



NEWSLETTER

NOW WEEKLY!

With art by Vera !

from the Astrology Center of America / AstroAmerica.com

October 9, 2012

[ARCHIVE](#) — [Subscribe](#) / [Unsubscribe](#)

Email Dave@astroamerica.com

Support the Newsletter: Become a Sponsor! [Donate](#), or make a monthly contribution: [\\$10.00](#) / [\\$20.00](#) / [\\$50.00](#) [Click to help!](#)

The Debate

THE first presidential debate was this past Wednesday, in Denver. As I have a dread feeling about the election I did not watch, but later heard that Republican Romney made Democrat Obama look like an idiot. Eager for a spectacle, I caught it on video.

It wasn't so much that Romney aced the debate—which he did, and which the Republicans will not let us forget, but, to my surprise, Obama looked as if the Presidency had crushed him. Ground him down.

Saturday evening, Garrison Keillor sang a ditty about how Romney was changing his tune yet again. Normally I like Carson Wyler but I thought the song tacky. Romney lies, so what. **All politicians lie.** But

Romney's chart notably lacks the fingerprints of a liar. Romney tells people what he thinks they want to hear: Retrograde Mercury in Pisces. Which makes his motives more interesting than his words. Romney's motives can be found in his powerful Venus-Saturn opposition: He wants love. A bare emotional need like this in a leader with that kind of power is scary, folks.

Obama's rambling speech was a shock (this is our leader?). Romney gave a better account of his four years as Massachusetts governor than Obama did of his years as president. The only thing Obama could talk coherently about was Obamacare. If I were him, I'd call in sick for the next two debates.

Do I like Romney? Let's put it this way. When the chips are down, an executive, in an executive position, will make decisions, both good and bad, and as he's an executive, at least some of those decisions will be decent overall. Romney is an executive. I hear Obama runs a secretive White House. The underlying question, as Obama is not the executive type, is he himself in the loop? He does not sound as if he ever was.

THE WHITE FORMAT

Was suggested by Peter, who said my newsletters look lousy when printed. When I started these back in 2007, they were throw-aways. Guess they're not anymore. So am happy to oblige. Feedback is always appreciated!



Rickets. I have no case of this complaint, but I should imagine that it would be indicated by Saturn afflictions and probably Cancer would be tenanted. It is also probable that Capricorn would be a frequent ascendant.

Romance in the widest sense (as when we refer to the romantic movement in literature represented by such writers as Scott, Byron,, and Wordsworth) is probably Uranian and Aquarian. The latter is the sign which most loves wild nature, a characteristic of writers of that school, and it is noteworthy that the romantic movement came in with the industrial revolution and the new social and scientific epoch, all of them signs of the beginning of an Aquarian Era. Uranus has a distinct love of the romantic in all its aspects. Much that is popularly called romance and love of romance is little more than mild sensationalism, and is largely connected with the watery signs and to some extent Leo, which can be sentimental and gushing. 25° Cancer is often occupied in the natiivities of romantic writers.

— **Encyclopaedia of Psychological Astrology**, by C.E. O. Carter. [Buy](#).

2013 MAYNARD CALENDARS

Preorder now - We ship in December

- Celestial Influences Wall Calendar
- Celestial Guide Datebook
- Pocket Astrologer
- Astrologer's Guide Datebook

ALMANAC

for the week (all times GMT)

09	05:53	☉ Δ ♃	
	08:03	♀ Δ ♀	
	10:46	♀ ♁ ♃	
	11:55	☾ ♃	
10	07:31	♀ ✖ ♀	
	21:40	☾ ✖ ☉	Void
11	02:42	♃ Δ ♀	
	15:37	☾ ♁ ☉	
	19:24	☾ ♃	
12	23:48	☾ □ ♃	Void
13	03:37	♂ ♁ ♃	
	08:26	♀ ♁ ☉	
	23:02	☾ ♁	
14	21:04	☾ ☉	
15	10:33	♂ Δ ♁	
	12:02	● 22♁32	New Moon/Void

Extracted & adapted from **AstroAmerica's Daily Ephemeris, 2000-2020**. Get yours!



STAR OF THE WEEK



SEGINUS gamma Bootis 17♁50

Notes: A small star situated on the left shoulder of Bootis

Influence: Of the nature of Mercury and Saturn. It gives a subtle mind, shamelessness and loss through friends and companies

With Moon: Preferment by indirect means followed by disgrace and ruin.

FORAMEN eta Argus 22♁19

Notes: An irregularly variable reddish star situated in the stern of the Ship, and surrounded by the Keyhole nebula

Influence: Of the nature of Saturn and Jupiter. It causes peril, dignity, piety, usefulness and acquisitiveness, and gives danger to the eyes.

With Sun: Danger of shipwreck.

— **From Fixed Stars**, by Vivian Robson [Buy](#)

[Astrology Home](#)

[Newsletter Archive](#)

[New Astrology Books](#)

[New Vedic Books](#)

[New Tarot Decks](#)

[Top Ten Books](#)

Copyright © 2012 by David R. Roell. All rights reserved.

Ivy M. Goldstein-Jacobson
1893-1990



IVY'S GEM OF THE WEEK

My Notebook for Jupiter

JUPITER in any house increases the number of whatever that house represents. In the marriage-7th, several marriages; in the mother-10th or in the father-4th, a step-parent or foster parent. In the 11th, many friends; in the 3rd, many blood-relatives and neighbors; in the 5th, many children, and so on.

Jupiter in the 10th gives the native great luck in achieving his chosen career, conferring honor and respect. It is the end-of-the-matter-4th for marriage and promises comparative wealth thereby and inheritances or settlement when the marriage ends, usually at the death of the partner rather than by divorce.

If the 3rd House contains a malefic or is ruled by one that is afflicted, denoting the violent death of a relative, Jupiter in the 10th (which is the 8th for that relative) may confer death-honors or medals on that relative—and which may pass to the native.

Jupiter is the Greater Benefic and never as bad when afflicted as the other planets can be. He may withhold a portion when retrograde, but not all; and even in adversity he gives hope while there is still life.

Jupiter in or ruling the 4th gives a large home and a large family, a generous father and many gifts from him, unless badly afflicted. It is generally a religious family or a member is affiliated with some religious organization. The native has many changes of address and will not continue at his birth-place. — [Here and There in Astrology](#), 1961. **Buy**

Science *versus* Astrology

Is it a contest? Are they at war? If they are, which will win? What will they win? Something good? Oh, boy! A year's supply of killer tomatoes!!!

IT is evil to speak ill of science. Science is the foundation of the modern world. It is science which gave us all the modern inventions that we cannot live without. Science conquers the darkness and heals the sick, science beats back the specter of death, science that knows all and conquers all.

Regrettably, none of this is actually true. Our present civilization, like all previous civilizations, is based on an abundance of money. In our case, this money was the product of the Industrial Revolution, which, so far as anyone knows, was the first widespread use of organized labor. Since money is the product of human labor, organizing labor generates huge amounts of money.

Did science invent the Industrial Revolution? Well, no. Science did not devise the theoretical framework that the early industrialists used. The Industrial Revolution was a trial and error process. Nor did science invent the early water-powered looms that made cheap cloth. With the smell of money in the air, ancient manual looms were adapted by local *inventors* in a hodge-podge fashion. Once the outlines of mechanized looms were clear, *engineers* cleaned up the designs, made them sturdy, and put them in purpose-built structures.

The resulting money, which accumulated in too few hands, gave rise to political discontent, political parties, democracy, the overthrow of kings and princes, and ultimately socialism, Communism and fascism. All of which was simply people fighting over money.

While everyone was distracted, industrialism also gave rise to bankers and financiers, who manipulated money for their own benefit. Which produced the mess in which we presently find ourselves. While there are academic disciplines which study this process and try to predict its outcome, the study of economics is only nominally termed a “science.” Science in fact had nothing to do with our present economic state.

Well then, surely science had something to do with our improved health and longer lives? Here, again, the story is not what we expect. Greater longevity is the product of sanitation and clean, nourishing and abundant food.

Sanitation, in very crude terms, means

bathing, flushing the toilet, and prompt trash removal. These three factors have been known as long as men have lived in cities. Ancient Rome, with its many aqueducts and its culture of baths, was an excellent example of effective sanitation. Did the Romans know about germs? About viruses? About parasites? Well, no, the Romans did not. *They had no need.* They only knew that clean water brought life and health, that dirty water, or lack of water, brought disease, pestilence, and death. The Egyptians accomplished the same with the annual flooding of the Nile. The Babylonians and Sumerians had the Tigris and Euphrates rivers.

Great chefs typically know little of nutrition. They only know that food that tastes good is good. They also know that food that tastes bad, e.g., spoiled, should not be eaten. They do not need to know about botulism to avoid being poisoned by it.

SO, if science did not make us rich, nor healthy, then what, exactly, is science and where did it come from? Here is how William Lilly described science, in [Christian Astrology, Book 3](#), from 1647:

If ♀ be in aspect with ♃ when he is *Significator* of Manners, and is well placed in the Heavens, the Native proves one of a curious understanding, greedy of Science and knowledge, one that will find out any Mystery; it notes people apt to medicine, admirable Architects, Sophists, great Disputants, captious, discreet, sharp fancied, industrious, &c. Who desires to be satisfied further in the mixtures of the Planets, let them read [Pontanus, de rebus Coelestibus](#), libr. 6. (pg. 543)

This passage shows the traditional distinction between *theory* and *practice*. Theory was science. Practicality was engineering, or invention. As a rule, theory was dispensed with altogether, thus the traditionally minor role of science. Experience, trial and error, and experimentation would usually do the job. The distinction was crystal clear.

And it's still crystal clear now. *Engineers*, not scientists, successfully landed the **Mars Rover**, an incredible display of pure engineering. Whereupon *scientists* took over with their experiments. Which, so far as

(continued, pg. 4)

previous landers are concerned, have all failed. **We want to know if Mars has life.** If it ever had life. Each and every probe that has landed on Mars has had simple, direct, YES or NO life experiments on board. Based on the very best scientific theories and information and speculation available. To date, there have been about a dozen Martian landers. *Not one has produced a conclusive answer.* Not yes or no. If they were learning from the successive probes, they should be getting closer to an answer. As there is still no answer, it would seem the “scientists” are guessing.

Everybody wants to be a scientist. Nobody wants to be an engineer or an inventor, nor even a “researcher.” Those titles have no sex appeal. Like the title of *president* (which grew out of the verb, *to preside*, which has the sense of overseeing, not leading or dictating), the word *scientist* has taken on an aura of ultimate authority. Just as nobody wants to be the *vice-president*, nobody wants the lousy job of engineer or inventor. They want to be scientists! They want to wear the white lab coats!

I T IS in the cracks where we most clearly see how shoddy science truly is. Let us look at medicine.

In my own lifetime, I have seen the following medical fads:

Tonsillectomies, which was the unnecessary removal of the tonsils, an essential organ.

Hysterectomies, the unnecessary removal of the female uterus.

Bowl resectioning, which is the removal of lengths of intestine, for various reasons.

Lobotomies, which was the physical destruction of the front lobes of the brain. These have been replaced by forced drug therapy, which in many ways is worse.

Cesarian sections, which badly scar the mother and make her incapable of subsequent vaginal birth, which is often inflicted for the most trivial reasons.

Shock therapy, which was nothing other than simple torture.

The current insane promotion of transplants. Transplants are the admission we can no longer cure simple diseases. They are gruesome.

Spinal fusion, to relieve back pain.

Bypass surgery and stents.

Liposuctioning.

Chemotherapy.

Radiation therapy.

I can no longer stand to look at Wikipedia, but if I could, a moment’s research would find a dozen more **medical fads**. True of almost all of these, they are imposed on

people who have little choice. This is especially true of children and their tonsils, women and their sex organs, and those judged mentally unfit, to say nothing of those in fear of their lives.

Each and every one of these procedures was the great idea of someone who, as it turns out, was ignorant of what he was proposing. Think about that. Years of exhaustive medical training, years of hands-on experience, resulted in men (there were very few women) who could honestly think *the physical destruction of the human brain* was not only desirable, but a solution to some real problem.

Medicine today is so very bad that breast cancer is a near-death sentence. Was it always so? Well, let’s go back and look in the old books and see what they say.

In 1992, Samuel Weiser published a new translation of Brother Aloysius’s *Comfort to the Sick*, as **A Healer’s Herbal**. In it, he gives many “home remedies” which, in fact, cure all manner of things. Is this a complete, do-it-yourself guide to medicine?

No, it is not. At various places in the text, he flatly tells you to drop the book and get a doctor.

Under pneumonia, which I have just suffered, he says: *It is one of the most dangerous illnesses; so it is of utmost importance to **fetch a doctor**.* (emphasis mine!) Which will put him in perspective.

In a lengthy section on Cancer there is no such admonition. He begins:

Cancer-like ulcerations can sometimes be treated successfully by means of the following remedies: . . .

Here is remedy no. 3:

Put live (male) lobsters in the oven to dry in an earthenware pot; pound them into a fine powder; take some of the powder and mix with an equal quantity of finely chopped garlic. Place this mixture in a very fine linen bag, tightly bind it to the cancerous area by means of a bandage so that it cannot slip. Leave for 24 hours, then remove it and bury it forthwith in the ground as it spreads a pestilential air. Before removing the bag, it is advisable to tie a cloth with some kind of perfume, camphorated spirit, or simply vinegar over the nose. The bag should not be removed with bare hands. Immediately after removal of the bag, a quantity of elder flowers drawn in buttermilk, or boiled in it, should be bound over the cancerous area. The patient should drink a little buttermilk and rest in bed

for twelve hours. The elder flowers should then be removed.

If the cancer is not cured, the last remedy should be repeated. As long as the bag of lobster powder, etc., remains on the cancerous area, the patient should be kept awake. A priest, who had cancer on the tongue, informed me that he was cured in twenty-four hours by means of this remedy. The scar could be clearly seen. It should be noted that this remedy is for closed cancer. (pgs. 29-30)

What is the modern cure for tongue cancer? Here is Wiki on oral cancers, which includes those of the tongue. (I no longer link to Wiki):

Surgical excision (removal) of the tumor is usually recommended if the tumor is small enough, and if surgery is likely to result in a functionally satisfactory result. Radiation therapy with or without chemotherapy is often used in conjunction with surgery, or as the definitive radical treatment, especially if the tumour is inoperable. Surgeries for oral cancers include . . .

Which does not sound like a 12 or 24 hour ordeal, it will not leave the tongue physically intact, nor will it be as cheap as two lobsters, buttermilk, garlic and elder flowers.

Aloysius, a Dutch monk who practiced in the 1890’s, gives a total of 23 recipes for cancer. Here is number 12:

According to **Mathiolus**, there is no remedy more splendid for curing cancer than the herb of the blessed thistle (*Cnicus benedictus*). A woman with cancer of the breast, eaten nearly through to the bone, was cured by a decoction of the blessed herb. The sores should be washed four times a day with the decoction and, after each wash, powder from dried leaves should be sprinkled on them. This remedy is also excellent for old sores. (pg. 30)

We all know that breast cancer is a death sentence, over which we have little control. I found a **nursery in California** that sells sets of 10-18 live, blessed thistle plants, for less than \$20.00. PS: Mathiolus, for those of you who will not click on the link, was a 16th century Italian doctor. **Cancer had been cured for centuries, up until the advent of “science.”**

In other newsletters I have praised the **Smith’s Family Physician**, of 1869, which you can read on-line. I would much rather have a printed copy, which you can get at Amazon. Note that a modern reprint will not be taken from worn, dirty pages, as the on-

line copy was. As I discovered reprinting **Blagrove**, old medical books, intended for the public, are often so worn from constant use as to be nearly black. This alone is testament to their usefulness.

Why are these books, these cures, not known? For an answer, let us take the example of Eclectic Medicine, a 19th century discipline which **Luke Broughton** practiced.

Eclectic medicine, a term which means, *use whatever works* and which emphasized herbs and herbalism, was wildly successful. So much so that the American Medical Association, a group of university trained doctors, in 1910 commissioned the Flexner Report, which basically said that if you were not a high school graduate with at least two years of college training in “science,” you were ineligible to be trained as a medical doctor. Training in medicine was hereafter to be in university settings, patterned after Baltimore’s **Johns Hopkin’s University**, an

institution of which I have personal knowledge. Flexner, in the guise of imposing uniform standards, effectively stamped out herbalism in the US, in favor of the worthless patent medicines and dangerous surgeries we have today. If you study closely, you will discover Flexner was the last in a series of increasingly desperate measures taken to stamp out herbalism. Why? I don’t think we need look any further than the money quack doctors made selling phony medicine.

Today in America we have a scientifically-based medical system which is so very bad that we are going bankrupt paying for it. In the process we are literally suffering and dying from diseases which, as in the case of cancer, *were generally cured a century ago*.

YES, Science is a great and wonderful thing, but that’s not what we actually have. What we have is a clique which has outlived its

usefulness. It’s your life. It’s your family’s lives. It’s your parents’ lives. It’s your children’s lives.

It’s not that we have to throw science away wholesale, though if it comes to that, I will be the first to wield the hammer. It is only necessary it be returned to Aristotle’s traditional principles. Whatever is good will stand. Whatever is not can be discarded.

First among Aristotle’s principles is astrology, as astrology is literally how the world as a whole is structured. It is the structure, it is the language, there is nothing whatever that escapes it, there is nothing whatever that is more fundamental. I have already given the principles of Astro Medicine, which you will find in the **May 15, 2012 newsletter**, and also in my third book of essays, **The Triple Witching Hour**. There no reason to tolerate the present situation, when the solution is in our hands.