

to imperfections more nuanced than those produced by integrated personalities, immature or self-centered, but always imperfections.

Conclusion. Harmlessness is a precondition of the evolutionary process and needs to be considered and developed. It is the backbone of the psyche and creates harmony in the personality if the daily life, words and thoughts make it own. The purification of harmlessness helps to eliminate non-progressive states of consciousness up to make “obvious” the understanding that its evolution is One with that of other beings.

“Therefore, harmlessness is the keynote of life”

Piermaria Bonacina

THE ACHIEVEMENT OF FREEDOM

My personal strongest experiences of freedom took place both in Sardinia where for two times I found myself in some new, unusual, out of control, dangerous circumstances.

The first time I happened to be cut off by a very rough sea for three days on a beach at Orosei Gulf.

The wonderful view and the spontaneous show of solidarity between people “prisoners” in that paradise created a special immersion on freedom.

But freedom from what? I ask actually myself. Where could this feeling rise from? It could spring from my neglected usual social needs, a sort of junk fallen down, which improved my receptiveness towards nature and the essential values in life.

What did I get from this experience? My needs, my unnecessary, my control disappeared.

I got back my Energy. I forgot the habit of “doing”, under cover of my “being”.

This real, concrete feeling has two disadvantages:

- it happens sometimes, it is isolated
- it gets boring

Two or three days of paradise are the best, not 200 or 300.”Freedom from” requires something to get free of. But after the Eden we can only get free from Eden itself. In effect our ancestors, Adam and Eve, were bored to death, they were fed up with the Earthly Paradise. Same thing for the Buddha, when he escaped from his father’s kingdom, where he was free and outwardly satisfied, but he didn’t have anything to get free of. So he left in order to get in hermitage into his inner prison where he worked for years to release himself and the whole world from the Ego, ignorance...

“Freedom from”, freedom of escaping is a very relative freedom. Often it is a propelling, is it also a value?

I would like now to remind a new experience of freedom it happened to me always in Sardinia, ten years later. I was at the seaside in a beautiful villa of a friend of mine, for two weeks of summer holidays. After a couple of days I feel down and broke my leg, I was alone, by myself, and didn’t know anyone there... After a venturesome rescue, the ambulance took me to the Olbia Hospital on a four bed room. It has been a full freedom experience: I was there completely alone, without anything, no belongings, no contacts, nothing to do. Yet, I felt protected and satisfied on my essential needs.

An amazing experience of Freedom, which I remember still now, often longing for it.

I wonder why, even lying isolated in a hospital, I did enjoy this unexpected stay on a complete well-balanced and centred way. This peculiar holiday revealed me all what I was longing for, much more than the planned one I felt totally at my ease, happy and peaceful. I was there, entire.

At that time I only perceived the reasons of my extraordinary feeling, my peak-experience. Reasons I can lightly focus now as they represent the keystone of my remarks on Freedom

Surprising and peculiar to me it was to perceive that in both my experiences, while being “prisoner” on a beach

or a hospital, I felt a deep sense of freedom. What could that mean? How strange?

No doubt about the reality and foundation of my background experience, as psychological feelings are beyond any discussion: I felt free, so I was free. I remind clearly that after a while I quickly lost this idyllic condition. As long as the friend of mine brought me my pyjama, handkerchiefs, telephone coins, and so on, and all the things getting" necessary", I noticed that the cage was closing over myself. I was once more in prison, from where I was escaped for a moment.

So, does it mean that it mean that freedom is a subjective feeling, not an objective experience?

This is the only answer to my experience, a concept already supported by many philosophers. Even Assagioli signifies this way of thinking on his "Freedom in prison". He says that it is possible to maintain his own inner freedom even on an external state of restriction. I dare to add, from my experience, that - as a paradox - we can achieve Freedom only in a prison, thank to the prison, any prison it could be.

It's important for us to connect to the deepest and most essential meaning of Freedom, that is: "released from", "untied from", without any conditioning or limits, that is independent. It means that Freedom is a condition which cannot exist in manifestation.

From this point of view we can only have Freedom in the Absolute, its etymological meaning is "untied from", "released from". But Absolute cannot be manifest and so Freedom, being an attribute of Absolute, obviously cannot exist in manifestation or in the psychological level.. It is a philosophical line of reasoning, unpleasant in its truth. Unpleasant as it forces us to admit that at the level of manifestation where we all live and evolve Freedom does not exist.

I mean the final absolute Freedom, the one which is a myth, something we will never be able to reach. A precious myth, which, pushing us towards something unreachable, leads us to achieve better and better levels of relative, intermediate Freedom.

The stairway of Freedom is similar to the Psychosynthetic one. There is not a finish line, there is a course, an evolving direction made by partial synthesis or freedom levels. Proceeding step by step, we get free from ancient influences in order to attain some superior ones.

Then we must realize that we are always in prison, and the conquer of freedom lies in getting on a better prison.

The only Freedom of man is:

- To choose one's own prison. To choose which conditioning elements to adopt, in which cell a man decides to live, between the ones within his reach, on which step he can stand better
- To choose the prison where he is living, anyone it may be. To choose means to accept it, to become the owner, to will it instead of to suffer it.

All that can appear a poor freedom, as anyway we have to stay in prison, always "not free".

On the other hand it means a lot: how many men can conquer the only freedom they posses? How many of them know how to put into practice this small/big potential level?

How many are able to choose their prison and feel free doing it, choosing their inner influences in order to improve their fulfilment?

Here we are again to the theme of Freedom as a subjective, inner state. If the psychological inner experience is not something stated and fixed, as it can be managed, modified and moulded, if your feeling free depends on an inner psychological attitude, then the option of living oneself free is inside everybody's reach, obviously everyone who knows how to do it.

This is the new perspective, similar to an authentic Copernican Revolution.

It happens because the experience of freedom stops to reveal itself as an isolated one, something which happens by chance on peak-experiences in life. It becomes something we can deliberately create or conquer, day by day, in our everyday life. Man can be the creator of his own Freedom

But in which way? On me the answer is: through the Psychosynthesis, reminding that there are many other schools of self-development

I have now to make a digression about some preliminary remarks.

In our modern society many people were their life through creating a comfort, they don't want to get free of. For those people Freedom means to keep the possession of all what can guarantee their wellbeing. They locked up a Freedom to detain or perpetuate. A completely different Freedom.

The concept of freedom is a point of niche, it involves a small part of persons who want to become free, as they perceived that freedom in retaining, freedom of possess and preservation is absolutely fleeting, poor, and uncertain.

This small minority is not interested to a freedom for achieving an exterior benefit, obtained through the control or the manipulation of circumstances. His purpose is to be free inside, on his inner states.

That means to change the point of view, from freedom of possessing to freedom of being

The path of inner freeing - as Psychosynthesis teaches - is a pursuit based on the Will. It would require a systemic research

I will indicate on a schematic way the main kinds of Freedom we can pursue on the Psychosynthesis method. I will now show in a schematic way the main kinds of freedom we can pursue on the Self-Psychosynthetic method.

Freedom from:

- feeling guilty-need to obtain someone's approval
- need to be reassured, to recover confidence (from outside)
- fear of judgement or refusal
- Comparison - perfectionism
- Disesteem - low self opinion - self depreciation
- Preconceptions, prejudices, opinions, habits, criticism, idealisations, claims, expectations
- Dependence - attachment - aversion

Freedom of:

- doing wrong
- being oneself (even if incorrect) - letting oneself

being - accepting oneself - loving oneself - welcoming oneself

- wishing - being fond of oneself - surrendering
- being content - appreciating - enjoying- tasting
- expressing oneself - asserting oneself - being fulfilled
- thinking - imagining
- willing (willing to will)- choosing to decide - saying no - exposing oneself to risk - playing

Freedom of being is connected with Psychosynthesis saying:

- freedom of KNOWING oneself
- freedom of POSSESSING oneself
- freedom of TRANSFORMING oneself, carrying out one's potential attitudes

How to conquer Freedom.

I would like to turn to a peculiar analogy with the climbing of a mountain. When the climber has reached the peak of the mountain, he doesn't keep his conquest on his pocket. He stops for a little, then he leaves, he goes down. This descent may become a new achievement, maybe a demanding adventure.

To conquer means to obtain something. But soon after it means to leave, to surrender, to grow away in order to achieve something new.

Our habit is to think the conquest as a booty to keep tight, non as a process.

The value of an achievement is in the ability of acting it, not in the result, it isn't based on the goal, but on the talent of reaching our purpose.

In Psychosynthesis we can find the same trend standing below the process of conquest :

The technique of Identification-Disidentification.

It is connected with the ability of relating with oneself ,one's parts and the others, afterwards letting them go, letting them free through the detachment. Now, why is it so important to achieve this new model of conquest? If the conquest represents a process and not a result, we acquire the freedom of renouncing to any attainment straight after we obtained it. That because we are certain we can regain it as long as we want it. Self-confidence rises from the ability of conquering, not from the possession of the conquest. He who is free to renounce to the

freedom of possession has got inner freedom.

If we are getting qualified to free ourselves from our touchiness, a relapse on it will give us again the option of training our power of release. We don't possess our inner freedom, we reaffirm it. A nice small sheet of paper by Assagioli: "The release of the New from the Old".

It has two meanings:

- the New gets rid of the Old
- the Old sets the New free, it gives it space, it lets it go. The release conceived as a redevelopment, not a revolution.

As long as we will play an active part on this process, becoming the conquerors of our freedom and co-creators of our Future, we will make it easier, building harmony on the slope to the stairs of freedom.

So every climbed step will be left free for the achievement of the following step.

Vittorio Viglienghi

THE IMAGES OF US... THAT SCREW OUR LIFE

Report by Elena Morbidelli
National Conference of the Institute
of Psychosynthesis Catania, April 25/27, 2013
"Ethics and Beauty"

St. Bernard, said: "A cold heart can not absolutely perceive a language of fire".

I thought long and hard about the term "screw" and its adequacy in the field of a conference.

Of course the word "steal" could sound more appropriate, however I preferred to keep it because it best describes the polysemy that I intend to bring to your attention.

In the popular term "screw", not only is the allusion to steal, to rob but in its rich coloring, there is also the synonym "rub", spend more or less energy on an object on a surface, and further, "disappointing", "cheating", "tricking": "that guy screwed me! Last but not least, also another meaning, that of flaunting a mocking indifference or arrogance, against someone or something; many Italians remember the "infamous": "I don't care!"

This brief overview of the meaning of the word "screwing" allow me to introduce an insidious ambivalence hidden in the title, or, if on the one hand, some education, moralist, conformist, politically correct... and I could continue indefinitely, there has "taught" (as Bruno Caldironi taught us, playing on the double meaning of the word) an ideal of beauty, goodness and cleverness, from another nowadays is more and more a model rewarding and even admired, being bad, bad or incompetent. I lingered in search of the opposite of the word "good", which has several meanings, from skilful, to the good and the brave, judicious (also remember the noun "good" by Manzoni, the bully). But the good to which I refer, it is that sort of parental imperative, that when we were young has repeatedly delighted: you're a good or be good. Tell me, how many sub personalities of the "good girl" or "good boy", are present in this room! On the other hand, if not respected, the requesting family (grandparents, uncles included), it bordered, on the contrary, that to be considered "ugly and bad". We know how this picture of us created by others, affect our psyche, especially during the formative years of personality, such as those of childhood and adolescence. On this point we will return later.

Let us then consider the meaning of the valence to the contrary. Why becomes rewarding, at least in some milieu, to be "ugly", "bad" and "incapable"? Until some time ago, at least in the field of beauty felt repeat "ugly but interesting", for men, for women "ugly but intelligent". Nowadays, we resort to the "ugly", for another purpose, to amaze, through the "attraction for horrid." Certain movies, books, video games, solicit fantasies, emotions, with horrific images, monsters, vampires, zombies, scarred faces, grim and violent scenes, devastations, disasters. Even a certain type of clothing, often expensive, and as they say, griffed, sees ripped articles of