ASC Sublord/MOON Starlord Connection – A Revised Study

Rangarajan Krishnamoorthy
ranga@mmsindia.com
[May 30, 2005]

This study is a variant of the earlier study conducted to see if there
existed an "anyway" connection between ASC sublord and MOON starlord in
correct births and "no" connection existed in incorrect births. The
results of the earlier experiment strongly indicated that the
connection existed in most cases, whether the birth was correct or not.
So it did not appear to be a reliable indicator of correct birth times.

I decided to revisit the experiment with some changes. The earlier
definition of "anyway connection" was as given by Kanak. Shri.Lajmi had
raised an objection at that time saying our interpretation of the rule
could be incorrect.

This time I defined "anyway" connection in six ways. The following are
the possible definitions (interpretations) of connection between ASC
sublord and MOON starlord. They are numbered C-1 to C-6. The first one
(C-1) is the same as the earlier definition.

The definition of "Agency" as used in some the definitions is given
first:

Agency Rule:
NODE is an agent for PLANET if and only if any of the following is
true:
    a) NODE and PLANET are in the same sign
    b) NODE is in the sign of PLANET
    c) PLANET aspects NODE (by vedic aspect)

Connection Definition – 1 (C-1):
    a) A and B are the same planet
    b) A is the sign/star/sub/subsub lord of B
    c) B is the sign/star/sub/subsub lord of A
    d) A and B are in the same sign
    e) B aspects A (by Vedic aspect)
    f) A is in the star/sub/subsub of a NODE and the NODE is an agent
       for B

Connection Definition – 2 (C-2):
    a) A and B are the same planet
    b) A is the sign/star/sub lord of B
    c) B is the sign/star/sub lord of A
    d) A and B are in the same sign

Connection Definition – 3 (C-3):
    a) A and B are the same planet
    b) A is the sign/star lord of B
    c) B is the sign/star lord of A
    d) A and B are in the same sign

Connection Definition – 4 (C-4):
    a) A and B are the same planet
    b) A is the sign/star lord of B

```
        c) B is the sign/star lord of A
        d) A and B are in the same sign
        e) B aspects A (by Vedic aspect)
        f) A is in the star/sub/subsub of a NODE and the NODE is an agent
           for B

Connection Definition - 5 (C-5):
        a) A and B are the same planet
        b) A is the sign/star lord of B
        c) B is the sign/star lord of A
        d) A and B are in the same sign
        e) A is in the star of a NODE and the NODE is an agent for B

Connection Definition - 6 (C-6):
        a) A and B are the same planet
        b) A is the sign/star lord of B
        c) B is the sign/star lord of A
        d) A and B are in the same sign
        e) B aspects A (by Vedic aspect)
        f) A is in the star of a NODE and the NODE is an agent for B
```

You can see that definitions C-2 through C-6 are derived from C-1 such that they are all STRONGER than C-1, but WEAKER/STRONGER among themselves. For example, using the symbol "<" to denote the "weaker than" relationship between two connection definitions, we can assert that C-2 < C-3, C-4 < C-3, C-6 < C-5, etc. (If it is not obvious yet, "stronger" in this context means that the definition accepts less number of birth times as correct.)

The purpose of arriving at several such definitions of "connection" is to see if one of them can give us the "effectiveness" we are looking for. Other definitions of "connection" can be given, and I encourage members to suggest these to me if they find it worthwhile. If Shanmugham had defined connection formally (as I have attempted to), then we would not have had to spend our energies trying to "guess" what he meant.

With these possible definitions of "connection", I modified my program
  a) To apply all definitions to various time points at 30 seconds interval on May 30, 2005 (midnight to midnight) at Chennai Egmore
  b) To apply all definitions to the AA-rated charts as before

Table 1: Acceptance Ratios (in %) on A Specific Date

Description	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	C-5	C-6
Acceptance Ratio	80.76	52.53	52.53	66.49	52.53	59.96

Clearly C-1 is the weakest definition.

In the second part, I ran each definition against the 300 and odd AA-rated charts. In each case I computed the "Acceptance Ratio" (A.R) and the "Rejection Ratio" (R.R). The latter is a measure of how many incorrect records (mutated by changing the birth time) that particular definition rejects.

Table 2: Acceptance/Rejection Ratios (in %) Applied to 304 AA-Charts

Description	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	C-5	C-6
Acceptance Ratio	81.90	65.13	55.92	70.39	57.57	63.49
Rejection Ratio	20.07	34.05	43.37	30.43	40.27	34.43

I had earlier recommended that the effectiveness of a BRT be represented as the pair <Acceptance Ratio in %, Rejection Ratio in %>. Accordingly,

      C-1: <81.9, 20.07>
      C-2: <65.13, 34.05>
      C-3: <55.92, 43.37>
      C-4: <70.39, 30.43>
      C-5: <57.57, 40.27>
      C-6: <63.49, 34.43>

Conclusion:

This study reveals that tuning the definition (our "interpretation") of "connection" can yield different acceptance and rejection ratios. Which definition is "correct"? I do not have an answer yet. It seems to me that we can get better insight if we apply the definitions to birth charts that have "astrologically proven birth times", irrespective of the available "biological birth times". I have my own doubts about the correctness of the AA-rated charts. Hopefully the work that Kanak (and other volunteers) are engaged in, that is using RPs to verify AA-charts, will form a better base to apply the various definitions.

<center>**** END ****</center>