

We must also be open to a different perception of life, become sensitive to vibrations of places and people, to feel the atmosphere of the environments, notice the meaningful coincidences, believe in intuition, know how to evoke the right inspiration.

I want close with a poem by Hildegard of Bingen, who, as a good mystic, still in the Middle Ages had it all figured out:

*I am the blazing light of the divine wisdom  
I light the beauty of plants  
I make water bubbling  
I give fire to the sun, the moon and the stars.  
Wisely I dispose all things,  
I adorn the earth  
I am the breeze that nurtures plants  
I am the rain born from the dew  
that makes the grass laugh with the joy of life.  
I call to collect the tears  
aroma of sacred work.  
I am the desire of the good.*

---

Sergio Guarino

## PSYCHOSYNTHESIS FOR THE FUTURE

*Translation by Kylie Drew*

I found a grand affinity with Assagioli's passion for the etymology of words: to return to the exact root, to the real significance of a word is always a joy and a breath of freshness, that takes off the veil of grey dust from the habit of use, often not even contemplated properly.

So, concerning the subject of our congress I immediately felt something more in the term *future*: in the suffix –ur- there is not only the value of imminence but also the value of predestination: but how can we accept this significance if we don't move away from the undeniable point of free will, to arrive rather close to

that *insch'allah* that deprives us of our own personal liberty? When Assagioli affirms that "all is as it should be", he certainly doesn't say it with the intent of pushing us towards passivity, to renounce our right/duty to act, to decide—on the contrary: how could he do this, someone who has based all of his teachings on the concept of *will*?

I have tried to put together this original concept of predestination with that of the will, and I feel that I have succeeded.

Certainly everything is as it should be, every action has in itself the germs of other actions, in a logical fluent chain: so we cannot hide behind the comfortable justification of fate, destiny etc. : we are the artifice of our destiny, as the ancient races well understood, even without having read Assagioli. But if the psychosynthetic will must and wants to construct the future, how can it insert itself in this process?

Let's look at our present: there is little that is acceptable, that is sharable, we are surrounded by problems often of very difficult solution; we are forced to see important people who certainly do not act like statesmen who program the benefits of future generations, but rather like politicians, who only see the immediate – not even tomorrow but only today; international relationships are conflictual, hypocritical, incapable of resolving their discrepancies by sitting around a table—and equally incapable of the radical, but deplorable solution of using arms; in this situation, how can a single person even hypothesize to change something? And even more, with only spiritual strength?

It is here that psychosynthesis helps us, that Assagioli would have liked to see spread through the various populations, universal proliferation, a unifying and coagulating factor like a religion: this international congress is already the first step towards the future of what we are speaking about: it is already a demonstration that there are men of good will, that are ready to speak and organize themselves, to search for common paths. Science has already had to admit that the spirit has a strength that up till now had remained unknown (and will have to be rethought again many times, from our point of view): science must realize the strength of the spirit, of thought, of prayer, verifying that they have had many concrete results, at different levels also incredibly, on a physical and health level: therefore we have in our hands an almost infinite force; if all participants with the same idea were to agree to concentrate at the same moment, they would surely obtain unimaginable results. What future do we want for generations to come? Maybe despite our good intentions we will not be able to see a real change in the near future, but we know that the moment is difficult and dangerous for the whole of humanity, so the effort has to be total: we have to play with our imagination in order to invent a different and better world, we have to use our thoughts, to invent practical ways to realize a dream, we have to

use intuition because the path is not always clear, and intuition can help us a lot; we have to use impulses, because the first impulse will come from them, we cannot remain inert in front of this desolate spectacle, we have to use sensations to verify every detail, we have to use emotions, because we must be totally involved, but clearly we have to put into play our will, not only to co-ordinate the abovementioned functions, but also to resist against the enormous difficulties that will be presented to us. But as in every act of will one needs to use a method and to reinforce the links in the chain so that we have a clear view of the object of the change; if we program the steps needed to be taken, activate the strength of play and so forth, it will be a winning factor. Already some of our centres have started a form of international collaboration, creating a web that needs to be strengthened and intensified: we want—as Gandhi demanded—to be individually involved in a change that we want to bring into the world.

I realize that I am almost using the tone of a religious speech: but nothing unites different people more than religion, and if some political doctrines have been accepted as religious belief, like totalitarian doctrines with little respect for humanity—well, let's welcome psychosynthesis as a new religion for everyone. After all (in order to return to the beginning of our speech) it could derive from *religere* or *religare*: in both cases they work very well: the first signifies something that I have liberally chosen myself—the second is something that binds me to my principles: and we have liberally chosen to feel ourselves tied to psychosynthesis and its basic principles, above all in transpersonal research, that right here and now, finds its concrete manifestation in the fusion of all these minds, of all our Self, that are searching to realize a dream that could become reality.

The basic problem of all the problems that surround us is lack of respect for the Other. I cannot see around me the capacity to recognize a soul who stands in front of me, I cannot see the capacity to accept the diversity of You, concentrated as I am on I, I cannot even see my own Self, let alone see the other. We followers of psychosynthesis have to have the boldness to demonstrate that this is possible, that every day we recognize and respect the Self of our fellow man, whoever he is.

Last year I met a drunkard on a bus: everyone looked at him with ill-concealed disgust, they kept themselves apart—indeed it was not a pleasant sight: but when he was about to collapse on the floor, a young lady and I stretched forward to hold him up and allow him to sit down, and in that moment, while the rest of the passengers invited us to stand back and leave him alone, almost irritated by our courtesy that appeared to them excessive, the drunkard took hold of our hands and kissed them. Evidently he thanked us for having recognized in him that spark of humanity and divinity that to the others present was not visible anymore. The young lady and I exchanged glances which displayed

solidarity: we had created our own separate world, a world in which love for mankind still made sense.

I mention this small episode because I would like to succeed in creating a future in which psychosynthesis acts as a lighthouse inviting everyone to the transpersonal: from the family to the society, from the society to the state, from the state to the world. Too ambitious? Probably yes, but that's no reason not to realize it: basically it is only a question of will: if all of us propose to ourselves this act of will sincerely and unhesitatingly, why shouldn't it be realizable?

I can only be pleased about the finesse of the choice of the preposition “for” in the title of the congress: not “psychosynthesis in the future” dully descriptive; not “future psychosynthesis” a sort of trite declaration of intent; but psychosynthesis *for* the future, with a strong transpersonal tension, that projects us into a social-cultural context, maybe also political, indescribable and maybe not even hypothetical. Psychosynthesis can help us construct a better future. But unfortunately we know (as Assagioli well knew), that constructive tension doesn't always end well: so it can happen that this future that we want to construct is not realized, that it is impossible to realize: so what is the use of psychosynthesis? Our strength lies in the capacity to use this ideology (and I don't use this word randomly) also, (and maybe above all), in the most negative moments. Assagioli speaks of *acceptance*: but in today's terms it appears to be more reductive than what it meant originally: *ad+capio*, I take inside me, I interiorize, not just I give up, a translation which is absolutely incorrect and heavily reductive.

One of the fundamental points of the Assagiolian idea is the capacity to be master of oneself, to be *compos sui*, as Seneca used to say, on which last year I held a conference and so I re-discovered him, even though I had always appreciated him. Seneca also affirms that a wise man needs to see things from the correct point of view, without being influenced, but keeping one's distance, disidentifying oneself just enough to not be hurt and overcome; and even he advises, in the moment in which our will cannot cope—for unavoidable or maybe imponderable causes—to direct our actions and our life, he advises us in that moment to “choose our

chains”: what a similarity with Assagioli! Not only cope, not only accept, but accomplish an act of will and freely choose our tragedy.

This, therefore is how psychosynthesis can help us even in the moment the future world seems to escape from any tentative to better itself, in the moment in which we feel inadequate and impotent to change the course of events in a world that doesn’t represent us, and that we would like to be different: first, let’s use our will at its best to obtain individual but above all transpersonal improvement; but if the force of negative circumstances should overwhelm us, well, let us choose them, we that have the capability to face anything.

84

To spread psychosynthesis is a duty, for the simple reason that in this way we are offering to our fellow man an invaluable instrument to face life, in good times but above all in bad. Psychosynthesis for the future means to accept what is inevitable in the term “future”, but also to stretch our will so that it emerges and achieves therein what is intentional, free, and voluntary.

---

Luciana Di Marco

## THE LAW OF RIGHT RELATIONS

*Translation by Mike Malagrecia*

A widespread concept in the field of Psychosynthesis is that the human group is a living entity just as any other group to which we belong, either by destiny or choice. Thus as a living entity, humanity has its own individuality and, according to the law of correspondence – and as stated by the Psychosynthesis model and Systems Theory – it has a Self, a spirit or Soul that represents its purpose and self-consciousness, a personality with three bodies (physical, emotional and mental), and a corresponding evolutionary level. We, individual members of this group, are like cells

within a body: we are integral part of it, in spirit, Soul and personality. In turn, humanity in its whole is but an *organ*, an integral part of the planetary system. The analogy could be extended indefinitely to include even larger systems.

The cells in the different tissues and organs of the different systems in our body relate functionally to each other. They collaborate to sustaining the life of the whole they belong to and from which they draw their identity and purpose. On the contrary, we, human beings, live unaware of who we really are and blind to the indissoluble link that connects us to others within humanity and the other kingdoms in nature.

This obliviousness is usually, and unfortunately, the background against which we build our relations, with the result that they are influenced by our distorted conditionings and defensive projections that confuse us and diminish our accountability; by our expectations that engender passivity; by our claims that cause reactive and disqualifying behaviors (failure to listen and consider others, guilt, denial, criticism, negativity, antagonism, manipulation, rejection, irrationality, lack of dialogue or communication, misunderstanding, not accepting or recognizing others, blindness, hyper sensibility, revengefulness, etc.). We can sometimes be exasperatingly self-asserting, over demanding and authoritarian, to the extent that we become so aggressive, violent, and cruel that we can even want to eliminate the other, either physically or psychologically.

And all this takes place both inside ourselves, in the interaction among our inner parts, and in our relations with other beings, in our inter-group and international relations. The news gives us abundant examples of this. Despite for centuries many enlightened Souls have tried in various ways, languages and environments (political, religious, philosophical, artistic ...) to help us improve the situation, the state of relations in the world today continues to be dramatic. The current speed of our times means that distances are shorter and that the possibilities for communication and movement have increased. So have the proliferation and overlapping of roles, tasks, exchanges, and rampant individualism, as observed in