

Excerpt From Pluto: The Evolutionary Journey of the Soul in Relationships, Vol 2

The following is an excerpt from Jeffery's second volume of Pluto. This volume is totally focused on the dynamic of relationships from an evolutionary point of view. This excerpt focuses on the main relationship typings that can define a relationship, and the topic of soul mates, twin souls, karma mates, etc., and how to determine what type is what.

Relationship Types

In this section we will be discussing relationship typing's. There are five primary, archetypal, typing's that two people in a relationship will be defined by. By understanding the archetypal dynamics that are inherent to each typing, and then linking these archetypes to the conditioning nature of past life dynamics, the four natural evolutionary conditions, and the conditioning impact of societal, parental, cultural, and religious imprinting, an even more thorough understanding will occur in your astrological ability to help a couple who is seeking guidance. Within the five primary typing's there are four specialty typing's that can exist or occur WITHIN the five primary typing's.

The five primary relationship typing's are:

- (1) co-dependant
- (2) counselor/counselee
- (3) student/teacher
- (4) sado/masochistic
- (5) self-reliant

The four specialty typing's are:

- (1) soul mates
 - (a) same soul
- (2) karma mates
- (3) twin souls
- (4) evolutionary differences relative to the four natural evolutionary conditions

The most common of all relationship typing's is the co-dependent condition. The co-dependent relationship is a relationship in which both people are dependent on one another for their lives to be sustained. In this condition each person will project their needs upon the other in such a way as to expect each other to perpetually meet those needs. This then becomes the basis of mutual projection wherein each person "out pictures" their inner reality upon one another, this out picturing and projection of inner realities upon one another creating a situation wherein neither person can see clearly, if at all, the actual reality of one another. By expecting each other to perpetually meet each others needs the stage becomes set for conditional love: I will love you if.....

In this way, each person can progressively loose sight of their own identities because of the co-dependent needs. The two people become so hopelessly enmeshed that the normal boundaries that generate a healthy relationship, in which each others individual lives can blossom and thrive, becomes non-existent. In the worst cases, each person in such a relationship will feel that they simply can not live without the other person, and will do whatever is necessary to maintain and sustain it. In effect, each person makes the other person their very reason for living as if they were each de facto gods and goddesses for each other. If, for any reason, one of the partners is not allowed to be in the relationship - death occurs, for example - or one of the people decides to change the dynamics because of the enmeshment and co-dependency, then the other person will feel like they are dying; can not live without them. The psychological state this will lead too is truly tragic and problematic. Some will contemplate, or actually commit, suicide.

The next relationship typing is the counselor/counselee condition. This is a relationship condition in which one person feels that another person has some vital knowledge or information of a psychological nature that they need, knowledge or information which they feel that they them self do not have. And the other person will feel that they do indeed have this information or knowledge to offer the other person. The person who feels that they have this knowledge will typically seem quite mature and integrated, and will present themselves to almost everyone as very adept and 'together'. They, indeed, can appear as quite insightful and reflect a wisdom that is attractive to many people.

Yet, underneath this persona, will be a person who is highly insecure at an emotional level. This type of person will typically have an emphasized emotional fear of loss, betrayal, abandonment, fears related to violations of trust, and fears of persecution if they reveal too much about their actual inner reality. Through the psychological dynamic of compensation they will attract those who "appear" more needy than themselves. The key word here is appear. This is because they are just as needy, perhaps more so, than those who are in touch with their needs. This compensatory act of attracting those who appear more needy than themselves is created in order for them to feel secure in a relationship: by presenting themselves as someone who can help another understand themselves in psychological terms, they think they are guaranteeing their emotional security because of being in a position of emotional/psychological control; this person needs me.

These people have a knack or ability to key in on the weakest psychological/emotional link in the other person in such a way as to present themselves as the person who will help them out of that situation. Yet, if the other person actually begins to heal, or to begin to understand things for them self, then the counselor type will feel threatened and insecure. Consequently, this person can be very manipulative in quite covert ways in order to maintain their position within the relationship: their emotional security is at stake. In the worst cases, this person, who once seemed so nice and helpful, becomes abusive and vindictive as their deepest fears of emotional loss, abandonment, and their perception of betrayal become played out yet again.

Conversely, the counselee in this type of relationship will present them self as someone who needs the counselor. In the beginning of the relationship, the counselee will feel, again, that the counselor symbolizes or represents something that they need which in their own estimation they do not have. In this way, they give their power up to the counselor who is all too happy to take power for it serves their need for emotional and psychological security. The inherent problem is that the counselee will only maintain the relationship for the duration of the need(s) that brought them into the relationship in the first place. And once these needs are satisfied or met, they will then want to terminate the relationship either because they have begun to learn how to satisfy their own needs, or because they will uncover another set of needs that the existing counselor/partner cannot meet. Thus, they will become attracted to another counselor type who now represents or symbolizes the ability to satisfy these new needs.

For both the counselor and counselee the karma of manipulation and use can exist or occur; for the reasons that are unique to each. Both are dependent on their roles in order to feel secure. Typically, this type of relationship reflects an inherent imbalance wherein the counselor does most of the giving, and the counselee does most of the receiving. Yet, paradoxically, the counselor is all too happy to give for this makes him or her feel secure. But, underneath this apparent happiness, the counselor is not so happy because their core needs are not being met. And these core needs are to get in touch with their own fears of loss, betrayal, etc. and to examine the causal factors and reasons for these fears. This is exactly why this type will unconsciously recreate loss, violations of trust, and their perception of betrayal via this type of relationship. By repeating this dynamic thru the psychology of repetitive compulsion they will, at some point, become emotionally and psychologically honest with them self. When this occurs, they may become the person who is the counselee in this type of relationship typing!

The next relationship typing is a variation of the counselor/counselee. This is the student/teacher type of relationship. Many of the same dynamics that are present in the counselor/counselee type of relationship exist within this typing. One of the core differences is that in this type of relationship the content is not specifically psychological. It has much more to do with teachings that reflect life itself in a broad sense. Depending on the evolutionary states of the people involved, these teachings can be anything from the spiritual /metaphysical to just the nuts and bolts of how to live in order to survive.

Whatever the case may be, the core dynamics of a relationship defined in inequality of roles, and the emotional investment in those roles for security purposes still exist. The high probability for manipulative behavior in order to sustain those roles also exists. And just as the counselor can experience being used and then left, so too can the teacher. Both the counselor and the teacher must realize, also, that they can also use their partners relative to the position or role within the relationship that they are invested in because of their security needs.

The next and, perhaps, the most difficult relationship typing is the sadomasochistic relationship. Perhaps it is the most difficult because it has so many forms and expressions that many people do not recognize it for what it is. For example, it can be as simple as a man and women doing the same kind of job, yet the women

makes less money. In one form or another, this type of relationship seems to permeate the interrelationships of men and women, and, indeed, the relationships of even gay men and women.

The core archetypal dynamics that generate and lead to this type of relationship were detailed above when the Garden of Eden Myth was discussed. It may be useful to reiterate these dynamics: a permeating guilt that leads to atonement or anger, dominance and submission, and inferiority and superiority. And within these dynamics the implicit teaching that flesh is antagonistic to spirit, and that for any real growth or gain to occur that suffering is a prerequisite to such growth.

In a masochistic pathology there will always be three messages, or thought patterns, that permeate the subconscious of such individuals. These underlying thought patterns will thus condition, control, and create the circumstantial realities of the masochistic type of person. These three thought patterns are:

(1) I deserve pain, punishment, crisis, suffering, humility (to be humiliated), and denial and I do not know why. In addition, the dynamic of denial /avoidance expresses itself as a suppression of the truth that is causing this to occur in such a way as to make excuses that will always sound like rational reasons in order to justify such conditions. And within this the related thought: there must be something wrong with me.

(2) For my needs to be met, I must hurt first.

(3) I am essentially worthless, while intellectually knowing better.

In essence, a masochistic orientation to reality will create a circumstantial reality that is defined by personal crucifixion; to compulsively sacrifice oneself in a myriad of ways. When atonement is linked with guilt the behavioral manifestation can only lead to pain and crisis. Self-sacrificial behavior, pain, and the creation of inner and outer crisis generates an analytical consciousness wherein analysis linked with crisis, etc., produces self-knowledge. In effect, a masochistic type can only learn about themselves through the creation of crisis and the analysis of self that this will produce. Crisis also has the effect of removing the psychology of denial and avoidance of the truth because of the repetitive nature of crisis formation in the masochist. At some point, the masochist will simply become totally exhausted from the cycle of repetitive crisis and desire to change. When this occurs, the blinders of excuse making will come off. Reality will set in. They can change.

In relationships, the masochist compulsively and habitually attracts one of two types of people. One type is what I call the "emotional wounded birds" of this world. This is the type that needs extensive emotional and psychological healing or repair. They are quite typically very narcissistic, and have no real capacity to acknowledge the actual needs or identity of their masochistic partner. Typically, they are so deeply insecure that they will create an idea or image in their minds of who they think their masochistic partner is, and then expect that partner to be that idea or image. Consequently, the masochistic partner is left feeling completely misunderstood and invalidated, no matter how many confrontations or pleas for recognition occur. In this situation, the masochistic person does almost all the giving, and is constantly putting out the emotional brush fires that the 'wounded bird' is creating. It is as if the masochistic partner might as well walk around the house with a white uniform on, red cross on the shoulder, and a name tag on the breast!

The other type that the masochist will attract is what I call the "silver tongue devil type". This is the type who knows how to present themselves; they know what to say in order to "hook" the masochistic type. Yet, once the masochist bites on the hook and makes the decision to be in the relationship, the actual emotional and psychological agenda or reality of the 'silver tongue devil' becomes revealed. And this reality has nothing to do with their original presentation of themselves. At this point, the masochist becomes totally disillusioned; another crisis is at hand. This is also the type that can promise change in order to re-secure the relationship. Yet, once it is resecured they revert to the old patterns. And, of course, these two types that the masochist can attract can be combined in the same person.

The masochistic type of person reflects a natural kind of innocence that creates naivete and gullibility. They naturally see the spirit or POTENTIAL of an individual, and then expect the person to either be the potential that they perceive, or to actualize what their spirit reflects. Rarely, if ever, do their partners do either. Thus, disillusionment sets in; more crisis. Masochists have a need to be needed; they live for it.

In the sadistic pathology anger is linked with guilt instead of atonement. As a result, the subconscious

messages or thought patterns become these:

(1) I have been made to feel guilty and I am angry because of it. Thus, I want to hurt others, and make them feel as guilty or as bad as I do.

(2) I want to make others atone for their mistakes or sins. I want to humiliate others so that I will humiliate myself.

(3) By punishing others for their imperfections, mistakes, or sins I am punishing myself. And, again, this pathology will also make excuses sounding like rational reasons as a way of avoiding/denying the truth of what is actually happening.

These three thought patterns will thus create a circumstantial reality that is defined, in essence, by dominance and submission; the master/slave, superior/inferior, and the victor and vanquished orientations to reality. In men, this leads to a related dynamic that is projected upon women: an underlying or latent fear called the castration complex. For women, who can also be sadistic, the castration complex also applies. This complex is psychological, not literal! The essence of this complex is the fear or feeling that the opposite gender will disempower, undermine, capture, enslave, or in some undefined way destroy oneself. Consequently, the sadistic pathology will desire to hurt another first, to attack first, to destroy first, to "get even" first, before it allows itself to get hurt, etc. For individuals who are defined by this sadistic pathology, there is always an underlying feeling that someone or somebody is out to get them, to attack them, to hurt them, and to victimize them. And instead of feeling that they deserve this, as the masochist does, they will feel victimized by such feelings. The masochist also feels victimized. But the masochist feels that they deserve to be punished; to be a victim. The sadist feels only anger because of feeling victimized in this way. When anger reacts to the feeling of being victimized in this way, then the anger can only destroy or hurt others; to punish others for the underlying guilt that resides in these individuals psyche or subconscious. In some people, the sadistic and masochistic pathology operate together, the manifestations of each dependent of specific circumstances. In classical psychology, this is known as the passive/aggressive type.

The sadomasochistic relationship typing has a wide range of behavioral applications. In its most overt forms, this dynamic is easily recognized by any of us. The most overt forms, of course, are the classical forms of sadomasochistic sexual practices that most people have some awareness of: the whips and chains, the leather costumes, the spiked heels, all the equipment that creates sexual/emotional torture, and so on. The operative psychological/emotional dynamic in such overt forms is intense pain, and the RELEASE from such pain; intense suffering leading to a sense of freedom when the release from the suffering occurs. In recent modern history, the most gross, yet most recognizable, person who embodied the darkest and most distorted dimensions of this archetype was Marquis de Sade.

In his time the sadomasochistic archetype was actually given a fancy philosophical name by the "noble" class that practiced it. It was called the "libertinage" philosophy. The implied teaching was: "in order to be free, to liberate, one must suffer". The first premise in this "philosophy" was that God was inherently evil, and that to do God's work, one must embrace evil and "to confound the laws of nature, to turn the laws of nature upside down". As ridiculous as this may sound to you, try to understand that such distorted thinking directly emanates from the equally distorted religious thought embodied in the Garden of Eden Myth: that flesh is in conflict to spirit. The implied guilt linked with flesh thus distorts the life of the flesh (senses) because of the suppression of them via the religious injunction to do so. Before de Sade, the effect of this teaching has existed since its origin. For example, the self-flagellation of so many pious monastic Christians during the 1400 and 1500's, which is still seen today among some of those in the Islamic world. And during the Crusades, it was a common practice, under the banner of The Cross, to sexually torture and mutilate men and women (mostly women) in unspeakable ways in an effort to extract CONFESSIONS about their immoral life practices, and to force them to turn in other people who were also living immorally. Among the Jewish people, it is embodied in the teaching, amongst others, of the "chosen few" wherein to be especially chosen or favored by God demanded persecution by others.

In other races it also exists. For example, certain American Indian tribes proscribe the Sun Dance in which metal is pierced into the nipples of an individual, and the metal is attached to ropes tied to a pole. The Sun Dancer then will progressively suspend himself so that the body is only held up by the metal attached to the ropes. The pain/suffering is then meant to induce "visions" from on high.

The point that I am making is that this sadomasochistic archetype permeates the collective psyche of

millions of people living today; and most do not know it. Yes, the most overt forms can be recognized by almost all of us. And in this recognition, we recoil in shock and horror; "how could anybody be like that, to do such things, to allow oneself to be such a way", and so on. In our times, this dynamic is most easily understood by us as the battered wife syndrome, the abused child syndrome, and the like. All's we have to do is turn on the television set and observe the next set of people, on the increasingly popular TV talk shows, discussing their childhood abuse to understand how extensively this S&M archetype permeates society. But how many of us can recognize the less overt forms of this archetype? And what are these less overt forms ?

Again, can it not be seen in the man and women doing the same job and the women makes less ? Can it not be seen in a man or a women who withholds their emotional or sexual attention from their partner as a form of punishment ? Can it not be seen in various forms of perpetual criticism from one partner to another; or both. This form can also be linked with "teasing" when that teasing has a motivation of humiliation. Can it not be seen in the man who expects the women to be merely a vicarious extension of his reality whose only purpose is to SERVE his needs ? That the women is inferior to him: a second class citizens at best. Is this not a form of dominance and submission ? And why is it that when a women wants to fully actualize herself that she is considered, consciously or unconsciously, as wanting to be "like a man" ? From mans point of view, is this not an example of the castration complex ? And why is it culturally ok in every society for a man to flaunt his sexuality, to brag about his conquests, to talk about women in the ways that they do, but not ok for a women to do exactly the same? Is this not traceable to the original archetype of The Garden of Eden Myth wherein man is now "getting back" at women for the original temptation ? Thus, the rape of a women. This is really an act of power and rage linked with the castration complex generated in the original Myth. Or, more commonly, the situation of a man who can be emotional and placating to the women in order to have sex with her, and then when the act of sex is over he is suddenly emotionally remote or overtly/covertly disdainful of the women; sometimes even angry at her. Why? He has given in to the temptation ! If you can understand this, then you will understand why women has to be PURE, and why women feel that they must be pure for their men: atonement linked with the original guilt generates the need to be clean: pure.

It is very difficult to overstate the degree to which this archetype permeates the collective unconscious of millions of people now living. And just as the nature of the seed that is planted in the ground determines the shape and form of the plant that we can see, so too does this seed of the Garden and Eden Myth residing in the collective unconscious determine the shape and form of what we can see by way of its effects into the reality of the interrelationships between people; particularly between men and women. And, by way of extension, to how human beings interrelate with the rest of Nature in all of its forms.

Astrologically, the sadomasochistic archetype correlates with the signs of Virgo and Pisces. From around 0 A.D. until now we have been living in the Pisces Age, and since around 1200 A.D. the Virgo subage within the Pisces Age. Many years ago, for example, I did a research study of people who consciously defined themselves as masochistic or sadistic. This was done in the context of a specialized group of people who were members of an S&M "church". Of all the people studied, ninety percent had an emphasized 12th or 6th House, a stellium of planets in Pisces or Virgo, and/or the South and North Nodes of the Moon in the 6th or 12th Houses. This should not be surprising when we consider the birthchart of Jesus of Nazareth who ushered in the Pisces Age for western peoples. The chart that I use, the one that makes most sense to me, was a chart that was rectified by the theologian/astrologer Donald Jacobs. In this chart, Pluto is conjunct Mars in Virgo which are both retrograde in the 9th House, and in opposition to the Sun, Moon, Venus, Jupiter, Uranus and Saturn is Pisces within the 3rd House. And Neptune, the ruler of Pisces, is conjunct the South Node in Scorpio. In essence, the life of Jesus was a life of "suffering for our sins", of trying to absolve our guilt thru absorbing our karma thru the act of sacrificing his own life, of "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do", and, also, of an attendant guilt based in IMPERFECTION which is reflected in his own words: "Father, take this cup from me". This means: Lord I am weak and not perfect enough for the job that you have given to me, please let me go. The implication here is that if one is pure enough, perfect enough, good enough, then that which we are given to do will simply occur. But perfection, in this context, can only be linked with a God that is conceived as perfect, and the human being is something less than this because of the TEMPTATION that was succumbed too in the Garden Of Eden Myth; the doctrine of original sin. So the human being in general, and women in particular, is never good enough, never perfect enough, to do what is given to one to do. This archetypically conditioned psychology thus sustains and perpetuates GUILT relative to the God that is conceived as perfect. The bottom line in all of this is that the sadomasochistic archetype will be sustained until and unless the Christian and Islamic Doctrines that conceive of God in this way are changed. As an example, these doctrines state that what is called God is the origin of all things. If so, then wherein lies the origin of imperfection? Wherein lies the origin of evolution?

Wherein lies the origin of anger? Guilt? Of sexuality? And so on. If one can embrace this, then we can see that what is called God is also an EVOLVING FORCE seeking to perfect ITSELF. Understood in this way, love and compassion will replace guilt, and the atonement/anger that this generates. Natural law will become that by which the human being understands life, not man made laws that distort natural law. It is only in this way, that the sadomasochistic archetype will no longer exist. And until this occurs, the sadomasochistic acts, on a large scale, such as the holocaust against the Jews and Gypsies that Hitler fomented, or the "ethnic cleansing insanity" that now engulfs what was once Yugoslavia as of this writing, or the dark forces of Russia who wish to return Russia to a state of domination via purging non-Russians from its borders, and so on will continue. As we move towards the Aquarian Age, the transition necessary that will allow an embracing of Natural Law versus man made law that distorts natural law, is underway. The intention of Pluto is Scorpio, relative to Neptune and Uranus being in Capricorn, is to accelerate this transition. This cycle of these planets in those sign only occurs every five hundred years. The last time this occurred, the transition into Humanism began relative to the last renaissance in the West.

Astrologically speaking, we all have the signs Virgo and Pisces in our horoscope somewhere. The question becomes this: Where and how is this archetype of sadomasochism operating in your life? It is exactly where you are most susceptible to this archetype via the impact of the original Garden of Eden Myth, and its permeation into the collective unconscious: the seed in the ground !

The next relationship typing is what I call the self-sufficient typing. The self-sufficient type of relationship is an archetype in which both individuals have learned how to identify and meet their own needs. The resulting attitude of such people becomes one wherein each will feel that they are in the relationship simply because they want to be: not because of what the other can do for them. The element of compulsion and projected needs is entirely eliminated. Such people are simply free from within themselves to be together with another person. As a result, such individuals have the evolved capacity to see their partners clearly and objectively. The feeling of being threatened or insecure, because of each other's individual needs or desires to actualize in the ways that each requires, is eliminated. Instead, each person will encourage and facilitate the individual development of one another. This allows for an unconditional love: I will love you always, no matter what. This is totally different than the conditional love that manifests in every other relationship typing thus far discussed.

The self-sufficient relationship typing does not mean that each person does not have needs. The difference is that each person has learned how to meet their own needs without projecting those needs on the partner. Such individuals are fine whether they are in a relationship or not. Because these types of people are not projecting their needs upon their partners, the partner, paradoxically, is all too happy to meet those needs; everyone has needs in a relationship.

Evolutionarily speaking, it takes a long time to arrive to a condition of self-sufficiency. As a result, this relationship typing is not common. In the western world roughly fifteen percent of all relationships will be in this condition. The nature of cultural and religious conditioning promotes DEPENDENCY on EXTERNAL factors in order to feel secure. From a religious point of view, this is reflected in a God who is somehow OUTSIDE of the individual. From a cultural point of view, women have been more or less controlled by the nature of patriarchal societies. Thus, women have been conditioned to be dependent on men. And men have been conditioned to have women dependent on them: thus, they are dependent for women to be dependent on them. In effect, a typical man's egocentric sense of maleness is conditioned by this kind of feminine dependency upon him. It is for such reasons that the self-sufficient type of relationship is not common.

Astrologically speaking, the archetypes that correlate to self-sufficiency or self-reliance are Taurus, the 2nd House, and the inner side of Venus. Remember, Venus has a dual rulership: Taurus and Libra. The Libra side of Venus reflects a persons needs that are projected upon a partner: co-dependency. It also reflects our capacity to give to, and receive, from a partner. The Taurus side of Venus reflects the inner awareness in all us of what our needs are, needs that must be met in order to live; survive. It also reflects our inner relationship to ourselves. Thus, all birthcharts will have a sign on the 2nd House, and the planetary ruler of that sign will be located in the birthchart somewhere by its own house and sign placement. This planetary ruler will be making aspects to other planets. The sign Taurus will be somewhere in the birthchart. And Venus will be in a house and sign, with its aspects. In combination, these symbols correlate with how an individual can learn this vital lesson of self-sufficiency. In a Composite Chart, the couple will have a sign on the 2nd House, it will have a planetary ruler located somewhere, Taurus will be somewhere, and Venus will be somewhere. In combination, this is how any couple can learn to be self-sufficient together. These points and principles will be more fully developed and examined in the next chapter called "ASTROLOGICAL

METHODS AND PRINCIPLES OF IDENTIFYING OUR ESSENTIAL RELATIONSHIP NEEDS".

It is interesting to note, now that Pluto has been transiting through Scorpio since late 1983, that the buzz words in relationship counseling have been "enmeshment", "the wounded child", and "establishing your boundaries". Remember that the opposite sign of Scorpio is Taurus. Thus, evolutionarily speaking, Pluto's intention within the collective Soul is to destroy excessive dependency on any external situation for security reasons. The evolutionary enforcement of learning self-reliance and self-sufficiency is at hand. This is why so many relationships have simply been blown to pieces, relationships that were once so close, so loving: and, yet, to co-dependent. New relationship models are in the process of evolving. Evolution is always preceded, in varying degrees of intensity, by involution. Involution means to undo or destroy something that is currently existing. Evolution then follows this involutory change. One of these new models will be, in a common sense, the self-sufficient typing that we have been discussing.

We now come to the four specialty typing's that can exist or occur within the five primary relationship typing's. The most common of these four specialty typing's is what I call Karma Mates. Now that you have gotten this far in the book, it should be fairly clear to you what karma mates are: two people who have had past life connections and experiences that are not finished or resolved. Past life connections and experiences is a very inclusive and broad situation that can be very simple or complex depending on the two people in question. Karma, again, is the simple and NATURAL law of every action having a proportionate reaction. Karma is inclusive: from 100% positive to 100% negative or difficult. In Synastry Charts, again, karma can exist between two people as distinct individuals, and in Composite Charts karma can exist within the relationship as a unit: as exemplified before, the couple who had Pluto square Venus in the Composite Chart could have excluded other people from their life completely because of their excessive co-dependency upon one another relative to their fears of emotional betrayal by other people. This was a mutual choice - Pluto square Venus in the Composite Chart - that could create a mutual karma in which they, as a unit, experience being excluded by other people at some point after they made their mutual decision to do so for themselves.

The natural tendency in all people when they feel that they have been taken advantage of by another, or have been purposely hurt, used, manipulated, had their trust violated or betrayed, or experienced someone else creating these situations for someone they love, is to be vindictive; the need to get back or even at someone, to create a sense of justice in an otherwise perceived unjust situation. This natural tendency in all of us correlates with Pluto, Scorpio, and the 8th House. This natural tendency can be controlled within consciousness as it naturally exists, and it can be controlled or modified by conditioning patterns of a cultural and/or religious nature: "God will take care of it", "let the justice system work", and so on. Acting upon the impulse to get even with someone, whatever the specific nature of the situation is about, is the CAUSAL factor in specific karmic conditions of a personal nature that can exist between two people. This type of karma, rooted in the desire to get even, will always be of a difficult or negative nature.

It is very important to understand this point because by acting upon this impulse to get even, to right a wrong, the specific karma that is created, or is pre-existing from other lifetimes, will or can be sustained for an incredibly long time: many, many lifetimes. This is so because not to many people have a consciousness that has evolved to the point of being able to see or understand the ORIGINAL cause or reason for any currently existing condition or situation. By acting upon the tendency to get even this can perpetuate whatever the karmic situation or condition is about. This is so because most people's orientation to, and perception of, reality is limited to the life that they are currently living.

Thus, if a person experiences emotional betrayal by another person in the life that is currently being lived, then that person most commonly will want to get even with the betrayer because the betrayer is perceived to be the CAUSE of the emotional pain created in the act of betrayal. For the sake of example, what if the one who was betrayed in this life did in fact betray the other in another life? And, in that life, the one who is now the betrayer felt exactly the same as the one who was betrayed in this life: the need to get even. And so it goes, cycle after cycle, a karma that is sustained over many lifetimes. A modern example that can illustrate this point, one that we can all recognize, is the example of psychological or sexual abuse that occurs within families over generations, the abuse being perpetuated thru cause and effect from parent to child. And when the child who has been abused becomes an adult, he or she will have the tendency to abuse their own child. At what point does or can this cycle of karma (cause and effect) between such family members stop? And how can it stop? What is necessary to stop it?

For many of us it can be very difficult NOT to act upon the inherent Plutonian desire to get even, to create justice relative to an unjust situation, to right a wrong. Obviously, this is a very complex and difficult

dynamic in life to truly understand let alone KNOWING what the "right" thing is to do in any given situation. For those who do have an expanded consciousness that is able to "see" beyond the life that is currently being lived, this expanded consciousness thus allowing for a knowing or perception of the original cause in any given karmic situation, the "right" thing to do can be seen. Great. But most of us do not have such an expanded consciousness. So then what? Perhaps the simplest answer lies in the axiom: two wrongs do not make a right. So in the illustration of the abuse that was passed down from generation to generation of family members, at some point one of these family members will break the chain of karma by acting upon this axiom. In many situations this will require a conscious act of courage to do so, and require a tremendous act of will - Pluto - to resist the natural tendency to get even.

Karma can also be very positive. The tendency in many people today, who try to understand the complexity of karma, is to think that karma is generally negative. Positive karma always results from a purity of desire to do that which is inherently the right thing to do. The key here is PURITY of desire. For example, if I desire to help someone in some way, yet my motivation (desire) in doing this is to reap some reward for myself, then the desire to help is not pure; the desire has an ulterior motive. Conversely, if this desire to help another is motivated by the intention to help for its own sake, because it is the inherently right thing to do, then the purity of the desire speaks for itself. Yes, there is an inherent right and wrong from a ultimate point of view. This inherent right and wrong has nothing to do with religions. It simply exists of itself, and is part of our consciousness as naturally created. In consciousness as naturally structured, the awareness of what is naturally right and wrong is reflected in our sense of conscience. If we do something that is inherently wrong, then our conscience creates a feeling or sense of guilt; this type of guilt also being natural to consciousness. Not many of us would disagree, for example, that it is inherently wrong to sexually abuse a child. Or that it is inherently wrong to emotionally betray another person. Or to cheat, lie, purposely hurt another, and so on. Conversely, if we do something that we know is an inherently right thing to do, then our conscience knows it to be so at an instinctual level.

Again, astrologically speaking, difficult karmic situations generally exist in Synastry and Composite Charts when stressful or hard aspects exist between planets. Favorable or positive karmic situations generally exist when non-stressful or harmonious aspects exist between planets. As most astrologers know from looking at many charts, most Synastry and Composite Charts have both stressful and non-stressful aspects between planets. Thus, most of the relationships that we have with other people reflect a combination of positive and difficult (in varying degrees) karmic conditions.

Karma can also be confused with evolutionary necessity. For example, an individual may have spent many past lifetimes denying or avoiding emotional reality. They could have avoided this reality by trying to embrace a transcendent reality reflected in some spiritual teaching, and isolating themselves in some kind of religious or spiritual environment: a monastery for example. At some point in this person's evolutionary development it would become necessary to create a life(s) in which that which had been avoided or denied could no longer be denied or avoided. Consequently, through evolutionary necessity, the Soul of such an individual would create one or more lifetimes in which emotional dynamics would be the very essence of the life(s) being lived. And because of the prior life(s) resistance to this, the nature of the life(s) in which the emotional dynamics were experienced could be very difficult: the circumstances of such life(s) enforcing the emotions to be experienced. These circumstances that the Soul would create could be of a continuing chain of events, throughout the life, of an emotional nature so that there would be no way to avoid the emotions. And these circumstances would include people whose actions or behaviors created difficult emotional conditions or situations for the individual. For example, being born into a family in which the mother tried to murder the individual as a child. And, throughout the life, other difficult emotional situations created by other people. The point I am making is this: evolutionary necessity has dictated this situation. There is no pre-existing karma to explain it; no specific prior life dynamics between the people involved that would account for it. Yet, the temptation for many who embrace the teaching and law of karma, is to think that if this individual is experiencing such difficult situations that he or she MUST HAVE DONE THE SAME OR SIMILAR ACTIONS THEMSELVES to the people who are now doing this to the individual.

At this point it may be useful to remember that all of us, at a Soul level, simply create the conditions necessary to facilitate our evolutionary progression, and to work out the difficult aspects of our karma, personally and with other people, in the ways that we do. WE ARE ALL RESPONSIBLE FOR OUR OWN ACTIONS. From the largest point of view, an ultimate point of view, there are no victims.

The next specialty typing is the infamous Soul Mates. And within this typing there exists a subtyping: the same Soul. In the last decade or too, it seems that so many people have been consumed by the desire to

find their Soul Mate. Much of this has been fueled by the appearance of many books on this subject, complete with guidelines and instructions of how to attract and secure such a partner. For those of you who have been doing astrological counseling for a period of time, you probably have had the repeated experience of yet another client racing through the door, with yet another chart in hand, and with the exasperated plea: "Is this my Soul Mate?"

Unfortunately, the conceptual basis of what a Soul Mate actually is has been horribly clouded and confused by a diversity of opinions from too many sources. So, I will share my opinion of what a Soul Mate is. The opinion or way that I understand what a Soul Mate is comes from the teachings of many God-realized Souls such as Jesus of Nazareth, and others. It is simply defined this way: Soul Mates are two people who have independently acted upon their desires to embrace a spiritual or transcendent reality, and the real purpose of the union with one another is to continue their individual spiritual development BECAUSE OF AND THROUGH THE RELATIONSHIP. In spiritual terms, this is called the path of the householder, versus the path of the monastic.

This does not mean that these two people are perfect. It does mean that they both have embraced a transcendent or spiritual principle as the guiding principles in their individual, thus relationship, life. Thus, there is a common spiritual (philosophical) foundation upon which the relationship is built and based. As a result, there is a larger point of view to refer and defer to. This then allows for unconditional love and support for one another, versus conditional love. Conditional love is one of the primary breeding grounds through which difficult karmic situations or conditions can be created. Unconditional love is one of the primary breeding grounds through which harmonious or positive karmic situations or conditions is created. Thus, true Soul Mates only have positive karmic conditions or situations that are mutually supportive and beneficial to each other. Soul Mates, evolutionarily speaking, is a condition that is evolved into from the most common of relationship unions: Karma Mates.

A sub typing within Soul Mates is the phenomena of the same Soul. What this means is that in certain states of advanced evolution, the spiritual state defined earlier, a Soul can manifest itself in more than one body/personality/ego at a time. In essence, the Soul, in order to accelerate its evolution through the progressive elimination of all separating desires, can manifest itself in what appears to be different people who exist at the same time and place, at the same time in different places, or both. These different people can look very different or the same, can dress very different or the same, can have very different life experiences or experiences that are remarkably similar with key variations, come from the same or different cultures, be the same or opposite sex, and so on.

The classical or archetypal feeling in each of the ego's or personalities that the Soul has created in order to accelerate its evolution in this way, is one in which there is a deep, permeating sense of not being complete; that there is a great inner existential void. Even when everything else in their life is so full, including a rich and experiential spiritual life, the different "individuals" who emanate from the same Soul have this inner feeling of something missing: it haunts their conscious sense of self. This feeling is registered in the ego's of the different personalities (people) that the Soul has created. Archetypically, there is a reason for this feeling. And the reason is that, at some point, the Soul who has splintered itself in these ways must merge back into itself the different components of itself that took on the FORM of distinct and separate people. This is no different than the Ultimate Source Of Creation projecting the totality of Itself into what appears to be the distinct and different forms of the manifested Creation. The act of Creation is an act of expansion. Through the natural law of polarity, expansion is met by contraction; like the rhythm of a heartbeat. And just as the Ultimate Source, God, calls back to Itself that which It has created, this call reflected as the transcendent impulse in the human being for example, so too does the Soul, who has splintered itself for evolutionary reasons, call back to itself the different components of itself that has manifested as "different people".

These "different people" that emanate from the same Soul are reflections of a complex of different desires, each ego that is created by the same Soul acting out these desires in an accelerated way. In other words, instead of the Soul creating just one life at a time in order to act out the myriad of separating desires that exist within it, the Soul has now evolved to a point where it can create simultaneous lifetimes in order to accelerate the elimination of separating desires.

Again, the Soul must be quite advanced evolutionarily speaking. This means that the Soul must have evolved to the spiritual state that was defined earlier. Since this state only embraces 5% or so of all peoples on the planet, the situation wherein the Soul meets itself in the form of people who appear separate is not

common. And it is not common for another reason. Generally, the complex of various separating desires that the Soul is acting out, in an accelerated fashion, by manifesting itself in "different" people at the same time are relatively compatible. Because these desires are relatively compatible the Soul is able to integrate the lessons and realizations that the various desires and evolutionary intentions create without needing to actually meet itself in the form of the different people that it has created. The spiritual state of evolution allows this. However, in some Souls at this level of evolution, there can exist certain conditions that will create a situation wherein the Soul will meet itself in the form of what appears to be the different people. The intention of this situation is the same: for the Soul to call back, merge, to itself its different components in order for an integration to occur within itself, which then allows for a total integration with God to occur. So what conditions lead to this situation of the Soul having to meet itself in the form of the different people it has created? The primary condition is one wherein the Soul has separating desires of an antithetical nature. Desires that are in opposition to themselves. An example of such antithetical desires would be a Soul who had desires of a sexual nature that, if acted upon, would conflict with other desires of a purely spiritual or transcendent nature. Of course, the apparent conflict within this Soul only exists because of the teaching that spirit and flesh are antagonistic. The Soul who has accepted this teaching would thus have this conflict. Thus, the desires of a purely spiritual or transcendent nature would JUDGE the desires of a sexual nature as WRONG or impure. And, yet, the evolution of the Soul is based on the elimination of all separating desires, whatever those desires are. And that which is desired must manifest into empirical reality for it to be acted out: eliminated.

The intensity of the inner conflict within this Soul would thus create "different" people who each embodied a nexus of desires that were in conflict to themselves within the Soul. In this way, they are acted out simultaneously in an accelerated fashion. The purpose of the "different" people who would actually meet in "real" life, again, is for the Soul to merge back to itself its different components: desires. This allows for total integration of the Soul to occur. For this purpose to be achieved, the Soul must necessarily CONFRONT itself in the form of these "different" people. By confronting itself in this way, the original cause creating this situation is also confronted: in this example, it is reflected in the types of desires that are antithetical to themselves because of the accepted teaching that spirit and flesh are antagonistic to themselves. The purpose of the confrontation that the Soul is posing for itself in the form of the "different" people that it has created, is one of CHANGING the basis of the judgment generating the original conflict: in this case, that spirit and flesh are not antagonistic.

This is a really interesting dynamic because when these "different" people meet in actual life, it is as if the Soul is confronting itself by way of the types of dialogs that would occur among these people. And because these people emanate from the same Soul that had a conflict relative to the nature of its different desires, the nature of these dialogs could be quite confrontive. The positive reason for confrontation with another, or within oneself, is to generate an awareness of some pre-existing limitation of a relatively fixed nature that must be changed in order for evolution to proceed. Conversely, since these different people do emanate from the same Soul, there is an overwhelming sense of recognition of one another when they do meet. And when these people do meet, because the Soul intends to merge back to itself its different components - desires manifesting as different people - the process of reunion begins.

In the beginning of this reunion, the different people who meet can manifest a resistance to one another. The reason for this is: the ego in each person has defined itself as a separate individual. This is a reflection of the separating desire inherent to the Soul. Thus, for the ego to let go of itself, to merge back to the Soul that created it, is to simultaneously ignite the fear of personal dissolution. So, in the beginning of such a dynamic, there is attraction and repulsion. Over time, such fears will subside. As they do so, the different people that the Soul has created will become ever closer to one another. The last stages of this process will manifest in such a way that the different people will finally commit to one another in a marriage type of dynamic. When this occurs, it will be a relationship within the specialty typing called Soul Mates. When this evolutionary process culminates, the manifestation of the different people will no longer exist. The merging of the Soul's different components, reflected in antithetical desires as the different people, has occurred. Thus, the Soul is now fully integrated, and ready to begin the conscious merging of itself back to its own Source: God.

The next specialty typing is called Twin Souls. Twin Souls are simply Souls that were created by God at exactly the same point in time, and who have been evolving thru time and space at exactly the same rate. Twin Souls, as a result, have had almost identical lifetimes in the sense of acting upon the types of desires that are unique to nature of the Souls themselves. Thus, life after life, the types of lives that Twin Souls create are essentially identical. Twin Souls look alike whether they are male or female, they will generally

wear the same kinds of clothes, have the same kind of dreams, fears, thoughts, perceptions, and be psychologically and philosophically orientated to phenomenal reality in the same ways. Twin Souls are not the same Soul as just discussed. They are separate Souls, yet Souls that are essentially identical.

Twin Souls rarely meet themselves. The reason for this is that the very purpose of relationships is to encounter or experience the nature of our personal limitations. By experiencing and confronting our limitations as they interface with another person, a metamorphosis of those limitations occur. Thus, we evolve. Since Twin Souls are essentially identical there is no evolutionary need, requirement, or purpose for such Souls to actually meet; or to be in a relationship with one another. In all the years that I have been counseled people through astrology, which now totals over 15,000 people, I have fifteen documented cases of Twin Souls who have actually meet. And out of those fifteen cases one set of these Souls actually tried to live together. After a short period of time, after the original fascination and amazement wore off, this couple separated because there was no REAL reason to be together. They got bored always looking in the mirror so to speak !

Of the documented cases that I have what has emerged is the astrological fact that these people have the same birthcharts ! These birthcharts are within minutes of being identical. In these fifteen cases the place of birth was the same, and the birthtime was within minutes.

The last specialty typing is what I call evolutionary differences. What this means is that it is very common for two people who are in a relationship to not be at the same state of evolution. Most of the time the difference in two peoples evolutionary condition who are in an intimate relationship is not that large. In some cases, the difference can be quite large. When they are quite large, then the primary relationship typings of the counselor/counselee or the student/teacher will also be implicated.

This situation creates its own set of unique challenges and problems. In the situation where the evolutionary differences are not that large, the challenges and problems are minimal. Basically, the one who is evolutionarily ahead of the other person feels like they are pulling the other person forwards all the time. Yet, the other person will generally balance the relationship in other ways.

The only time this will be a big problem is when this situation is also linked with the primary relationship typing's of the counselor/counselee, or the student/teacher. When this condition exists, then the one who is more advanced evolutionarily will feel quite dissatisfied because of the obvious imbalance within the roles of the relationship. Yet, the responsibility for this imbalance lies within the individual who is more evolutionarily advanced because of dynamics or reasons for being in this kind of relationship typing as discussed earlier under those typing's.