

## 7. Invariable absolutes: ether, economy, efficiency.

After considering space and time as an absolute, Newton defined the correlation between corps under a rigorous causal and deterministic point of view. The invariable absolute was the ether, something intangible but able to define all the relationships. This model was lately considered unable to explain what the modern was observing.

If we substitute the word “ether” with “economy”, we can probably have a complete sentence as well, which will enable us to say that one is stuck and/or fixed at Newtonian time when saying that an invariable absolute is able to define and rule all the relation.

It sounds as the sole difference between “good old times” and today progress and innovation is that the absolute is now called “economy” or “efficiency” instead of “ether”.

But as it was for ether, economy is not sufficient to give responses to all we observe.

The need of keeping an absolute and pervasive reference (as with ether, economy and efficiency) seems to tell something of the systematic and institutionalised defences driven by the services and the institutions rather than the ones of the people we are supposed to offer care to.

It sounds quite an updated concept, as it fixed a sole paradigm for the complexity of both individual and social circumstances, such as disabilities vs. normality, inclusion vs. exclusion. Updated, but still conceived as innovative. Life in 1870 might be fascinating to some.

Having a given absolute in “economy” means shaping an individual in terms of cost/benefit ratio, in term of efficiency. Still, underlying an individual in such bipolar terms means that someone is or isn't. It means that if one is economically efficient, he/she will be a fine part

of the majority, the great part of us. Otherwise, one is a leftover. A scrap. As the dictionary says literally, one who is left over after the greater part has been used. By others.

This is quite an implicitly demarcating social role, which sounds like a staggering violence on the head of people.

Its being implicit, and somehow silent, it is probably the reason why it is not self evident to many. It is clearly evident to the ones which suffer it, though. And to those few who has the humility and the courage to open their inner world in search of awareness to discover their own personal rank<sup>22</sup>.

In the profession of care-work, both Galileo and Newton theories are wide awake, each time we hear the fallacious-but-familiar statement about the market capacity of being self-sufficient, about the efficiency as award criteria, about the silent rank that determines the people position and possibilities.

---

<sup>22</sup> Ref.: *Sitting in the fire, large group transformation using conflict and diversity*, 1997. Following Arnold Mindell, I consider “rank” as the composite sum of personal privileges which define the “social and personal power arising from culture, community support, personal psychology and or spiritual power”