

### 3. Our ancestors, or the circularity of communication.

The antic era<sup>6</sup> marked the first attempts to design formulas on the nature of things: it comes from the speech on the order of cosmos and on the efforts to find its laws and principles.

Our ancestors knew the big Nature, and they confront it on the base of time to explain the whole complexity of things. It was a circle of signification where the end was likely bound to a new beginning, where the end was as well a finality of the beginning.

In every circle, each event makes sense as a part of the whole, and not just for itself: the signification of the entire process is meant by its conclusion<sup>7</sup>.

Our ancestors knew that it was necessary for this circle to happen: the activities might complete their course from where the event originated. Not by case, the ancient Greeks gave the word “energy (*enérghēia*)” to activities.

To complete a circle, energy-activities have to culminate their courses from where they began. This basis is the functional principle of life. It also sets the body as the holy temple of meanings, and the inner world as the logos for its sacred significations.

If the circle doesn't complete its course, or if its origin is misunderstood or misconceived, some energy/activities would rest

---

<sup>6</sup> There are worldwide evidences of previous and parallel endeavours to give significations to the complexity of the world. I apologize for being a bit Eucentred and for the limitedness of my knowledge. I deeply suggest to refer to real physicians for a complete view on the history of physics.

<sup>7</sup> This is a valid principle which lay at the basis of whatsoever theory on the common shared communication, where the signification of each speech is completed by and within its conclusions.

open to produce results which will end up differently than expected.

It is nothing new if it would be transferred to daily experience: each time something unexpected happens within the relationship of care, it might have something to do with a misconception of its beginnings.

The request of care is commonly assumed as the beginning of every care-work<sup>8</sup>; any misconceptions might question the role of the caregiver and the whole speech of care that originated in that very moment.

Still, if the end is linked to where it began, we are saying that no individuals should be considered “chronic” by given definition<sup>9</sup>.

Simply because individuals were not “chronic” in their beginnings. Humans are born evolutive, not chronic. As well as all other animals, humans are biologically born to be evolving and adaptive, and not to be sucked within a position of dependency that can be barely been assumed as survival. When such position happens, it questions the care-worker speech.

Further more, as an individual is always a part of a process, it becomes evident how “chronicity” can tell something interesting on the context and the institutions that co-generate it by not been able to come up with anything else.

Sometimes, the “do-not” part of a speech is more effective and significant than the “do” part in term of impact on the net result. Blaming the receiver of a “do-not” action made by the care-worker is still something else. It is an imposition of power.

In this perspective, it is quite bizarre the fact that institutions are always very keen for innovations. If they are co-responsible of producing chronicity, innovations is more suitable to confirm their position. Quite bizarre, so to speak. And hard to trust.

---

<sup>8</sup> There is always a question, a demand, a desire that fix the starting point of every process of care-work. This demand, request or desire might be either explicit or implicit, and it is central to the whole process.

<sup>9</sup> Chronic indicates the persistence of a state or a condition for a long time

Every time an institution generates or keeps along with a chronicle dependency<sup>10</sup> by pointing the cause on the person-in-need, it is signed a quite clear statement of power more than a mission of care. Oops.

In a circle, every conclusion has signification by itself, and each event was the development that brings meanings to what came before. No resentments or angst, the past is a present not yet-become future.

As Master Oogway<sup>11</sup> said «...yesterday is history, tomorrow is a mystery, but today is a gift. That's why it is called the present ... ».

Ignoring this, it is to say we situate ourselves a bit before our ancestors: they knew that the future was not just a repetition of the past, but a never-ending redefinition of the present.

In care work, everyday is the first day. Every time is the first time, still with an inner memory underneath. This is possible in care work as in normal life every time a person allows his/her self to save some inner space to be amazed, and amused.

Ignoring this in care work means being astonished each time a person reproduces exactly a failure over and over again. If one ever saw such things happening, it might be interesting to doubt on what part the care-worker or the institution had in the process.

Arthur Schopenhauer reminded how «...we should treat with indulgence every human folly, failing, and vice, bearing in mind that what we have before us are simply our own follies, failings, and vices ... »<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>10</sup> Caparròs wrote that «... the poverty of one third of the population is a requisite to maintaining the political system based on flattery and patronage and on dependance on subsidies and charity, that leaves people in a situation of permanent crisis, of social and political anomy, of extreme dependance/addiction to the State and its policies...» (ref.: *Contra el cambio, un hiperviaje al apocalipsis climático*, 2010)

<sup>11</sup> Ref.: the cartoon movie “*Kung Fu Panda*”, 2008

<sup>12</sup> Ref.: Arthur Schopenhauer “*Parerga and paralipomena*”, 1851. The terms are ancient Greek translation for appendices and omissions.