

7: FROM TAURUS TO GEMINI

On 16/5/2026, there will be a new ♃-(☉) in '2 Taurus'. This symbolizes a good time for the psyche to “collapse ‘2’'s standing wave-arc function” toward “science” & toward the “positive” aspect of matter. From Ancient Greece through to recent times, “(positivist)-scientists” debated whether matter was/is “continuous” or “particulate” but, in the Enlightenment, the idea of indivisible atoms took hold. Into & through the “post-Enlightenment”, however, (i) Einstein revealed that matter, at its “base”, is best understood as a very condensed “form” of energy and, (ii) the “Big Bangers” revealed that matter “emerged” from energy. This means that so-called “(monist) materialism” is a ‘mis’-nomer... it is, in fact, “(monist) energism”. This ‘mis-’ underlines scientists’ over-valuing of ‘2 induction/3 deduction’ & under-valuing of ‘1 abduction’ (& as for ‘4 im-duction’, “forget about it”). Therefore, epistemologically, science is “half-ist”.

Another reason that FA ‘likes’ the term, “half-ist”, is that not only do scientists restrict themselves to induction/deduction but they also ‘like’ to take the “irrational” (= ‘2-1’) step back into ‘11-10 eliminative science’ and become “meta-science deniers”. In 1931, Kurt Godel proved that committed anti-Platonism is categorically wrong i.e. “regression” through the zodiac’s left “half-(ist)” needs to be censured). The problem is that old one, “who watches the watchers?” In other words, it is the censors who are to be censored. Meanwhile, the “right” attitude for zodiac-phile Platonists remains...

Beginning at an unusual place to “begin”, ‘3 Gemini’, and, then, looking more closely at “regression”, let’s re-view what ‘3 Gemini’ is about (i) “1st person thoughts”, (ii) receiving “external thoughts”, (iii) juggling between ‘(i)’ & ‘(ii)’ and (iv) returning to ‘2 matter’. For example, when Freud wrote his “Project for a Scientific Psychology” he was tilting at a ‘3-back-to-2’ “regression risk” but, of course, Freud’s prioritization of the “family romance” kept ‘4 cyclic time’ in the frame. The 6 diameters of the zodiac are, in one sense, the “dissectors” of cyclic time that, without them, would be conceived as a continuum. We have, however, already noted that “developmental time” is both continuous & phasic, so there is no great “rift” between ‘3’ & ‘4’, especially if, ‘in 3’, the astrologer can expand the idea of “irreducible duality” to “irreducible trinity”. In other words, for a 20th-21stC soul to deal healthily with “identification with Divinity”, s/he needs to avoid philosophers who declare themselves to be “non-dualists”, “(half-ists) monists” or “dualists”. In more other words, s/he needs to become a “quaternalist psychologist” who ‘gets’ that the 1st personal inner realm looks both “forward-out” and “back (further)-in”. When the psychologist comes to understand this, s/he realizes that s/he is at “the (♫ “I went down to...” ♫) crossroads”. The (... errr) “time” is nigh to recall assumptions about flowing “time” & any “deals” that one has made with it.

The most “archetypal deal” that can be made with “time” is to “save” it, either by “stopping” it or by “short-cutting” through it e.g. “if I can steal ‘x’, it means that I won’t have to spend time working for ‘x’”. Such actions can, respectively, be sourced to ‘12’ & ‘11’. One could say that mankind’s “scientific” enterprise-as-a-whole was-is about “saving” time... “look at this washing machine with its new wonder technology that dries your clothes too!... and, how much more will I “save” if can manage to steal one!” Moreover, the thief “saves” even more “time” when s/he learns how to present him/herself in “false” ways (e.g. “I will be nice enough that you will take your eyes off my light fingers”) and, because, for centuries now, “science” has been telling him/her

that “saving time = progress = good”, we run up against one of our favourite “dyadic” Freudian phrases, “(a deceiver’s motivations will be) sealed on both sides”. With this psychological discovery, we arrive at the ‘Q’: what fraction of “deceit” is “conscious” and what fraction of “deceit” is “unconscious” (= “delusion”)? We return to this issue in our next essay but, here, we need to start looking for the “truth” of ‘2-into-3’...

Sigmund Freud is an exemplary ‘2 (☉) Taurean’-into-‘3 Geminian (♊)’ insofar as he realized that statistics don’t get anyone very far in psychology. At the end of the day-(life), the only thing that counts is “quality” (“quantity” might be interesting but it won’t prevent “conscious” &/or “unconscious” suicide). Even “surface psychology” would suffer a “repeatability crisis” because, so it seems, gatherers of statistics don’t “observe” in the direction of their (unconscious) biases. Freud, no doubt, would never be happy about FA’s comparisons to Christ, but both of these “p/Psychologists” knew that moral courage is “individual”. As “Marge Simpson” asks daughter, “Lisa-(under-peer-review-pressure)”, “if everyone else jumps off a cliff, would you jump too?” Yep, Jung ran Freud’s ball a good deal further than Freud was prepared to run... but, here, we are examining Taurus-into-Gemini, not Scorpio-into-Sagittarius. Well, OK, then...

If, when ‘2-shifts-to-3’, there is such a thing as a “good reduction”, it would be to “reduce” one’s own tendency to remain ‘11-12-1 godlike’ e.g. don’t feign to “know what it is ‘like’ to be (not only a bat, but also) another individual”. To relate this idea to the material of our prior essay, we translate, “don’t pretend to know what it is ‘like’ to be an agnostic”. For the devout religious devotee, this would be the “acid test” to discover the degree to which s/he is “projecting” his/her “(unconscious) agnosticism” onto others i.e. if a devout religious devotee “feels” that s/he has superior knowledge and therefore “feels” that s/he has every right to inform others of their respective (so s/he believes them to be) “hell-bound” predicaments, the devout response would be to recognize this as a “projection” of one’s “inner agnostic (or, even, atheist)” onto these “others”. If the devout religious devotee is unable to do so (e.g. s/he decides to hammer his/her points-nails home with additional rounds of proselytism), s/he is not as devout as s/he believes himself to be and, so, his/her “true” task is to desist worrying about the state of other’s “souls” and begin worrying over the state of his/her own ‘4 soul’.

To translate the ideas that are presented in the paragraph (directly) above into a Christian context, we would say that Christ’s post-Resurrection “hanging around” for 40days prior to h/His Ascension takes us to a waning Moon that is closing in on its conjunction with the Sun in either Taurus or Gemini. After Ascension Day (in 2026, it is 14/5/2026), there is a 10-day interim (“Ascensontide”) wherein the devout Christian spends his/her time recalling the Apostles’ prayers for the “descent of the Holy Spirit” (“Pentecost”). Because the Holy Spirit has not yet arrived, there is a need to adopt an “as if” attitude to the promises of Christ. In other words, the doubt that is slumbering in devout believers now has a chance to be “raised” & “processed”... by doing one’s best to “know what it is like (not to be a bat, but) a ‘humanist’”. If a believer can come to “know what this is ‘like’”, s/he is given the keys to his/her “personal unconscious” and, then, s/he unlocks the “truth of belief”... as J.C. exclaims, “woe unto you scribes & Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea & land to make one proselyte; when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves”. ☿ Freud’s version of Christ’s advice goes as follows, “learn about ‘reaction formation’ A.S.A.P.”.

2027-2029: ♃-to-♊: SUPEREGO NEARING ITS “USE BY” DATE Pt.1

On 7/7/2025, Uranus, the planetary expression of ‘11’ and of “sudden change”, (... errr, suddenly) changed sign from Taurus to Gemini. After turning “retrograde” on 7/9/2025, Uranus returned to Taurus on 7/11/2025... and, then, “anterograde” once more, Uranus re-entered Gemini on 26/4/2026, wherein it will remain for 7yrs, a span wherein the ideological thinker may find him/herself suffering from “arrest” because s/he spots (seeming) contradictions in your/my ideology... but not his/her own e.g....

Upon one’s introduction to ‘11 Uranus’ associations to (i) “sudden change” yet (ii) “(at least, relatively) static” macro-scalar patterning, anti-astrological heads begin to scratch over the seeming contradiction of “change” & “stasis”. For FA & the larger fraction of astrologers, the cliché “the only thing that doesn’t change is change itself” is likely to relieve itchy heads. In other words, ‘11’ isn’t a fan of the “to-ing & fro-ing” that is part & parcel of incarnation because this seems to be inferior to an immediate brandishing of a “finished product”. So, in a way, astrologers would be more accurate if they conceived ‘11’ as having links to “sudden cessations of change” that, due to the “sudden-ness”, brings about a sense of changefulness when, in fact, that which is ‘seen’ upon cessation “had been there all along”. In more other words, when we talk about “inventors” (= ‘11-ish’ characters), we are more usually talking about “discoverers”.

One of the reasons that Uranus has strong links to astrology is due to the typical experience of “what had been there all along” when the novice astrologer experiences his/her first chart reading. The astrologer will say ‘x’, ‘y’ &/or ‘z’ to his/her client and if, in the client’s mind, the astrologer is correct, the client will be “suddenly changed” into a novel respect for astrology... but, the client’s birth time, date & place “had been there all along”. Another strong Uranus-to-astrology link is the rebellious attitude that astrologers often take to “paradigms”... astrologers know that “religion” & “science” have indulged themselves in tedious “to-ing & fro-ing” about “what has been there all along” for centuries & millennia and, because of their respective unquestioned multi-assumptions that, as Thomas Kuhn pointed out, “causes” the rejection of “anomalies”, they are sure to persist in this tediousness into future millennia & centuries. Therefore, astrologers see no point in engaging them. FA agrees... however, putting some distance between oneself & theologians & scientists doesn’t mean that one should jettison what, over time, has been, if one-sidedly (not invented, but) discovered about the psyche.

As FA’s longstanding readers know so well, Freud’s chart recently underwent its 2nd Uranus-return in Taurus. In these 21stC days, Freud is thought to have invented his psychological structure... but, of course, FA would 50% disagree and counter with the 50% possibility that Freud (re)-discovered “inner” structure. Our confidence can be sourced to Plato’s view of a tripartite psychological structure that, for this person, leads him/her toward “honour”, for that person, leads him/her toward “appetite” &, for a 3rd person, leads him/her toward “truth”. Thus, FA’s view is that Freud had re-discovered the “truth” of “triplism+” – e.g. counter-ideas can heal symptoms – yet we also take the view that Freud was, in any case, a bit “too dualistic” insofar as he hoped for his theory to be “reduce-able” to energy=matter. Freud only pondered ‘5 Leonic’ things near the end of his life... but, even then, Freud didn’t make the key distinction between the superego & the ego in respect of “conscience” i.e. it is differentiable into ‘10 inherited’ & ‘5 developing’ aspects. We will return to this key issue, but first...

1929: JUPITER IN TAURUS (INTO ♉)

This was a strange Jupiter in Taurus year!... what could be interpreted as “luck in respect of material things” was the year of the worst financial crash in history. This is why, in our view, one needs plenty of context when interpreting Jupiter in any sign...

1: PANDORA’S BOX (P.W. Pabst) ☹☹☹ *Pat Metheny: One Quiet Night*

Jupiter, a fiery-energetic planet, transiting Taurus, an earthy-matter-focused sign, sparks the idea of “functional opposition” e.g. the Wall St. crash was, in its way, fuelled by fire & earth being uncomfortable bedfellows. Indeed, fire & earth also have their “opposition” issues in the bedroom. If one looks for some compatibility between Jupiter & Taurus/the 2nd house, s/he could look to their shared ability to “bridge” the psyche “forward”. We have seen that Jupiter in Taurus facilitates the “bridge” from Aries to Gemini and Taurus’ interest in physical beauty can do the same. Keep in mind that ‘2 Taurus’ speaks to the “duality” of being “extraverted” yet also being “receiving (= introjecting)” and, as such, it provides the 1st inkling that masculine-outwardly ‘1’ needs to admit the need to go “back in”. In terms of “Pandora’s Box”, the analyst can always hope that seductress experiences, like “Lulu”’s (Louise Brooks), will “bridge” a male analysand, from ‘12 introverted fantasizing’, across her ‘2 extraverted reality’, to his ‘5 centroverted’ interest in a particular woman. One of the aspects of Taurus to keep in mind is that it is a “fixed” sign (= another phase that is at risk of “stuckness”).

Mike Oldfield: Tubular Bells

2: THE MAN WITH THE MOVIE CAMERA (Dziga Vertov) ☹☹☹

Here is another example of Taurus’ “sensation function” serving the (... errrr) “function” of “bridging” the soul “forward” into Gemini (and, as we are arguing for 1929, being aided by Jupiter’s transit through ♊). It is also something of a “reaction” to Eisenstein’s docu-drama, “10 Days...”, insofar as Dziga wanted to shed the drama & promote the document. When we learn that Eisenstein had ☾ in Aquarius & Dziga had ☾ in Capricorn, we are given a strong Icarus-ian sense of the clash between ‘11’s ideological “dissociation” from “reality” vs. ‘10’s “reaction” against ideology and into its belief that it ‘gets’ “what is real”... and neither caring for the 10 other perspectives

3: LOVE PARADE (Ernst Lubitsch) ☹☹ *early “talkie/singie”*

The song, “the Love Parade”, highlights the Kleinian view that, in the first year of life, mother is as much a collection of “(external) objects” (the baby has “relations” with them) as she is a “unified being”... the necessary “bridge” to “internal objects”

4: BLACKMAIL (Alfred Hitchcock) ☹☹ *2 versions! A silent & a “talkie”*

Receiving financial payments (that add to one’s ‘2 resources’) for withholding ‘3 information’ speaks to Jupiter’s capacity to “connect” ‘2’ to ‘3’... but, isn’t Jupiter supposed to be “benefic”? ‘A’, “yes” if, first, the “buildup of emotion” was “benefic”.

5: THE BROADWAY MELODY (Harry Beaumont) ☹☹ *early “talkie/singie”*

Although the 2nd Oscar winner doesn’t seem much today, it still highlights the ‘2-back-to-12’ function of cinema... when there is a stock market crash – an event that no individual, not even a president can control – there is inevitable ‘1 desire’ to escape

1941: JUPITER IN TAURUS (INTO ♀) Part 2

On 16/2/1941, Jupiter in Taurus came into conjunction with Saturn in Taurus. One could view this transit as a time of C(h)ronos' vomiting up of the rock that he had swallowed. The "expansion of materialism" was a theme of WWII and, in our current world, is the theme; with "our" pitiable/evil billionaires, "Kane" is a "must re-see"...

1: CITIZEN KANE (Orson Welles) ☹☹☹☹ 8th

Some critics of this one have pointed out that it left them a bit emotionally cold. Hmm, we think/feel that this is the point... as per Thomas Nagel, this is "what it was 'like' to be Charles Foster Kane (Orson)". The coolness of Orson himself shows up in his Gemini ascendant & Aquarius M.C., between which, we find his Sun-Mercury in Taurus (see our note above) in his 12th house square his cool Uranus-Moon in Aquarius in his 9th house. Orson's passionate side is seen in his Mars-Venus conjunction in Aries, and we do notice Orson's/Kane's passion for his misguided amour, "Susan" (Dorothy Comingore)... "what it was 'like' to be Orson". It happens that, ultimately, the press bypass the meaning of "rosebud"... yet, this is fully in keeping with the fact that Kane never found out what it meant either. The knowing of a thing's importance is naught in comparison to the knowing of what that thing means. The most important 'Q' for "this 21stC life" that the individual will come up against is "who are you"? A grab-bag of "sub-personalities" – the interviewees were able to see one or two of them, but never all of them – can't answer this 'Q' & financial success blocks any realization that one is a grab-bag of eyes of needles through the camel of "ego-Self-knowledge" won't pass.

2: THE MALTESE FALCON (John Huston) ☹☹☹

Jupiter in Taurus is straightforwardly symbolized in this film insofar as the '2 material' treasure hunters have been on a 17yrs '2 long journey' to take possession of the titular booty. Psychologically, however, most of the interest focuses on the various degrees of "denial". Although both of the private detectives, "Miles" (Jerome Cowan) & "Sam Spade" (Humphrey Bogart), are aware that "Ruth/Brigid" (Mary Astor) is lying, the former "denies" the danger that accompanies dishonesty, whereas the latter, although not "denying" danger, is "denying" how his own admiration of Ruth/Brigid's clever utilization of her "anima" had led him into the maze. The analytic psychologist would see Sam confirming the "projection" of his "very undifferentiated anima" when he describes the falcon as "the stuff that dreams are made of". If Sam were to consult a Jungian therapist – the scene of him weighing his options was not Jungian – he would have been informed that his attraction to Ruth/Brigid is "+ve" insofar as it had drawn him out of fantasy and into "real" life. The worst thing that Sam could do is consult a philosopher because s/he would have drawn him back out of his "worldly reality".

3: THE LADY EVE (Preston Sturges) ☹☹☹

As it was in "Bringing Up Baby", we have another screwball comedy about the clueless scientist dealing poorly with his "anima/soul differentiation". Despite this, we remind the '12-to-1 religious zealot' that becoming a "reductive scientist" is, in relative terms, an achievement. So, although "Charles" (Henry Fonda) is a snake expert in the academic sense only... he is doing better than most of us who have landed east of Eden. Eventually, both religious zealots & academics need to learn "how" to '2 (re)-expand'

“reductions”. Noticing that this story unfolds an ocean liner, we notice that it unfolds ‘from 12’ through ‘1 desire’ for ‘2 resources (money)’ gained via ‘3 deception’, landing in ‘4 parental care’. If all the “(Lady) Eves” (Barbra Stanwyck) of the world can fall in love with the “Adams” of the world “deeply” enough... their unions will eventually become “deliver-able” from the ‘12 ocean’ “depths” to the ‘4 harbour’ “shallows”.

4: THE DEVIL & DANIEL WEBSTER (William Dieterle) 🍷🍷

This Faustian tale’s main claim to fame is Berhard Herrmann’s Oscar-winning score – and it is definitely worth a listen – but it also has the distinguishing feature of a direct reference to the book, “Job”, that has special significance for Jungians. The Devil – here, “Mr. Scratch” (Walter Huston) – doesn’t buy the souls of the fortunate... he waits for a soul to “feel” that it has been so unfairly treated that losing it is nothing

5: DUMBO (Walt Disney: producer) 🍷🍷

The feeling of shame that, very often, goes with different-ness may not be such a bad feeling to have because it can have the effect of turning the different-ness inward and, therein, to a place where its value can be properly “held”. It may also be the case that being separated from mother assists this process, especially if father is a mouse.

6: HOW GREEN WAS MY VALLEY (John Ford) 🍷🍷

After a run of hard-bitten tales about haves & have nots (e.g. “The Informer”), Ford proved that he could sentimentalize when circumstances required it. As for “Tom Joad”, the sons of “Gwylim Morgan” (Donald Crisp) are frustrated by capitalism, but it also possible that being forced to leave their valley for greener pastures is biblical.

7: MEET JOHN DOE (Frank Capra) 🍷🍷

Frank Capra’s “capracorn-y” movies are known as populist crowd-pleasers... but, when we look a bit closer at his filmography, we realize that there was something in him that was always pushing against populism & crowd pleasing. Both this one and its follow-ups don’t flinch from the themes of murder & suicide... in a comic setting!

8: SULLIVAN’S TRAVELS (Preston Sturges) 🍷🍷

In order to “inhabit” the part, the “method actor” may find that s/he needs to go back through his/her biography & tap into personal memories that “resonate” with the character s/he is playing. The oversized & the undersized memories are the same.

9: JOHNNY EAGER (Mervyn Le Roy) 🍷🍷

The road to “Tony Soprano” begins here... the truth of “developmental arrest” is that it is always accessible from within but it has its cost. The gangster only discovers retrospectively that he has lost far more than the cost of 3 or 4 years of psychoanalysis.

10: SERGEANT YORK (Howard Hawks) 🍷🍷

This WWI film is a photo-negative of Spielberg’s “Saving Private Ryan” i.e. it studies the “rationalization”, “it is worth killing 100 to ‘save’ 1000”... Steven’s WWII tale, however, ponders the “rationalization”, “is it worth killing 100 to “save” 1”?

1953: JUPITER IN TAURUS (INTO ♃) Part 3

The early 1950s saw Japan in post-WWII recovery mode. It is difficult to know the degree to which this was cause, effect or (merely) correlation in respect of Japan's directorial triumvirate, Kurosawa-Ozu-Mizoguchi, making their best films. Whatever the answer, Westerners saw value in trying to better understand Japanese culture...

1: TOKYO STORY (Yasujiro Ozu) 🍷🍷🍷 87th

Many film-buffs rank Yasujiro's film above Akira's "Seven Samurai" because the latter traces too easily to the West's (John Ford's) "Westerns" whereas the former is "sui generis". Perhaps the most unique aspect of Yasujiro's approach is his interest in having audience members feel as if they are members of the family on screen... just as the screen family spend most of their interaction time sitting motionless on the floor, so the motionless camera is placed low down to give the effect that you are also sitting motionless on the floor, happy to take part in the stillness of the relationships. For this reason, the audience members who didn't have the happiest of childhoods might balk at what unfolds... the "true" thoughts & feelings of the family members are withheld in a way that "blocks" "soul growth". Yasujiro does a brilliant job of getting his actors to hide-yet-simultaneously reveal their "intersubjective tensions" when there is more than two in the frame ("2 company, 3 a crowd") and, then, as it is in psychoanalysis, "2-ness" hidden thoughts & feelings become manifest. It is only "Kyoko" (Hirayama Kyoko), a schoolteacher and the youngest of the (four +1 deceased) children, who feels the lack of "intersubjective interest" as upsetting. In reply, "Noriko" (Setsuko Hara), the daughter-in-law (the deceased son's wife), reminds her that the "generation gap" is too wide to permit a psychological "bridge-builder" to build a safe-enough bridge.

2: THE WAGES OF FEAR (Henri-Georges Clouzot) 🍷🍷🍷

One psychoanalytical-astrological 'Q' that deserves to be re-asked would be: is "repression" solely attributable to '10'? For example, is it not possible that the "fixed" (= difficult to budge) aspect of "earth", '2', has a role in the "repression" process? The answer would be, at the least, "possibly". One way to consider this "possibility" would be imagine '10' & '2' as earthy "bookends" and, in this way, the "pressure cooker" of '1' can be imagined as the "book" that, like Samson, pushes the pillars apart. This 'Q' is highly relevant to this film, all the way from its title the '2 wages' of '10 fear' to its imagery of "explosiveness within" (the psyche) because, instead of being attacked by bandits from "without", the lorry drivers, Aries-ish "Mario" (Yves Montand), Taurus-ish 'Jo" (Charles Vanel), Pisces-ish "Bimba" (Peter van Eyck) & Gemini-ish "Luigi" (Folco Lulli) are threatened by the "cargo within", barrels of nitroglycerin. How does one deal with fear? Imagine the camp to which one is heading is a "container of" fear.

3: FROM HERE TO ETERNITY (Fred Zinneman) 🍷🍷🍷

Because the hero of this story, "Prewitt" (Montgomery Clift), is a boxer, it could be seen, from the Jupiterian perspective, to be hitting the screens a year too late. Then again, both Aries & Taurus are the "instinctual" signs of the zodiac (they are focused upon "irrational" intuiting & sensing)... the main difference being that Taurus is less concerned with instigation. Hence, we see instigation coming from, "Judson" (Ernest Borgnine) and Prewitt being lured into a bout "outside the ring". A "rational" type of

individual might scratch his/her head when “irrational” types act first and think later, but the problem is not about acting first & thinking later... it is about how one reacts after one’s initial action. Prewitt talks to his ‘3 sib’, “Angelo Maggio” (Frank Sinatra).

4: THE BIG HEAT (Fritz Lang) ☹☹☹

As we saw in “From Here to Eternity”, the hero, “Bannion” (Glenn Ford), does not come out swinging but, if a Bull is sufficiently goaded, he reacts instinctually... to, so we discover in the next scene, his great cost. The hero’s story involves coming to his “point of crisis” and, instead of acting instinctually, he reflects enough to “allow” the story to resolve humanly. Archetypically, the hero’s reaction is a self-overcoming that opens a “space” for “God” to “re-instigate” via another’s action e.g. a hero’s “anima”.

5: STALAG 17 (Billy Wilder) ☹☹

Being an American-ized version of Renoir’s “La Grande Illusion”, Billy makes the case that being imprisoned might be more fun than being in the trenches, although the “appears unjust is just” (see FA’s, “Plato’s ‘Republic’ & the Zodiac”) “hero”, “J.J. Sefton” (William Holden) would be keen to disagree... nothing to be “at ease” about.

6: SHANE (George Stevens) ☹☹

Being faster with a gun than pretty much everyone else means that, by & large, the faster will have more chance to reflect on the meaning of guns than those who are slower (yes, OK, the slow could be reflecting in the afterlife). Just because a gunslinger has “more chance”, it doesn’t mean that he takes it... nor “how far” he might take it.

7: ROMAN HOLIDAY (William Wyler) ☹☹

Audrey Hepburn had Sun conjunct Jupiter in the 2nd house in Taurus (Venus was near the cusp of her 2nd house). It is no big surprise, then, to learn that Audrey’s star-making film was made at her Jupiter return. Taking on the conceit that princesses are even more “imprisoned” than we peasants is easy to eat... but not so easy to digest.

8: I VITTELONI (Federico Fellini) ☹☹

The majority of Fellini’s films have a strong autobiographical flavour. Indeed, the best Fellini films are “autobiographical” e.g. “8½”. Fellini fans won’t want to miss this coming-of-age tale of a writer trying to escape his small-town ties. The birth time is debated but, in one chart, we see Jupiter in Taurus transiting Federico’s 9th house.

9: THE BANDAWAGON (Vincente Minnelli) ☹☹

It might be OK to put “Faust” on Broadway during Jupiter’s transit through Scorpio but, when Jupiter is transiting the sign that appreciates what the senses bring, Taurus, it is more “resonant” to put up a feast for the eyes... it may assist incarnation.

10: GENTLEMEN PREFER BLONDES (Howard Hawks) ☹☹

Straightforward ‘9 benefic’ Jupiter in resources-focused ‘2 Taurus’ stuff here. Don’t miss diamond-loving “Lorelei”’s (Marilyn Monroe) immortal line, “I will never let myself fall in love with a man who won’t trust me no matter what I might do”.