

# Abstracts from Proceedings of the Congress Business Intuition 2004

© 2005 by FOIL  
All Rights reserved

FOIL s.r.l.  
Sede legale: Piazza Enrico Fermi, 1  
05100 TR – Italia

Sede Operativa: Via Moschinone 4  
26866 Marudo LO - Italia

Tel. +39 0371 218070  
Fax +39 0371 218032

[info@foil.it](mailto:info@foil.it)  
[www.foil.it](http://www.foil.it)  
[www.businessintuition.org](http://www.businessintuition.org)

ISBN 88-88742-10-7



## *Chapter One*

### **FRAMING THE CONGRESS' SUBJECT MATTER**

1. A winning economy is always the result of functional intelligence: its prestigious manifestation is the balance between needs and services, determining peace among the constituent parts.

2. Wealth does not come from the prosperity of a land or of a sea, but from the encounter of evolution and technique. Whichever the region, its wealth is determined by the work and collaboration of intelligent human beings, coherent in their rationality and volition.

3. We have all realised that whatever we sell or produce should enrich the buyer.

4. The development of economic theory, since its beginnings with Adam Smith, has led us to perfect a number of skills, which we exploit in the present process of globalisation:

- a. competence in a competitive market;
- b. customer relations to widen and cultivate a client base;
- c. total quality;
- d. life-long-learning;
- e. upstream analysis;
- f. distribution of wealth and social commitment (were it only for the development of the market, we need to facilitate everyone's wellbeing). Individual gain occurs through social capitalisation;
- g. social responsibility (it is valued more than the product);
- h. legal transparency;
- i. the wholesomeness of ecobiology;
- j. financing for those who engage in initiatives of economic and social relevance.

The Congress will address all these issues.

5. We have all become aware that wealth is a catalyst for civilisation and humanism, and that it diminishes the likelihood of war, delinquency and illness.

6. Apart from these points, the *specific* theme of this Congress is the identification of *the psychic causality in the economic event*: it is an investigation and an opening for our insight into the mind of economic rationality. Effects, statistics, monitoring of the economy, as well as the whole field of economic theory remain outside this understanding. We shall frame the primary causality and the (creative or reactive) motivation behind economic practice; clearly, we shall investigate the psychology of the manager, of the entrepreneur, of the leader who formalizes the compound result of a global business. Being able to identify and frame intuition means holding the key to economic infallibility, but without the discoveries of Ontopsychology intuition lacks its scientific footing, and remains the chimerical result of alleged “enlightenment” or happenstance.

This Congress targets three achievements, two of which are social and one scientific.

### 1.

Wealth and economic success – whether individual or collective – are the result of a process of existential training and self-perfecting, that lasts throughout the individual’s whole lifetime. Being a producer of wealth is a duty; it is part of the dignity of being a person on this planet; it is a merit; it is personal gratification built upon the common good; it is phenomenology of the providence of life.

Self-sustenance is the primary duty that life designates, and the autonomy to participate in all rights derives from this.

While we are all sensitive to famine and poverty in the world, we should also be aware of extremist tendencies in state, colonial and welfare politics. These lead to the formation of transversal bodies of legal and social parasites, resulting in a diminishment of our power to acquire interior values: the values that give more being. Hence, let us assist, but without diminishing the responsibilities of those we assist.

It is a duty to help those who are momentarily in need, but it is a vice and an act of connivance against nature to condition others to be needy by character.

Relieving someone of his responsibility of self-sustenance means severing his dignity, his pride to be a generous agent of society and of life. I do not believe that the best protagonists of the public would want to become dependant on a society where others work and pay taxes.

Even paying taxes should be regarded as something good: it is a pleasure to contribute to everyone’s well-being according to the order chosen by democracy, and the commitment and welfare of a taxpayer is the token by which he can claim respect from the authorities.

### 2.

The issue is to objectify and identify the circumstances of economic self-sabotage.

Entrepreneurial counselling consistently confirms that, in 60% of cases, loss or failure to make profit does *not* derive from objective external factors such as competition. Instead, it occurs “by design,” by the subject’s unconscious design – contradictory as it may seem with respect to his conscious volition.

Self-sabotage – whether at the level of the individual’s life or at the level of the business – occurs through a twofold logic:

a) the activation and subsequent consequences of behaviours that will cause a situation of frustration. That is, the individual fails to conform his actions to the identity of the project;

b) the interpretation that the administrator or operator of the economic project selects, with respect to the dynamics and psychological motives that he chooses unconsciously (but whose effects are factual). Essentially, the operator, in spite of the external possibilities and the chosen strategy, enacts a contradictory choice that undoes all the previous construction.

Ontopsychology offers an extraordinary and unique tool to identify and isolate the drive to self-sabotage, and consequently to prevent its consequences from unfolding.

In essence, we do not know man to be capable of egoism. Natural and consequential egoism is the result of superior knowledge and inner maturity.

### 3.

The third aim is what specifies this Congress most precisely. The theme is scientific, because it frames the object of a long research in economics, politics, history and psychology. *Psychology*, in this context, indicates the understanding of the behaviour and attitudes of superior operators in our society: this is the psychology of the superior practical functions of human intelligence, of which leaders are the most notable expression.

It is scientific because it is based on discoveries (repeatedly confirmed by the method and the results) that are specific of the ontopsychological School, of which FOIL is a very practical application.

Fortune and success are based on precise mechanics, by which simple causes lead to the desired effects. *Intuition* is a vision that formalises the connection with the desired result. In the moment of intuition, the subject visualises the nexus that, as part of the project, configures the identity or haecceity of an action, that is synchronous with that nexus.

This vision is an operative moment; the carrying out or programming of the event can subsequently be achieved through the rational practice of historical compromise, but with the aim already clearly in mind.

Many researchers have investigated and tried to capture the traits of intuition. Intuition is part of the essence that makes man an intelligent being. To find it, we must turn to the root of our nature, which historicizes itself for the conservation and evolution of the species of persons.

Today we can identify and distinguish this natural causal principle that enables us to intuit or foresee; like any universal law, it follows a precise logic.

This third point is what constitutes the originality and the absolute international novelty of this Congress.

Hundreds of presentations, contributions and interventions by the participants from all over the world will revolve around these three themes and their intrinsic variables.

The knowledge you can acquire and bring home is enormous.

It will certainly constitute a bright experience for some and a gain for many.

At the same time, there will be stands, poster presentations, exchanges with experts in all fields, entrepreneurs, producers, distributors, professionals, researchers, for an exchange of public and private interest.

I wish you all to find great mental gain and satisfaction in this encounter.

## *Chapter Two*

# **INTUITION IN THE LIGHT OF ONTOPSYCHOLOGY'S RECENT DISCOVERIES**

## **2.1 Introduction**

Much has been said on Ontopsychology, in the last ten years. As a form of knowledge, a rationality, it is quite simple. The problem is that, to understand it, you need to be simple. A scientist who is complex will never grasp the simple. Unfortunately, in these ten years many have limited themselves to *talking* about Ontopsychology, and have done so in ways that led to confusion. Today things are looking better, thanks to the involvement of Saint Petersburg State University, a prestigious institution that will certainly help us to convey the *conceptual tools* needed to understand the practice and application of Ontopsychology.

Honestly speaking, I had a great advantage over Freud, Jung, Rogers, Skinner, Maslow, Ananiev, etc. They all contributed in different ways and from different perspectives to the development of a research ranging from neurology to psychology. However, they all lacked a scientific foundation in *philosophy* – a key aspect of human knowledge. Jung studied parapsychology and mystical theology in depth, in order to understand certain problems of the psyche and of the unconscious; Freud had the inspiration of the Torah in his background; Frankl, a psychiatrist by education, understood the need to perfect his understanding of philosophy. When, like many others, he became a victim of the horrors of war, and was deported to Auschwitz, he discovered the importance of *meaning*, the sense of *finality* – something that Freud, Jung, Adler and so many others had overlooked.

I met Victor Frankl, and we considered working jointly. But I noticed that his preparation was wanting, particularly with respect to Schultz's autogenous training. When using this technique, the psyche produces universal images that the most advanced currents of psychology still fail to explain. Why does the human unconscious, at a certain level, produce certain images, like the image of the angel, the concept of the eye, etc?

These researchers lacked the *theological* knowledge necessary to understand such phenomena, for in studying the psyche, it is necessary to take into account the role of myth, the concepts of good and evil, the ghosts of death, of vegetation, of the past, and so on. Psychology must address, rather than deny, these issues, if it is to provide an exact response to man's quest.

I had a distinct advantage in that, when I began to concern myself with psychology, I already had the twofold technical mastery of those two disciplines: philosophy and theology.<sup>1</sup> This enabled me to understand problems that today are still considered unresolved: what causes the onset of a disease? Why does a cell or an organ divert from its correct biological functioning, leading to anomalies such as a neoplasia or a scotoma? What factors affect the course of an illness? And so on. Cells and organs are within the space, the constituent matter of man's existence: this is why it is possible to develop an understanding of their functioning.

Furthermore, the ontopsychological School has managed to understand why certain cerebral circuits can be incongruous with the global well-being of the body, as is the case in schizophrenia. Schizophrenia is psychiatry's, neurology's and psychology's greatest challenge, which remains misunderstood to this day; and yet it is all-pervasive: nearly everyone has an element of latent schizophrenia.

My training began with the foundational understanding of the logical processes of rationality: classical *philosophy*, the philosophy that investigates the simplicity of principles (*not* the history of philosophy, but the capacity to analyse the principles on which bodies of knowledge develop) and *theology*, hence the mediating relation between human knowledge and the universal principles.<sup>2</sup> I then entered the realm of the psychical compounds: biological instincts, emotional tensions, ideological prehensibility.<sup>3</sup> The ontopsychological School has identified three constants in our sensory-intellective processes (learning and consciousness). These three factors are the constituents of perceptions and reactions in our (rational-conscious as well as unconscious) behaviour. Knowing these three "informational agents" enables us to realise an organic project within the logic of integral business. Namely, the intuition of the ontic *In Itself*, the deflection monitor and the semantic field.

---

<sup>1</sup> Every science has its rules, its logic: the logic of biology is not the same as the logic of sociology, just as the art of friendship has rules that differ from those of jurisprudence.

<sup>2</sup> We should ask ourselves, with every flying fancy, prayer, poem, art, feeling of love, whether this is a way of approaching the basic principle of life, or rather of repeating the same old role plays that humanity recites over and over. We should, for instance, consider whether contemporary art is truly art or just insanity. In this case humanity has truly come to an extreme, that the best scientists and researchers need to concern themselves with.

<sup>3</sup> With respect to ideologies, we should ask ourselves whether they are really manifestations of rationality, or only sublimation, displacement of primitive, unexpressed instincts. What is viewed as social order, for example, could just be the schizophrenic satisfaction of a repressed sexual urge.

## 2.2 Intuition

Intuition certainly constitutes the masterpiece, the enlightenment, the performance of human intelligence within the historical situation. Apart from his animal, material, terrestrial condition, man is also an intelligent being, and he is endowed with the capacity of universal, transcendental, artistic perception. The point is to verify whether, in the context of daily life, in the interplay of interests that make up all historical situations, man has a soul that can indicate a direction, and if so, how this direction can be identified and differentiated from illusions, semantics, emotions, experience, and other interferences.

*Money is mind*: money is intelligence, business is intelligence. But how should we understand the intelligence a banker, an entrepreneur, or a politician possesses, of which money is but a consequence? Where is the mind that actuates the project and realises the event? When an expert is consulted, who has the full knowledge of Ontopsychology, he resolves the problem of a business, a corporation or a political party in one week at most, regardless of the size of the organisation. The expert will isolate a few points, critical junctures from which all other factors ensue. These are remote, elementary junctures. *Elementary* in the sense that they are the primary movers, the causal variables that determine the effects. All effects – including all issues regarding laws, banks, conflict, succession, etc – are subsequent and subordinate to the project, set up, or programming.

Let us consider the example of a great piece of music, like Beethoven's Ninth Symphony. The composer did not need hearing: a great composer does not need the senses, for everything is simple in his mind, and he only needs to find the material means to translate that cast of mind into the fabric of history.

And since the theme of music is dear to so many of us, we could think about how it is *written*. Guido d'Arezzo (995-1050) addressed the problem of coding music for the purpose of communication, and found the necessary *technique*. He essentially mimicked the strings of a guitar or a lute, assigning lower notes a value, higher notes another value, thus establishing the variables on the *pentagram*. Since then, d'Arezzo's notation of placing black dots on the pentagram has become the operational language of the spirit of music. This operation is paradigmatic of the proceeding of science.

Certainly d'Arezzo was also an enlightened man, just as Archimedes. But enlightenment is something that comes through *scientific training*; it is nurtured through years of study, of silence, of research and observation. This research is something marvellous, for those who have a *passion for truth*. Truth comes from continuously perfecting a potential: it cannot be improvised under the auspices of academia, mystery, politics or fortune.

## 2.3 The need for simplicity in scientific practice

I would therefore encourage all scientists to be simple. Being *simple* means possessing the coincidence with the project of things (*coincidence* means to be equal: mind equals reality, mind equals process, mind equals result). Conversely, a researcher who suffers the interference of prejudice, complexes or any social-existential contradiction is bound to deviate from the transparency of things. Ontopsychology has discovered two or three points, on which the constitutive structure of man's psychicality in relation to the body of history revolves.

The scientist certainly lives off spiritual nourishment; yet he needs a technical, elementary expression. He participates in a higher vision, a different nourishment, a world of visions and contemplation; but when he needs to help others, he must teach how to bake bread, he must find simple translations that can be put into practice by others as well.<sup>4</sup>

A scientist cannot be a source of actualisation, unless he is himself intimate with the spirit. Man's spirituality is much greater than his rationality. You could ask me what the spirit is, but if you will only accept a rational argument, I will not be able to answer. By its intrinsic nature,

---

<sup>4</sup> An example could be Thomas Edison, who found the way to bring light into people's homes.

*rationality always demands conformity*: rationality provides an instrument (a car, two legs, etc), but not a purpose. But we must take spirituality into account if we want to analyse finality, the project or purpose, the why that rationality conforms to. A project is “spiritual” because it sets an *order organised around an aim*, an end, which can only be intuited through the vision of the spirit – which alone can consider the end before the introduction of any means. What the senses perceive at the end (the result), intuition identified from the beginning.

Rationality only perceives the finality when the effects have rolled out, when the execution has been completed; in order to understand, it must conform to the established principle. As a matter of fact, rationality is based on something that is rationally inexplicable. Conversely, the spirit, intelligence, is aware of the end. The spirit possesses a quality of *self-evidence*: it moves and sees within the simplicity of the act. It already *is*, as it builds; it is already complete, as it begins; it has already arrived, as it sets out. *In the end, only the spirit can constitute the criterion of rationality.*

The spirit is what sets the *goal* – say, eliminating a tumour. Let me remind you that I was led to the ontopsychological discoveries by ten years of clinical practice. I had set out to understand, to penetrate disease: how it develops, evolves, etc. Luckily, my quest was successful, and I concluded that illnesses derive from a deviation of the individual’s behaviour, a *psychical attitude*. As the subject pursues aims that contradict the drives of his ontic *In Itself*, his natural identity, he constantly introduces the information that programs the organs to deviate from their normal functioning. This information is so powerful that it can alter the cells’ very DNA. The subject pursues these aims consciously and voluntarily, even though he considers them unconnected with his own organism. I also witnessed the consequence of a baby-swap, in which a child born in a family, whose members had died from cancer for the last four generations, was placed in a family that had similarly suffered from lung diseases or tuberculosis, and vice versa: the result was that the newborns would take up the pathological typology of their newly assigned family. In other words, the child would “learn” the typology of the hereditary disease that was dominant in the family to which he was assigned. This made it clear to me that illness derives from the subject’s psychical behaviour, in its many aspects: laws, traditions, religions, beliefs, etc. Individuals “craft” their pathologies based on their strongest points of affective reference (love, hate, sexuality, pride).

We should remember that humans have been *made*, that is, they are *parts of the universe*, and hence participate in universal laws. The order of the universe is inscribed in the biology of man. Our psychical order rests on the elementary laws of the world of life; subsequently, there are external variables in everyone’s life.

Proceeding by simple steps and observing the different aspects, I discovered the elementary principle within every person that discriminates being from non-being, beyond Freud’s unconscious and Husserl’s phenomenology. Husserl, albeit not a psychologist, had realised that all science – and psychology in particular, for he knew the great psychologists of his time – had positioned itself outside of the real causes, and this is the essence of his famous 1936 Prague conference, *The Crisis of European Sciences*.<sup>5</sup> I often wondered how Husserl had come to this understanding, and found that he had a deep theological sentiment, although his personal spiritual aptness was not matched by equal psychological insight. Despite his knowledge of and esteem for Freud and many other psychologists of his time, he affirmed that their investigation remained outside of the real causes, outside of the dynamics of universal laws, outside of what he called the “world of life.”<sup>6</sup>

A scientist should verify to which extent he is on the right path, for if his research is off target, then the real contradiction, the real object of investigation, is *his nature*, his symptom, his phenomenology. Similarly, what causes delinquency? In nature, we do not find delinquency: we will not find, say, a cub attacking its siblings out of sheer evil. So in the case of delinquency as well we need to investigate what factors have caused this diversion from the biological processes of nature.

---

<sup>5</sup> See E. Husserl, *The crisis of European sciences and transcendental phenomenology*, Northwestern University Press, 1970.

<sup>6</sup> For example, in biology, a cell becomes ill when it goes astray from the concrete, material order of nature.

*The spirit writes through matter.* Human beings are intelligent, but they are made of flesh; they are bearers of a wider aim, of a universal order, but they are only passing notes in a great score. Notes annotated on the pentagram are viable, readable as long as they remain within the pentagram, but get lost if they wander off the universal laws and pathways of nature.

During my clinical practice, my aim was always that of resolving the symptom, be it impotence, a malign tumour, arthritis, schizophrenia, etc. It was not critical for the patient to understand; but since he was paying me, I had to help him to resolve his problem. I perceived this as a *challenge* for my intelligence, as well as a matter of *honesty*, of living up to the patient's payment. As I cured my patients (it is possible – in fact, easy – to restore health through psychotherapy), I gradually developed an understanding of what I was doing, of what principles I was setting in motion, that led to the resolution of the symptom. My intervention resolved the bodily symptoms of the patient, for inner change is quite a different matter: it is a choice that is only up to the subject. But I was satisfied to see virility return, headaches disappear, and the subject regaining his health. This was generally achieved after five or six sessions. Then, some patients demanded more counselling, as they wanted to “seek wisdom;” but these are only illusions, and the path to wisdom is quite a different dimension.

I found that the patients would relapse whenever they receded to the same psychological or moral attitude or relationship that had initially led to that illness. This indicated that the illness was related to a particular psychical, moral, emotional attitude of the subject, his psychological “standard.” This relation is undeniable, just as the relation between speaker and word: the word reflects what the mind of the speaker formalises. Conversely, for patients who refrained from the attitudes that had led them to contract their disease, after a few years, a relapse would become impossible. If they die, it is because they have failed to do away with the same old behavioural model, or they die of other diseases.

## **2.4 Applying Ontopsychology to the economic practice**

After my achievement in the realm of clinical practice, I attempted to apply this knowledge to the higher functions of society, until at one point I simply asked myself the question: why should this knowledge not apply to economic matters? After all, business is a product of the mind, and any enterprise, political party or organisation is dominated by a psychological model: if the model is healthy, the result must be as well. Through a number of observations, I realised that economy is the excellence of the practical result of a functional intelligence. I had to refine the conceptual framework, around the basis provided by the three fundamental principles of Ontopsychology. Adding these three principles to an economic viewpoint makes it possible to achieve the exactness of nature, the exactness of life, and consequently self-fulfilment and infallibility.

I had come to the conclusion that there is a nucleus, which is the primary mover of man-as-unity-of-action. In essence, this nucleus should irradiate the whole existence of man, and the logical ego should be aware of it and move in coincidence with it. In practice, however, this coincidence is lacking.

I called this nucleus *ontic In Itself*: the Innermost Self of being, the Innermost Self of the unity of action, the existential entity that man constitutes. The *ontic In Itself* is connected with the order of reality – not necessarily with the ideas of the subject. It thrives as long as it remains connected, that is, as long as it keeps the *ontic nexus* with the totality of being. When the *ontic nexus* is separated from the global nexus, man remains outside of reality.

The knowledge of the logical-historical ego – our conscious knowledge – derives from our social consciousness: our history, tradition, beliefs, etc. It is *not* extrapolated from the logic of reality, or from the simple truth of the laws of the world of life.

The ontopsychological School has managed to probe the *ontic In Itself* and to identify its behaviours and attitudes. The *ontic In Itself* is the elementary moment of man's psychicality, his spirit – commonly referred to as the *soul*. Being a simple moment, it is undivided (in space and in

time): it is spiritual, all-in-one, it knows no before or after. It is also the source of our *intelligence*,<sup>7</sup> that is, the capacity to see within (*intus*) reality. Ontopsychology has revealed its behaviours, its preferences, its connaturals and connaturates, in short, its process of functional usefulness. The *In Itself* constitutes a prototype, an identity that establishes its selection on the surrounding universe. In simple words, man can drink potable water but not arsenic; he can eat the edible mushrooms but not the “poisonous” ones. The thematic (complementary) selection of the ontic *In Itself* determines certain mandatory relations for man’s unity of action. By observing its relations – where it places its preferences, what it selects as being useful and functional, what it identifies as augmentative – we can tell life from non-life. It therefore constitutes a true criterion for behaviour, and this understanding constitutes *intuition*.

The ontopsychological School has identified the phenomenology of the ontic *In Itself*; it has analysed how it chooses, what it calls its own, what it can and cannot metabolise. It operates the *basic metabolism of existence*; its selection is physical, to begin with, then psychological, and all the way up to the highest levels of man’s potential. Anyone who wants to be healthy and intelligent must serve this intrinsic order of nature. Having observed the phenomenology of the ontic *In Itself*, Ontopsychology has seen what it produces, what it seeks, what confirms or weakens it. Essentially, the ontic *In Itself* emanates some signals. By following these indications, we achieve the result of curing symptoms, of existential self-fulfilment, of confirming the order of nature and of entering the possibility of intuition.

Constituting a dialogue between the individual *In Itself* and the subject’s self-fulfilment (the needs of his functional utilitarianism), intuition points out that this principle of man as unity of action has, as its fundamental trait, a movement of self-conformity and self-confirmation. The ontic *In Itself* constantly evolves with self-production; like any biological principle, it seeks growth, confirmation, *qualitative* and *quantitative* expansion: a movement of *autoctisis*.<sup>8</sup>

Today, I will practically demonstrate how it is possible, by following the indications of this nucleus, to find the right direction, the right decision, that will lead the subject to the resolution of a problem, and consequently a sense of greater life and fulfilment.<sup>9</sup>

Take, for example, someone who is suffering from an illness, or someone who is in trouble with the tax authorities, or whose enterprise is not making profit, etc. The identity of the ontic *In Itself*, placed in that situation, will indicate the optimal course of action to take. *The practical indications of the individual ontic In Itself are all that is needed to understand what is going wrong and what needs to be changed.*

Thus, by looking *at the source* of the operator’s mind, Ontopsychology sets *man* in conformity with the rationality of nature.

## 2.5 Using Ontopsychology’s operative tools to read intuition

When FOIL<sup>10</sup> is consulted for a business problem or the like, it proceeds as follows. Firstly, it analyses all the projections that configure the situation in question (statistics, corporate image and other available data), and of course, the demand or need of the client – be it an individual, an organisation, a state, etc. But it also gauges the way out, the solution that is strategically indicated by the ontic *In Itself*, the nucleus. The ontic *In Itself* possesses this “enlightenment,” because it is connected with the order of reality. This order, which belongs to the operating subject, possesses the preferential relation, considered as a result of the different agents inter-related with the operator. In other words, the environment is perceived hierarchically, depending on what affects the operating subject’s interests most.

---

<sup>7</sup> From Latin *intus legere actionem*: to read inside the action, to understand from within.

<sup>8</sup> From Greek αὐτός: self, and κτίζω: to constitute, to found.

<sup>9</sup> In any case, this is only a very short synthesis of what is written in my books. It takes time and patience to study them, for they are not always easy. But once their content is understood, practice comes easy.

<sup>10</sup> Fostering Ontopsychological Interdisciplinary Leadership skills, s.r.l. (ltd.).

Having observed the different ways in which the ontic *In Itself* manifests its indications, we can put those indications into practice and be certain to achieve the desired result. As all dynamic processes, the ontic *In Itself* uses quite diversified semeiotics. In the end, the results are but the final, apodictic confirmation of the hypothesis initially programmed by the ontic *It Itself*.

Intuition is one of the many phenomena of the ontic *In Itself*. When the consciousness of the subject does not perceive it directly, it is still possible to trace it in dreams. Every night, dreams trace the graph of the dreamer's existential situation; they contain direct information about the nucleus, about complexes, pathogenic manifestations, technical difficulties caused by others, social pressures, etc. In short, dreams make it possible to decipher the subject's situation in relation to his health, his wealth, the result of his undertakings, and so on.

*Unawareness of dreams determines a loss of meaning and of reality.* The unconscious writes its letters throughout the day, and highlights where the subject has gone wrong and how to compensate for that mistake; alternatively, if the subject is leading his life well, it pinpoints external situations that could prove dangerous.

If the ontic *In Itself* provides the information, we do need the rules of Ontopsychology to decipher it. These rules allow the coincidence between the symbol and reality; they enable a precise understanding of dream symbolism, thus combining the knowledge of consciousness and of the unconscious.

[...]

### *Chapter Three*

## **THE DEFLECTION MONITOR AS THE ACTIVATOR OF SELF-SABOTAGE**

### **3.1 Revealing intuition through dream interpretation**

We have set out to understand the mind behind any historical event: the simple, essential architecture through which the mind organises the manifold; the way in which the one produces infinitely many parts. We cannot gain this insight in universal terms, but it is indeed possible within the perspective and the modest extent of our portion of existence. Limited as this may be, each of us has a relation with the Principle; if not, man would be nothingness, and this is a consequence of the self-evident principle that “being is, non-being is not.”

Yesterday we showed a practical application through a case. We were only able to correctly frame the problem – with respect to the realisation of a project – by analysing the *integral* projection of that person in the situation. This analysis then reveals whether a project is feasible, whether everything is in place, whether the undertaking is a positive and realistic one to begin with, etc. In yesterday's case the dream provided the analysis of the situation.

*Dreams* are written by the integral, albeit unconscious, nature of the subject. We call *unconscious* that part of us that we are unaware of, but that nonetheless exists and operates; in fact, it seems to be the strongest part of an individual. It is a whole universe that each one of us *is* but does not know, and it constitutes a great challenge for our science. We are much greater beings than we tend to think, but we lack the capacity to become aware of and rationalise this potential.

Finally, yesterday's analysis revealed a situation obfuscated by the interplay of moral and legal controversies – not a “simple” situation. It also showed that the project in itself was an excellent and realistic one, and that the operator, the leader, possessed the necessary capacities to carry it out. She was simply making a mistake in the execution, by communicating through the wrong channels and people. The bridge – symbolising effective communication – had collapsed, meaning that the leader's rational undertakings had failed to achieve their purpose, and the problem remained

unresolved. We also saw the emanation of intuition by the *In Itself* – the second, small wooden footbridge – proving that it was still possible to materialise the project historically. In summary, the leader had the capacities and possibilities necessary to realise her project, but needed to change her rationality with respect to the collaborators through which she communicated with other parties.

The following step would be to identify which people to keep at distance, and then to start over, using extra care in the key phases in the project. The dream also showed that the leader would understand and succeed – I would say by the end of this year. When she does, she will send the “bunch of flowers” I asked for, which will provide the material evidence of what I have affirmed.

### 3.2 Principles of the perennial philosophy

Even if it is transcendental, being is the substantial element, the “constant present” of our existence. The ontic *In Itself* is an essence with multiple functions; it is a multifunctional essence that becomes manifest through the formalisation of specific actions. A hand, for instance, is a specific formalisation of an intelligent essence; but the hand alone will never move; for the hand to move, it needs someone or something to decide how and when: *the designer or spirit*.

Mankind is positioned in this ambiguity between the historical and the ontic, between being and existence, essence and transience; this in-between is the realm of self-construction, historical *autoctisis*, which, if centred, is also ontic *autoctisis*. In this reality, the primary, original essence of the ontic *In Itself* has its own identity – before it manifests itself as a reflecting and wilful being. The term *identity* means that one thing is just that thing, and not something else, it has its own modality, different from others. Identity is what formalises, delimits, specialises being; it sets the typology; it configures the modality of existence. Being manifests and verbalises itself through its creatures, each of which has its own ways, its own traits, its own identity.

*Identity* means *id quod est ens*: what being is. To grasp an identity, we analyse how the thing precipitates under the analysis of the senses (this is how we tell the identity of the dog from the identity of man, that of the rose from that of the tulip, that of water from that of iron, etc). So identity is just a specific modality, but it also constitutes the sole criterion of choice, of discrimination, of metabolisation: it establishes what is good and what is bad. There is no good and bad in an absolute sense: in absolute terms, there is only being; so good and bad only exist in relative terms. Good is what conforms to man as an individual within the world of life; bad is what injures, what mortifies this ontic identity. Hence, an individual may metabolise anything, as long as it is approved, recognised by this very criterion: the identity that constitutes him as a living being.

As a matter of fact, we are all positioned within a historical-existential situation, that is, outside the pure unity of being. *Historical-existential* indicates the variable, context-relative quality of our situation, conditioned as it is by time, body, motives, etc. This is the way in which the ontic *In Itself* makes its haecceity, here, now and thus. A person – as body, as existing being – is an event, a *haecceity* (“here I am”) of being, embodying itself here, now and thus. The individual’s haecceity determines his limited context, his preferential place; from this place, he then develops and unfolds his strategy of becoming. This is the play of being: a word is pronounced, part of an enormous discourse, and that word must find the meaning and the mind of the whole.

All great masters, scientists or educators know how their pupils struggle with the apparent complexity of the discipline they study. But the pupil who arrives at the end of the journey will discover that that complexity derived from the same simple principle, conjugated in a multitude of forms, figures, ciphers, operations and languages. The point, then, is to maintain our ontic identity: man *is* to the extent that he is with his ontic identity; with it, he lives in joy; without it, in sorrow. The existential situation then requires a technical formalisation (juridical, architectural, economic, political, etc); the challenge being that of finding the *nexus*, the means to connect the project to its actuation within the environment, within society, without ever parting from the authenticity of one’s own identity: what makes one a *person*. What is the whole world to man, if he loses his own soul?

The first stake, then, is that of *preserving* life – your own life, to begin with: unless yours is complete, there is little you can do to help others. A further step is that of *integral increase*, combining quantity and quality – quantity in the service of quality, because quality involves greater mental gain, hence greater *intelligence*. Intelligence is the primary form of energy available to man on this planet, as it provides the connection with being in itself, with the principle of the world of life. In this process of preservation and increase, the development of the ontic identity should go hand in hand with the development of the historical identity of the individual-as-person; each action should lead to a gain on both fronts, on the front of being and on the front of history. The human<sup>11</sup> being is a historical being, an inhabitant of this planet, a product of the earth, a terrestrial embodiment of the spirit. This process is what I call *historical autoctisis*.

Hence we need to be able to actualise our *entity* (being in itself) along with the value of the *historical synolon*<sup>12</sup> we make: mind and matter, man as person within society. Society is as determinant as the ego itself: the ego cannot be complete without social interaction.

These are the elementary constituents that make human beings what they are. If you see all this as being very theoretical, it means you are mostly unconscious of yourself.

### 3.3 Human psychicality and the interference of the deflection monitor

Above we have outlined the nature of the project, the play of life. We find a number of accidental differences, between individuals and races, when we look at the human species. Incidentally, when we consider man as an intelligent being, we should not think of him as the creature that evolved from the Stone Age. *When we analyse the psychical formality of the human being, we find that its origin is outside this planet.* The specificity of the human ontic *In Itself* did not originate on the Earth, and man's presence on the Earth is a passing phase. We find this in the archive of the historical mind. The intelligence of man contains a process of creation in the making; today, the universe still writes its future also through the human mind. Mankind is still in its infantile stage, before a future orchestrated by a superior providence. Human beings have the duty to understand themselves, the reason of their situation and their purpose. This is all part of an *introductory technique*, a rational capacity to understand the way things are: *I am here; I have the capacity and the will to understand.*

In this area, there are no precise external sources of knowledge. We know that books were always manipulated by the prevalent regime: in Pharaonic times, what did not conform with the juridical order of the ruler was burnt or destroyed, but the same was done by the Arabs and by the Christians. The power in place establishes what is true and what is not: even the ancient Romans destroyed the memories of many peoples. This is just a pattern in history: the winner wants to be the only one left on the field, and therefore eliminates all others. The consequence is that successors will only have access to the information certified or tolerated by the system.

The earliest form of communication might have been a sort of *intentional hologram*, that is, *the capacity to remotely formalise a spatial quantum bearing information.* The word *information*<sup>13</sup> comes from an extraordinary civilisation: it indicates *communication that penetrates the form of action*; it penetrates the DNA of the cell. This word was not the result of the evolution of the Stone Age civilisation: it comes from a superior technology of knowledge. Information is communication that constitutes the receiver.<sup>14</sup>

When we analyse the unity of action of man as a historical organism, we understand how man is made today, but it is more difficult to understand how man was made, and what has happened during thousands of years of evolution or regression. What we do notice, however, is the introduction of parallelism, from the original single point. Someone or something has managed to

---

<sup>11</sup> Human, from Latin *homo*, and in turn from *humus*: earth.

<sup>12</sup> Synolon, from Greek σύν ὅλος: all-together, all-in-one.

<sup>13</sup> From Latin *in actione formo, signo*: to mark action, to structure action.

<sup>14</sup> In the field of biology, when an organ or a cell receives information, this information involves a transformation that is not only functional, but also organic, constitutional.

establish repetitive information, to establish a standard within man's cognitive, moral, emotional, psychological processes (*repetitive information*, as we would find it in a conveyor belt, a CD, or any mechanical device involving repetition). Essentially, we find man's mind polluted with constant information, a sort of prosthesis, adjunct to the natural system of the world of life. The purpose of this mechanism or information processor is solely of maintaining itself: it is a machine, parasiting man for its self-subsistence. Think of the combination between a cell and a chip: once the suitably programmed chip is plugged into the cell, it regulates the cell's functions.

I have called this adjunct element, this mechanism *deflection monitor*. *Monitor*, because it is a reflective, mirroring mechanism. It is like visualising information on a computer screen: we are convinced that the visualised information is real, that it coincides with reality. However, it is also possible to articulate information on the monitor, that is not correspondent with reality: fictitious information. Such a device is in place in the human cerebral system.

### 3.4 Cerebral brain, visceral brain and memetics

Biologically, man is equipped with two brains<sup>15</sup>: the viscerotonic brain and the cranial or cerebral brain. The neural cells constituting the "grey matter" of the cerebral brain are identical to those in the neural system covering the 7/9 metres of our intestines; of the two, the visceral brain is the primary one.

The ontopsychological School has found that the perception of the viscerotonic brain is always exact: there is always correspondence between reality and what the viscerotonic brain conveys. The information processed by the cerebral brain, on the other hand, does not always correspond to the concreteness of outer reality. The discoveries of Ontopsychology have been possible by constantly crosschecking the information obtained through these two systems, and gradually maturing a consistent analysis. The deflection monitor is a device that produces deviating information (hence the term *deflection*), information that is offset from reality, not correspondent. New information gained through perception, knowledge and external change is overridden by the constant, repetitive information of the deflection monitor.

In this area, the ontopsychological School organised a great congress on memetics, which took place in Milan in May 2002. By now, the discipline of memetics<sup>16</sup> is known internationally, and its concepts constitute one of the greatest challenges for science. It builds on the knowledge of computer science: the founders of memetics realised that human beings behave according to memes,<sup>17</sup> that is, repetitive images that reflect something of which there is no original. Human beings convey images that are not underpinned in reality, images that have no correspondence with reality.

Authors on memetics hold that all knowledge (from the Bible to contemporary thought) is a matter of memes: man's actions would be determined by memes – informational viruses that draw their energy from man's neurons, only for the purpose of self-subsistence, and only according to the logic of their program (the machine as an end in itself). Man provides the basic energy through which memes reproduce.

International psychological culture is still oblivious of this crucial problem: for example, during the last Beijing Congress of Psychology,<sup>18</sup> the world's greatest scientific congress of the discipline, memetics was not even mentioned. In institutional culture, psychologists – but also economists – are still "travelling by camel."

---

<sup>15</sup> To verify this, we simply need to carry out analyses and research and gather information

<sup>16</sup> The main authors on the subject are: R. Dawkins (*The Selfish Gene*, New Edition Oxford University Press, 1989); R. Brodie (*Virus of the Mind*, Integral Press, 1996); S. Blackmore (*The Meme Machine*, Oxford Univ. Press, 2000).

<sup>17</sup> From French *même*: the same.

<sup>18</sup> XXVIII International Congress of Psychology, Beijing, 8-13 August 2004.

### 3.5 The deviation induced by the deflection monitor and self-sabotage

Apart from their native intelligence, human beings use a number of means: consciousness, emotions, rationality, etc. The point is that these means, these tools are not exact. In other words, the means through which our intelligence (ontic *In Itself*) materialises historically lack the connection, the contact, and hence the unity of action with reality.

The deflection monitor has established its memetic functioning in parallel to the functions of sensory perception. In this sense, it is interesting to analyse the process of knowledge. A gesture as simple as taking an object in your hand involves a complex set of relations: how does the hand recognise and measure the object, so that it can seize it? What information does the brain receive and send to the hand? Modern neurology still struggles, when trying to explain these mechanisms. There is a complex process of encoding and decoding of information at work, in which, for example, a mountain seen through the eye is represented in the brain as, say, the shadow of a semi-electric dot.

But let us leave aside the detailed explanation of perception, and jump to the conclusion, which is that, within man, there is that “something,” that religions, philosophies and popular beliefs have described as “the spirit of evil,” “the devil” or similar expressions. These ideas derive from the awareness that something goes wrong within our consciousness, and in fact this is an effect of the deflection monitor, its effects being sorrow and unhappiness. When we use the ontopsychological method to analyse an individual’s personality, this mechanism manifests itself through the prevalence of a small number of memes, constellating the subject’s conscious attitudes and behaviour. The deflection monitor prevents consciousness from being a faithful mediation between the ontic *In Itself* and reality; consequently, we perceive both according to the selection of the deflection monitor’s interference.

The deflection monitor has its symbols, its words, its information, distinguishable from the intuition of the ontic *In Itself*. They are quite different: the deflection monitor is peremptory, categorical, repetitive (“this is the right way, this is what you ought to do”), thus determining mental rigidity. The Freudian concept of the superego can be helpful: the superego and the deflection monitor have much in common, as each builds up on the activity of the other. By contrast, the ontic *In Itself* appears out of nothing; it is an intangible formalisation that takes shape and then disappears, a pure space that is absolutely vacuous to our perception, but turns out to be infallible in the realisation of the historical project. Intuition, which is the information coming from the ontic *In Itself* in a historical situation, is clearly and distinctly different from any other form of information. Intuition only provides the way back to the point, *the point* being the place where reality is exclusively specific to that identity. This information conveys a reality, the most friendly face of a situation. The deflection monitor, on the other hand, constantly repeats, reworks and repropose a standard. It is not a biological mechanism; it is not a natural product, but something that has taken shape historically, through the interaction of societies and systems.<sup>19</sup> The information provided by this *third party* is not centred on the subject’s functional utilitarianism. It is just psychedelic, psychological, conscious information, but it is not in the interest of the operator, of the living being. The machine as an end in itself.

This is the principle of self-sabotage, the categorical informational device that establishes stereotypes, the psychological precipitates of repression (Freud’s *complexes*) and the biological neoplastic precipitates that belong to the realm of medicine.<sup>20</sup>

During the opening session, I pointed out that 60% of entrepreneurs, of business operators are self-saboteurs: they actively organise the fall of the key projects, the integral projects for their personality and their environment and business. This is, of course, an unconscious process:

---

<sup>19</sup> I have always avoided putting the emphasis on the origin of the deflection monitor. Anyone who wants to gain too deep an insight into the deflection monitor will eventually lose his mind. This mechanism seeks *contact*: as the researcher penetrates into it, it pollutes the researcher’s mind. What is certain about it, is that the information it proposes is not profitable for the identity of human nature, and this is why I recommend following the path that has been set by the world of life – because it works, it brings good results and self-fulfilment.

<sup>20</sup> Indeed, information is not only a matter of the mind, as it is also inscribed within the body (biological information).

externally, the individual's intentions are sound, confirmed and espoused by the banks, the statistics, the governments. So an entrepreneur might choose information, that he consciously thinks will lead him to success, but that will in fact determine his self-sabotage. When the effects become apparent, he will lay the blame on outside factors (collaborators, governments, banks, etc) and fail to understand that he is himself the actor behind the problem that he confronts with so much energy every day. Where there is a real economy in place, the entrepreneur himself is the greatest danger for his business. And when a project fails, it is always possible to look at technical mistakes, at external circumstances – all this constitutes useful information and requires professional skill – but what is most important is verifying whether the operator is really centred on himself, whether he positions himself within the intelligence of functional utilitarianism, or, conversely, another element such as the deflection monitor prevails. The deflection monitor does not appear as such, but manifests itself through some symbols, behaviours, relationships, strong beliefs, etc. Its manifestations are numerous, and many of these have been identified by the ontopsychological School. But, since it is essentially repetitive, the disguises it uses to condition the individual's daily life are relatively few and constant.

One of the ways in which the deflection monitor appropriates the subject's energy is by manipulating his memory, thus severing the connection between the conscious ego and the ontic sense of intuition. As a result, people live for the sake of a meme, of an idea, of a fixation, and they will tend to mould the world of life to the mnesic circuit of the deflection monitor. Such *mnesic circuits* are biological organisations determined by habits and stereotypes, not necessarily aligned with the polyfunctional *In Itself* of the individual. Such circuits take preference over others, because they have been previously selected with a given purpose. That is, they are used because they have been chosen, not because they are factually better or more valid.

[...]