

Coelho³ went to the desert to find his guardian angel and he had a series of steps to perform. One of these is called the ritual that destroys rituals. The explanation is that the magus gradually becomes the slave of his own rituals; therefore occasionally, he has to undergo a process of purification to get rid of them. The purpose of the ritual that destroys rituals is to help him to step out. De Bono's methods can be understood in the same way. He created methods to help stepping out of our rituals. Methods that destroy methods.

This leads us to the next aspect of creativity; the creative must be free to create. Few would dispute this statement – but being free is not as simple as it sounds.

3 CREATIVITY AS FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

Freedom is the opposite of slavery. Of course, one may argue that there is no slavery in the world today but there are other views as well; e.g. Marcuse [34: 36] asserts that:

“The slaves of developed industrial civilization are sublimated slaves, but they are slaves, for slavery is determined neither by obedience nor by hardness of labor but by the status of being a mere instrument, and the reduction of man to the state of a thing.”

Freedom can be fully understood only if examined in relation to the complete personality. [35: viii] Fromm (ibid: 26) distinguishes two kinds of freedom: the negative, or “freedom from” as well as the positive or “freedom to”. We are free from the bonds of the pre-individualistic society; but we are also left without the safety it guaranteed; we are left in isolation. There are two responses to this situation; either we seek new dependences and submissions or we advance to a realization of positive freedom based on uniqueness and individuality. Which way to choose is answered by Szondi's [36] fate-analysis.

According to Szondi we have several possible fates for ourselves. These are determined by our genome and instincts (ontogenetic and phylogenetic heritage) on the one hand, and by our socio-cultural environment on the other. Nobody can choose a fate that (s)he has not seen or does not have built-in. The (positively) free person can choose from the available ones; but the others live a constraint-fate. Therefore we also call the positively free people “self-strong”, the others are “self-weak” or “fate-ill” people. Szondi claims that only people who can choose their destiny can be happy. So who can be free? According to Szondi the answer lies in the children's room. The children's room

is not necessarily a separate room but a place where the child can express herself/himself. To have a children's room makes the difference between being raised for freedom instead of obedience. The famous Hungarian architect Imre Makovecz said in an interview that he only accepts an apprentice who could look up to her/his father (dominant parent) instead of fearing him. If one was trained for obedience, it takes hard work to make one free [34: 44]:

“... it must first enable its slaves to learn and see and think before they know what is going on and what they themselves can do to change it. And, to the degree to which the slaves have been preconditioned to exist as slaves and be content in that role, their liberation necessarily appears to come from without and from above. They must be ‘forced to be free’, to ‘see objects as they are, and sometimes as they ought to appear’, they must be shown the ‘good road’ they are in search of.”

We argue that only free people can be creative. They need both negative freedom, so that being creative is allowed by the authorities, and also positive freedom, which means that they can handle their own creativity [35: 208]:

“We are proud that we are not subject to any external authority, that we are free to express our thoughts and feelings... The right to express our thoughts, however, means something only if we are able to have thoughts of our own: freedom from external authority is a lasting gain only if the inner psychological conditions are such that we are able to establish our own individuality.”

Why would one remain a slave if one can be free? Presumably this is because freedom has its price – a high price. First, freedom always goes together with responsibility. If one is told what to do or how to make one's choices – one is not responsible. But if one is free to choose from existing solutions or to create a new one then one is responsible for one's choices and creations [25: 284]:

“... an absence of «objective» standards does not mean less work; it means that scientists have to check all ingredients of their trade and not only those which philosophers and establishment scientists regard as characteristically scientific. Scientists can thus no longer say: we already have the correct methods and standards of research – all we need to do is to apply them. For according to the view of science that was defended by Mach, Boltzmann, Einstein and Bohr, and which I restated in AM,⁴ scientists are not only responsible for the correct application of standards they have imported from elsewhere, they are re-

³ Coelho, Paulo (1995) *The Valkyries*, Harper Collins, London.

⁴ The acronym reads “Against Method” which is another book of the author.

