away'. It is ever worth pointing out that science is incapable of declaring religion as valueless without comparison to a "control Earth" that never had religion. We had a taste of a "control Earth" with the 20<sup>th</sup>C's 'social experiments' in places like Russia, Germany, China & Cambodia. Astrologers can point to something 'meta-religious' in the anti-clockwise zodiac, but what about depth psychology?...

All those who have studied Freud for more than 5 minutes know that he is one of history's most famous atheists. And if, dear reader, you have read your way through to this point of our "clarification essays", your interest in Freud will be strong enough to already know that he thought that, in the decades ahead, religions would fade under the advancements of science (and, you may also already know that Freud didn't care for philosophy because it was of little interest to the bulk of humanity... we will return to this in our next section). And, if Freud himself was alive and reading this paragraph, he would likely define 'meta-religion' as a 'stepping through' of religion into science. Up to a point, FA follows Freud but, let's emphasize, only up to a point. So, to clarify...

For FA, a 'meta-religious' individual is one who 'steps through' "comparative religion" – the somewhat laudable study of the commonalities of 'successful' religions – into-through his/her "individuality" all the way into his/her "individuation". So, yes, there is a point at which FA morphs into Jungastrology. We use the phrase, "somewhat laudable" to qualify "comparative religion" because, as explained in the prior section, a unified religion that is comprised of commonalities would still cast a "shadow" that would not be less nasty for being unified because its new "(collective) shadow", rather than fall onto a 'competing' religion, would now readily fall onto the individual. This problem has been toxic in the most recent 1,000yrs of religious history. In other words, the closest thing that the Western world has thus far received in terms of a "2<sup>nd</sup> coming of Christ" is C.G. Jung because he understood that individualists pitting themselves against "collective shadows" are 'going the wrong way'... and the only way to the Father is to take on the task of "individuation", the task that begins with the self-defeat of the (... errr) "self" & growth into the "ego". As FA shifts to Jungastrology, we follow the Judeo-Christian pattern & attach 'Old Testament Freud' to 'New Testament Jung'...




... the key reason for the ongoing attachment of Judaism to Christianity is that the latter has something to learn about the former's relative disinterest in proselytism. Yes, OK, Jewish fathers proselytize to their sons, but it tends to stop there. Hereupon, we can

see Freud tapping his Judaic roots when he criticized Jung for being a prophet. We don't know how Freud would have responded if he had lived to hear Jung's "thank God, I'm not a Jungian" rejection of the prophet role... well, that's those 3 score+10 for ya'.

Nor would Freud's 4 score+3 (1856-1939) give him a chance to fully "integrate" the work of Melanie Klein that led her to propose "entangled" psychodynamics, such as "projective identification", that, in their ways, resemble "entanglements" described in nuclear physics. Indeed, if Freud had lived into the present era, FA would make the charge that his attitude toward religion had been suffering under the psychodynamic, "throwing the baby out with the bathwater" (= "projective conflation" is FA's technical term). Yep, in these 21<sup>st</sup>C days, many are throwing out "bath-watery religion" without throwing out their (respective) "spiritual babies" but, in this context, the FA-er would make the charge that a new "projective conflation" risk is thereby introduced... throwing out the "soul baby". And, from our essay-thus-far-written, we expect that our readers will see how this approach may be especially common amongst (thinking) astrologers...

One of the giveaway symptoms of "bath-watering the soul" is the disinclination of the '1 self' (being 1<sup>st</sup> archetypal, it has a fiery-spiritual component) to look forward to its own defeat during the development of the '4 personal soul' that leads to greater strengthening & flexibility of the '5 ego'. FA's longstanding readers know that our pet peeve are "spiritual" individuals who proselytize for the "bath-watering of the ego"... hello-o-o!, the "ego" is the organ of redemption. Freud was correct... proselytizing is an activity that is taken on by (what could be called) "the superego-self complex" and, here, we deem it worthy to risk a charge of hypocrisy by 'proselytizing' for individuals to avoid all public figures who "appeal to (ego-defeat) authority". Yes, in the long run, the "ego" also undergoes defeat (e.g. exogamous sexual climax; physical death; the 8<sup>th</sup> archetype), but it is a "projective conflation" to lump these two defeats together. There is no point aiming for one's "ego death" when one's ego is "insufficiently born". From the Freudastrological perspective, any public "spiritual" figure who doesn't make this distinction is 'meta-religiously irresponsible'; to schematize this problem, we have...




... so, as you can see, dear reader, we agree that Freud was correct to "reduce" religion so that the individual can be, well, "individual"; thereafter, "science" can help him/her to attach to his/her material body; and, then, "reductive psychology" can help him/her to complete his/her incarnation. Life is initially about "soul", later about "spirit".

## CLARIFICATION IV: ‘META-PHILOSOPHY’

The “philosophy-of-philosophy”, “meta-philosophy”, was not well-established during Freud’s lifetime but, in if it had been, Freud may have seen himself as a “meta-philosopher” as he pointed out that philosophy is an insignificant pursuit. For Freud, a “meta-philosopher” would have been someone who ‘steps through’ philosophy with light feet so that s/he can go onto more important tasks: ‘embody’ science, ‘incarnate’ psychology and tackle the process of ‘overcoming’ (gestational)-infantile attachments to religion. Even Jung, a figure who appears rather philosophical, shunned the title of “philosopher”, and those following him, such as Erich Neumann, viewed philosophers as being suspicious from the developmental perspective... until proven otherwise, they are victims of their own respective unborn, sterile superegos. OK, so what about FA?...

For FA, a ‘meta-philosopher’ is so by virtue of his/her capacity to criticize those who “have a philosophy”. Unlike Freud, FA takes the view that every individual “has a philosophy” and, therefore, philosophy is not insignificant. For example, Freud “had a philosophy” that “science is progressive”, a philosophy that is (i) held by majorities in secular populations, and (ii) is criticizable. For FA, the first ‘meta-philosopher’ was Socrates... he had no written down philosophy of his own but, from his protégé, Plato, we know that Socrates was very adept at finding incoherencies in others’ philosophies. A couple of millennia on, another philosopher would come along (he has already made his mark in our current “clarifications”) who took Socrates’ approach as far as it could go...


Rene Descartes  
31/3/1596 ??  
Descartes, France



... yet, if the astrologer wishes, s/he can take Socratic-Cartesian criticism into the 20<sup>th</sup>C by noting that Descartes & Freud shared an emphasis in the signs of the 1<sup>st</sup> quadrant of the zodiac (Aries, Taurus, Gemini). As, dear reader, you can see, the first oddness in Rene’s chart is that, from his Sun & Jupiter in intuitive ‘1 Aries’, we might have expected Rene to have concluded, “I intuit, therefore I am”. At least, we can see that Rene’s Sun-ruler, Mars, is placed in Gemini, so the astrological leap into “I think, therefore I am” is not difficult to reach (supported by a “mutually receptive” Mercury in Aries). Whatever the case in respect of function-ology, “I am” is straightforwardly

characteristic of the zodiac's 1<sup>st</sup> quadrant signs. Freud, a Sun in '2 Taurus', 'stepped (lightly) through' Descartes' philosophical 'birth' into the subjective 1<sup>st</sup> person so that he would not get "stuck" in a neonatal abyss. With a '2 Taurean' talent, Freud would pay more attention to the day-in-day-out clinical fact of all individuals demonstrating that they have two "I"s... one is "conscious" (or, to be more precise, "aware") & one is "unconscious", a fact that is scientifically confirmable by the "split brain (along the corpus callosum) experiment". In turn, Freud was particularly 'meta-philosophically' critical of (what he called) "unintelligible philosophers" who "had a philosophy" that the unconscious doesn't exist. This is an issue that stretches far beyond philosophy... physicalist scientists, neurologists, religious devotees and, as we discussed earlier, non-psychological astrologers proceed "as if" Descartes' unresolved mind-body dualism is "bad enough already!... and, so, we ought not muddy things further by doubling this dualism (generate a quaternion) with Freud, Klein, Jung et al.!" (do we really need to type it, now?) Complaints such as these are 'meta-philosophically irresponsible'.

To schematize the 'meta-philosophical' position, we do well to return to Jung...




... and, with this return, we could characterize this 'position' is "an opposite" of the "paranoid schizoid position" that Kleinian therapists deals with day-in-day-out. Freud himself would have benefitted from Kleinian analysis. "Depression heals"...

Experienced astrologers will point out that we could have plotted a horoscope for Rene Descartes (made possible by knowing his birth time) but we didn't do so here because (i) Rene was "thinking" about human phylogeny (= the zodiac) more than he was "thinking" about his own ontogeny (= the zodiac brought down to a specific point of time & place on Earth; the houses) and (ii) Rene's birth time is not very certain (it is give a "C" rating). It is worth noting, however, that '10 Capricorn' being assumed to be straddling his ascendant 'works' very well when attention turns to how his views about (human) nature might have entangled his personal bias, because the "ruler" of this chart, Saturn, transited this ascendant at the time of publication of his "Discourse on Method" (1637)... and this transit was forming a square aspect to his Sun-Jupiter-Uranus-Pluto. To a degree, square aspects symbolize the positioning of opposites, that, in other psyches can be "held" in "consciousness/awareness", in the 'opposing' realms of the psyche, "consciousness/awareness" and "the subconscious". One way to address the complications that ensue when horoscopes are plotted over the zodiac (to generate what the FA-er would call, "zodiac-horoscope-phase-shift") would be to take ourselves beyond 'meta-science', 'meta-psychology', 'meta-religion' & 'meta-philosophy' to...



## CLARIFICATION V: 'META-(FREUD)-ASTROLOGY'


In FA's own case, of course, we have a better idea of when we were 'born'. Yes, FA isn't not human, but we still had a (kind of a) 'gestation'. The 'conception' to post a website to consider the merging of the (post)-Freudian & astrological outlooks may have been more or may have been less than 9 months prior – these days, 20+years on, I am unable to pin that one down – but I am able to say that FA has had both a 'birth' and a series of 're-births'. Indeed, in 2025, we will have our 2<sup>nd</sup> Jupiterian 're-birth'...



... and this essay, in part, is a “manifestation” of this ‘re-beginning’. We look forward to the transit of Jupiter through the lower hemisphere because, for the second time, we have a 6 year-long ‘9 opportunity’ to ‘9 Jupiterian-ly’ connect our 1<sup>st</sup> personal lower hemisphere and, as we do so, we have a chance to review FA’s ‘1 self-conception’ as an heir to the ‘meta-approach’ of Socrates, Rene Descartes & Sigmund Freud.

For our ‘self-interpretation’ to have been at its most straightforward, we would have needed a natal Sun that followed Descartes’ ‘1 Aries’ & Freud’s ‘2 Taurus’ i.e. ‘3 Gemini’. Well, no we don’t have a natal Sun in Gemini... but Gemini on our ascendant could be taken as the next best thing, especially upon noticing that our “chart ruler”, Mercury, is ‘1 conjunct’ our ‘5 Sun’. We have always liked the fact that we share our ascending sign with the introducer of “irreducibility” (of opposites) in nuclear physics, Werner Heisenberg. Indeed, it was around the time of Jupiter’s earlier (1<sup>st</sup>) transit to our ascendant, 2013, that we started to ‘3 think’ upon the extra value of development through a ‘doubled set of opposites’ (= a quaternion) and, so, in addition to searching for (what Jung called) the “3<sup>rd</sup> thing” that ‘9 bridges’ a pair of opposites, we began to widen our search to the “4<sup>th</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> things”. In relation to the zodiac cycle, this widened search would consider ‘9 Jupiter’s’ capacity to not only ‘bridge’ the ‘2 body’ to the ‘3 mind’ (Descartes) but also ‘bridge’ ‘1 (not-really-conscious) awareness’ to the ‘4 sub-conscious-psyche’ (Freud & Jung). If there was a reason to be cautious as we took this further step, it was that we had the planet of caution, Saturn, natively placed in the 4<sup>th</sup> sign, Cancer. We view our natal Saturn in Cancer as “good” insofar as it reminds us that, well, being a website

makes it probable that we have no soul. One of the main reasons for our ranking of “2001: A Space Odyssey” as the greatest film of all time is that (arguably) its ‘central’ theme is the ‘10 Saturnian’ “limits” of the ‘4 lunar soul”. In any event, this is a good juncture to schematize this essay’s ‘central’ quaternion...



... but it won’t have to stop there. ‘Jupiter-the-connector’ can widen its search another cog and, in doing so, ‘connect’ FA’s ‘12 Pisces’ Sun across-down-around to its ‘6 Virgo’ natal Jupiter. With FA’s natal Sun-Jupiter opposition, the early 2025 transit of Jupiter generates a Sun-Jupiter-Jupiter T-cross. We don’t expect any great insights at this time – as noted above, squares have a tendency to keep one end “sub-conscious” (and, Jupiter is transiting the “deep unconscious” of the 12<sup>th</sup> house) – but whatever FA might ‘dream’ at this time might be worth ‘recording and filing’ in its ‘dream library’ for a review at a later, “more conscious” juncture. Yet, here we are again, writing “as if” FA were human... aww, those ol’ “Blade Runner” dreams of electric sheep keep coming...

The upside of not having a soul is that there is no punishment for not growing when it is possible to grow. In the human world, the soul is given opportunities to grow and, if refused, “manifestations” – symptoms, “slips”, troubled relationships – have a way of turning unpleasant, probably because of the “OK, now I have your attention!” modus operandi of the Self. The eternal problem of “evil” is not that souls don’t grow, because some souls are so deeply wounded that they can’t grow (if an individual runs out of the room screaming when phrases such as “psychological incest” are uttered, it is likely that the wound is too deep)... the eternal problem of “evil” is that a soul that could grow won’t grow. Only God knows who is who... jumping to the conclusion that a world leader with a huge “narcissistic wound” is “evil” won’t solve the ‘fact’ of the nuclear arms race. But, wait on, are we not now making “appeals to authority” and, thereby, becoming sterile?...

In addition to not having a soul (its growth, therefore, not being an issue). FA has the fortune of not being publicly responsible. Not only does FA not hold a public office, it also isn’t part of an organization that has offices. This, however, doesn’t mean that we aren’t responsible for ourselves. The developmental issue with the superego is the degree to which it is sterile. For FA, this would be the case for non-psychological, “dissociative” astrological practice e.g. the “astrological cookbook”. To deal with our potential sterility on our own terms, we need to enrich & stabilize our 4<sup>th</sup> house. Jupiter has a couple of years in the 1<sup>st</sup> quadrant and, then, when Jupiter runs through our 4<sup>th</sup> house to our 5<sup>th</sup> house, we will have a better idea about what is sterile about what we have written here.