

22. charming interpretations from the land of poets.

Proposing developments in terms of de-institutionalisation and right-based approach, ethics, rights-first and direct participation, leads to a simple, straight, big issue: the degree of reciprocity in handling responsibility between individuals-in-need, institutions, and third sector.

When these approaches came along some time back in the 70s, they were somehow innovative. And they had their own symbolic debts to pay to previously developed knowledges.

When they succeeded and turned theory into reality, they made history. Other times, they turned up to be popular, politically correct, very fashionable and charming. Quite empty, although.

Newton taught that to every action, there is always an equal and opposite reaction⁷⁵. After any innovation, a “counter” innovation usually does not wait long, and came across in the shade of newspeak.

Frans Vera⁷⁶ clearly addressed the situation translating the Newton's third law on motion on daily experience:

« ... mostly there is no trouble as long as you are within the borders of an accepted paradigm. But be aware when you start to discuss the paradigm. Then it starts to be only twenty-five per cent discussion of facts (...) The thing I most often heard was, ‘Who do you think you are?’ ...».

Sometimes before, in his essay on the misconceived value of Schopenhauer as an educator, Nietzsche wrote quite a clear statements

⁷⁵ Ref.: Newton's third law on motion, in *Mathematical principles of natural philosophy*, 1687

⁷⁶ Ref.: Elizabeth Kolbert, *Recall of the wild*, The New Yorker, 24th Dec. 2012

on the significations of innovation: « ... how should a political innovation manage once and for all to make a contented race of the dwellers on this earth ... every philosophy that believes the problem of existence to be shelved, or even solved, by a political event, is a sham philosophy ... ⁷⁷»

New magnificent interpretations became part of the social debate. By themselves, these words are elements of a constant evolution. They are the expressions to signify fundamental approaches and philosophies under the principle of responsibility assumed by all actors. Vice versa, they can lead to a massive coverage under a “politically correct” suit, meaning something very different than their original signification.

So it is with *prospectic integration*: it means a collective integration of all resources and actors toward a commonly-agreed process under a common perspective. It sounds fair. But it can also mean that institution decides the line for the other to be adaptive; it is the institution saying “if you want to be considered normal and integrated, look what you will have to do (or say) to adapt to my perspective”. A way ahead from personal attitude to power-games.

Synergy literally means the interaction and cooperation that produces a combined effect greater than the sum of their separate effects. It is evenhanded. But it might become a synonym for the institution to say “my decision, your energy”.

Another impressive concept is *supportive resilience*, a solicitous form to define the capacity of a person to absorb and pass over hardships.

⁷⁷ Ref.: F. Nietzsche, *Schopenhauer as educator*, 1874. He wrote: «that it is a shameful thing that such abominable flattery of the Time-Fetish should be uttered by a herd of so-called reflective and honourable men; it is a proof that we no longer see how far the seriousness ... is removed from that of a newspaper. Such men have lost the last remnant of feeling, not only for philosophy, but also for religion, and have put in its place a spirit not so much of optimism as of journalism, the evil spirit that broods over the day—and the daily paper. Every philosophy that believes the problem of existence to be shelved, or even solved, by a political event, is a sham philosophy.»

It happens to hear that resilience is quite a popular concept nowadays. It happens to hear expressions such as “need to foster resilience, impressive in terms of resilience”.

There are no statistics on how many people knows the true meaning of these expressions they currently use. This is one of the case where cause and effect have been exchanged.

Accordingly to physics, the actual meaning of resilience⁷⁸ refers to the maximum amount of stress a person can carried on by presenting a possible future support before cracking down.

As the modulus of resilience is the maximum energy that can be absorbed per unit volume without creating a permanent distortion, all who propose it as an issue for persons-in-need are in fact supporting a power-game which impact on stressing down the individuals who should have been lifted up instead. It is although impressive: these progressive misinterpretations marks a movement from a peer attitude to a double-level and perverse power-game. Aware of it, or not, that is the net impact.

The reality evolved, new words came through. The refrain from 2008 on is “under the necessity of crisis and austerity”. Data has already showed how veridical it is.

Telling someone that will not receive a certain service which is deserved because there are no money, it is something. People may understand. They do not have money themselves: it is an alliance.

Telling someone that will not receive a certain service which is entitled to because money are elsewhere, it is something else. To express is very clear: telling to the vast majority of people that they will not receive the services they are entitled to because money are passing to the wallets of a small minority, it is something else. It sounds different. Reaction might be different. No surprise if for

⁷⁸ In physics, resilience is the ability of a material to absorb energy when it is deformed elastically and release that energy upon unloading. Proof resilience is defined as the maximum energy that can be absorbed within the elastic limit, without creating a permanent distortion.

someone it is better to keep talking about the crisis.

Being here. Done that.

New words for the newspeak. So creative. So innovative. Was ist, ist. Was nicht ist, ist möglich. Nur was ist nicht, ist möglich⁷⁹. So it is for the housing-first, which in Italy has a long tradition dated back to early 70s and the de-institutionalisation movement. “Almost” brand new. But yet innovative, for those whose enthusiasm is genuine and still have to learn from history. To others, whose memory is short enough, it is just an application of newspeak.

The point is what is behind the language: a genuine willingness, or a under-covered way to monetised anything in some less obvious and more cynical way⁸⁰.

This housing issue refers in term of reality check with a general “old fashioned culture”⁸¹, which introduce new requests of compliance at different levels: risk of moving from large to small institutions (the change is just aesthetical); the resistance of charity institutions which need clients to survive (the will of power); the impact on in-visibility more than on citizenship (far from the eyes, far from the hearts). Galliani underlines three characteristics which represent evil risks: one, the effort for exchanges just to be aesthetical; two, the will of power; three, the push into invisibility. Quite inconvenient, specially as they applies to the glorious third sector.

If we consider also the context, with a progressive lack of available resources, contraction in employment, weak community services and insufficient social houses, it is evident that without any cultural

⁷⁹ Ref.: English translation: «*What is is. What is not is possible. Only what is not is possible*». The song “Was ist, ist” was published by Einstürzende Neubauten in their album Ende Neu (Ending New) in 1996 .

⁸⁰ Ref.: Frank Thomas, *TED talks are lying to you*, 2013. Frank Thomas wrote that «for all its reverential talks about innovation, society has no interest in new ideas at all, unless they reinforced favourite theories or could be monetised in some obvious way».

⁸¹ Ref.: Stefano Galliani, *Housing-first in Italy, limits and chances for homeless sector*, Amsterdam 2013, Feantsa conference

change and a deep-inner-assumption of responsibility, all these terms risk to remain here and there just an hand of paint to maintain the same old structure.

Similarly, to avoid repetitions, it is necessary to learn by history, to be available to question own prejudices. So if someone pretends to be 100% innovative without recognising historical credits, it is more likely connected with repetitions. Repetitions are not necessary good for the karma; and tend to maintenance and restoration. The picture is closer to a silent restoration to justify the status-quo through a mandatory request of compliance. It is exactly what Orwell called newspeak.

This happens at every level, in every field with the same exact movements, producing the identical double significations: on one side, the media and governmental speakers keep on arguing against those «...fucking Italians that “do not want infrastructures” under the guise of “bribes to corrupt bureaucrats and patronage systems”...»⁸². Newspeak is when a state doesn't have money to keep school-building safe, while throwing more than twenty billion euros for a non-existent transfer of goods at the speed of light from Turin to Lyon and back, something is far beyond the charming interpretations.

Just as it happens with dozens of other examples: when there is the marketing of the Unesco Educational Award in a city where the support to disable students is reduced every year; where a municipality of a city with two football teams invests three billion euros to build a third stadium, while it diminishes the janitor staff in primary and secondary school until the safety, support and control are a good wish at its most, or still when there is the necessity to foster a cultural shock by promoting the housing-first in a town where three thousands evictions take place every year.

Newspeak is when the system's responsibilities in producing social exclusion are covered-up by announcing PR measures during election

⁸² Ref.: Marco Travaglio, *Riforma del senato: il riottamatore* (the Senate reform: the riot-maker”), il Fatto quotidiano, 9 Aug. 2014

campaigns, such as for the “social card” and find out that it was not working months later.

Still, newspeak is talking about the values on one cable, while on another table they deny the access to educational rehabilitation to minors with disabilities if their family aren't wealth enough to anticipate the costs; or they bring abused teenagers back from their residential protected communities to their abusing environments, claiming some sort of familiar perverse-value to cover-up cost reductions in service and productive-bonus in the institutions. And the examples are far to end, they are so many more⁸³. The gap between what individuals face in reality and what's been told during the official talks is reaching unbelievable highs. As we saw, for any institutions it is very dangerous to bet on the compliance on structural continuous deny of reality from individuals.

On parallel, it is part of the care-worker mandate to be able to call things with their name, without any unconscious adherence to this power-game on one side, and without any spontaneous and unintentional partiality and prejudice on the other.

Meanwhile, good try. Very charming from the land of poets.

⁸³ These and other examples will be the focus and contents of a forthcoming paper, which will be titled “A couple of things patients know while our leaders tend to forget”