

Ivy M. Goldstein-Jacobson
1893-1990

IVY'S GEM OF THE WEEK

Planetary Hours from In the Beginning Astrology

HAVING under consideration the planet ruling your desired objective, first note its condition in the ephemeris to see if it is disposed to co-operate in your behalf on that particular day. If retrograde it will not participate fully until it turns direct and this is particularly true of Mercury who cannot decide which way to go . . . even if direct but turning retrograde in a day or two. If intercepted in the char you finally set, the matter ruled by that chosen planet will be in a bind until changing into the next Sign which will take longer it is in an early degree. If intercepted but in mutual reception so that it can be temporarily read in the same degree but back in its own Sign out of interception the matter can be handled well with some assistance.

When all is said & done

The MOON is the developing power on which depends the outcome of any venture under consideration. In selecting the day & hour for taking an action, we base our decision to act or not on what she advises according to her FINAL aspect "when all is said & done". If she is void of course the matter also is inactive & will get nowhere but with no harm done. If in a common Sign & cadent house, the matter does not land as it was planned: some change takes place. —

In the Beginning Astrology, 1975

More on September 22:

- 1776 – Nathan Hale hanged.
- 1784 – Russia colonizes Alaska.
- 1823 – Joseph Smith finds gold tablets.
- 1893 – Victoria lasts longer than George 3.

SCIENCE OR PSEUDOSCIENCE

The Craters of the Moon

THIS one is easy. Easy, easy, easy. Like stealing money from a bank. Easy, easy easy. The Moon has craters. Mercury has craters. Moons of Jupiter & Saturn have craters. Even asteroids have craters.

We first saw craters nearly 400 years ago when we first looked at the Moon with telescopes. And we knew then, just as we know now, that craters are caused by meteorite impacts. There are thousands of meteorites in museums around the world. Most of them are made of nickel & iron. Simple stuff.

And we have actual samples of lunar soil, and while it's not available to you or me, its basic chemical properties are known. Since we've walked on it, we could probably substitute ordinary dirt. After all, all we need to do for this week's challenge is :

MAKE A CRATER

We have the rocks that flew through space, we have the material they hit. HOW HARD CAN IT BE?

The great claim of Science is that we only believe what has been proven to be true. None of this "God told me so" stuff. No Old Wives tales. Science is rigorous! Science is methodical! Science is exact! Science is True! Science Examines Everything! So if meteor impacts created the craters of the Moon, then surely someone, somewhere, has proven that?

Would you believe me if I said that in nearly 400 years, NO ONE, no "scientist", at any rate, has attempted to make even one?

While I think this is a staggeringly obvious oversight, surprisingly, craters-from-meteorite-impacts falls apart as soon as you look at it. Here is what must be duplicated:

Every crater ever observed, tens of thousands in all, are all perfectly circular. Which can only happen if the meteorite lands at perfect right-angles to the surface. A straight vertical drop. And while the Earth may be big enough to draw meteorites into us, and while our atmosphere may dense enough to slow meteors to the necessary perfectly vertical trajectory, none of this applies to the Moon. It has no atmosphere, and its gravity is weak. So why is every extra-terrestrial crater ever observed perfectly circular? Where are the glancing impacts? Elliptical

shapes? Straight line gashes? Shouldn't they be in the majority?

All extraterrestrial craters, every single one, are shallow. How can that be? The crater in Arizona, which actually seems to be an impact crater, is roughly eight times as wide as it is deep. It shows signs of significant erosion, which would imply it was once even deeper. The Moon's Tycho Crater is 17 times as wide as it is deep. Seventeen times. And Tycho is one of the Moon's deeper & supposedly newer craters.

All extraterrestrial craters, all the one's we've had a really close look at, are badly eroded. "Melted", if you like. Supposedly this is because of later meteorite impacts, but if this were true, the Moon's surface should be littered with meteorite debris. It is not.

And then there is the problem of lunar domes. Big flat round domes. Meteors didn't create them, nor were they created by lava flows, since there is no evidence of lava vents, and a lava flow isn't a soap bubble. It never flows round. Go look at Hawaii. Super-hot lava goes where it likes. I will leave aside the fact that the Moon is believed to have gone cold long, long ago & so has no lava, inside or on the surface, which means those domes should have been smashed to pieces eons ago from all those meteorites.

AN alternative theory, first proposed by a rabbi in 1950 (who shall remain nameless), says that both the craters, as well as the domes, were formed when the Moon (and, presumably other similar extraterrestrial bodies) were superheated from an outside source, until their surfaces boiled. I liken it to the bubbles that form in sugar solutions, like fudge. Bubbles are always perfectly circular. If the heat was intense, but brief, it would not penetrate more than a few hundred feet into the surface, which would explain why extraterrestrial craters are shallow. Gas pressure inside the bubbles would eventually burst them, shooting material in all directions, forming the mysterious rays. Sudden removal of the heat would leave unexploded bubbles, which would collapse & form domes. What did astronomers do upon hearing of this theory? Pseudoscientists all, they condemned the rabbi, declaring he was not a member of the club. **Next time: The 5000 year old theory of the Sun.**

Don't fall from the sky! Get your Astrology books from **AstroAmerica!** All the books, all the time, fast service, fair prices.

Order on-line at
www.AstroAmerica.com
Order toll-free: 1-800-475-2272



WHY WHERE
WHAT WHO
WHEN

ELECTIONAL ASTROLOGY

Part 27:

What Clothes to Buy

IN choosing a sign for the Moon the nature of the garment should receive consideration. Thus Aries is suitable for buying hats & headgear; Taurus for neckwear; Cancer for coats, shirts, blouses, vests, etc.; Virgo for gloves; Libra for belts; Sagittarius for skirts, sporting outfits, tailor made costumes & checks; and Pisces for boots, shoes, stockings and socks. If possible there should be a favourable aspect from the planet ruling the color of the garment. The Sun rules gold & yellow; the Moon, silver, grey, yellow, green, brown and opalescent colors; Mercury, yellow; Venus, pale blue, green, pink, turquoise & art shades; Mars, red, scarlet; Jupiter, blue & purple; Saturn, green, black & very dark shades of any color; Uranus, rich dark brown, also checks, stripes, tartans & colour combinations; and Neptune, lilac, lavender, mauve. — **Electional Astrology**, 1937 — *These guidelines would be most useful when shopping for others, as in gift buying.* — **Dave**

Still more from September 22:

- 1888 — National Geographic appears.
- 1908 — Bulgaria declares independence.
- 1927 — Jack Dempsey loses to Gene Tunney
- 1975 — Sarah Jane Moore tries to kill Ford.

The Best Books on:

Progressions

I was asked this week for Nancy Hastings' book, **Secondary Progressions, Time to Remember**. Which, I regret to say, is out of print. When it was new two decades ago, it was almost the only book on progressions in print.

The best book on progressions, better than Nancy's, is **Sophia Mason's Delineation of Progressions**. It's detailed, comprehensive, from a working astrologer, and nicely laid out. I have heard complaints the delineations are excessively harsh, but exactly how much sugar coating do we really want, or need? Better to know the worst, even if it's not likely.

I myself reprinted **Alan Leo's The Progressed Horoscope** a few years back. The book dates from 1905. It is full of an English sense of Pep! and Vigor! and Pull Yourself Up & Do Something, which can be annoying. Unique to this book, delineations include parallels, semi-squares & inconjuncts. Leo ran a mail-order chart business, it seems he profited from the volume.

Leigh Hope Milburn's **The Progressed Horoscope Simplified** dates from 1928. It uses the old good vs: bad aspect, which, in fact, is not in any way shabby. (Leo, by contrast, may have been the very first to explicitly write conjunctions, sextiles, squares, trines, inconjuncts, oppositions, etc.) As progressions show trends, not actual events, keeping up with them gives a necessary framework to transits.

Finally, there's **Blaschke's Astrology, A Language of Life, vol. 1: Progressions**, a staggeringly brilliant compilation of techniques. A must-have.

Born September 22:

- 1961 — Michael Torke, composer.

SOLAR RETURNS FORMULAS & ANALYSES

by **Nance McCullough**

It is Better to use Seconds Rather than Minutes for Erection of the Solar Return Chart

BY using minutes instead of seconds, there can be a 1 to 3 degree difference on the ascendant cusp. The formula for solar return chart erection found in Appendix B uses seconds.

Future solar return ascendants move from year to year in a clockwise manner due to the ascending degree increasing. For example, if the current solar return chart ascendant is turned to that chart's 10th house position, the former 4th house will be the approximate ascendant for next year. I checked out several subsequent year solar return charts, and the ascendants increased between 75 and 92 degrees. Many people have commented that the solar return increases a square (90 degrees) per year, but that is not quite true. If the 90-degree increase were true, then the native would never move from CARDINAL angles to the MUTABLE or FIXED, or vice-versa.

The GMT's of ten subsequent solar returns that I checked showed that the GMT increased between 5 hours 40 minutes & 5 hours 59 minutes. The increase in GMT has the effect of moving each subsequent solar return ascendant forward as described above.

The solar return Moon moves forward between one and two houses each succeeding solar return, making the Moon on the chart appear to be moving counterclockwise. — from **Solar Returns Formulas & Analysis**, by **Nance McCullough**. Used by permission.

