Society and territory: prevention and social planning.

Roberto Veraldi[1]

Abstract

Prevention and social planning are two terms that bind to the sense of community and identity of a territory, at a time of socio-economic regeneration of the territory itself and resilience to the crises imposed by globalization. The local community is at the center of the processes of renaissance, or at least this is what all decision-makers declare in their planning. In reality, programming (at all levels, from European to local) needs to confront the demands, values, resources and power (even perceived) of change that belong to the local community, as an expression of relationships and power. The relationship between external/internal agents of change is not only limited to policy makers and stakeholders (both of the different levels of programming and of the different sectors of the same local community), but also to the view that they have of the dichotomies (sometimes stereotyped) such as: health/health, well- being/disease, development/protection, investment/cost, participation/delegation.
Keywords: community/society; local/global; social identity/relationships[2]

[1]University Gabriele D'Annunzio of Chieti-Pescara; University of Belgrade. roberto.veraldi@unich.it.

1. Introduction

The word, the feeling, the reaction that unites all of us in this globalized world, is fear. Fear of the foreigner who steals our work, fear of the foreigner who deals drugs on the street, fear of the labour market that selects more and more ruthlessly, fear of companies that can fire at any time by closing an entire plant to move it to another part of the globe, fear of financial speculators who can ruin a nation in a single day.

And all this generates anxiety, the anxiety of recognition and reassurance, anxiety of grandmother to be more accepted within their own experience of relationships, anxiety to slip slowly among the invisible, among the last, between the gap of society, but also anxiety of entire communities that see their places impoverished, denied, compressed by capitalist society and by a lack of planning projected into the future. And all this is expressed through a tension, to use Bauman's words, between individual phenomena and collective phenomena experienced at varying degrees of intensity as threats, such as subsidiaries of the post-modern (I would add that I do not particularly like postmodern adjective. I love more the term of late modernity or second modernity).

I would then like to focus briefly on this state of fear: if we think of unemployment, new miseries, daily precariousness, and this just to stay in the local, we see how all these aspects become phenomena that give full hands insecurity, doubt, distrust, risks. The generalized precariousness, the urban insecurity, the migrants who push at the borders, the illegal immigrants who steal our women's work, the violence that the ecosystem suffers from the consequent climate changes, the destruction of the forests, the poisoning of the seas, do nothing but give an obscure existential representation, bearer of threats that have now become systemic and that represent scenarios unable to build handholds to which I can cling to in its increasingly frantic search for points of reference.

And the uncertain forms that the contemporary world takes on today, can be considered the mirror of the slipperiness and ambiguity of the forms of identity of the citizens of this century: the figure of the uncertain (and widespread uncertainty) is about to be one of the dominants of the present and the immediate future. Perhaps we could add that, net of any play on words, perhaps what we are most afraid of today is just not knowing what to be afraid of.

The third world, for example, appears to be absorbed for better or for worse in the complex economic, social and political dynamics of globalization, with a significant increase in the distance between a few developed nations, most of which are afflicted by the dramas of poverty, hunger, underdevelopment, and political unrest. We must add that the very bad habit of defining developing countries as the Third World hides the bonds of dependence on Western countries; bonds that are very strong both from the times of colonialism and from today's globalized neo-colonialism.

In all this, Europe shows a profound inability to assume its responsibilities, denying its historical and cultural matrix, avoiding being inspired by principles of justice, fair distribution of resources, the fight against hunger, and leaving room only for the heartless and depersonalizing economy. What comes out of this description in gloomy colours: it discerns a tear in social networks and a weakening of the welfare state that gives way to the war between goods and labour, on the one hand, and the community on the other... the effects of this war could somehow once have been cured

in the backyards of affections and family ties or social networks, today these backyards are increasingly undermined by weak and temporal ties; solid networks then give way to mobile networks.

And it is no coincidence that he has repeatedly used the word network. It is a word that refers to a protective and reassuring dimension, but also a coercive dimension; its conceptual evocation allows us to approach and keep together a system of binomials and antinomies that would otherwise conflict. The network allows us to work with e between the formal and the informal, the community of the individual, the right and solidarity, money and the free, the public and the private, the ego and the other.

Above all, however, what stands out most is the attempt to break up even the remaining links between weak networks because of the increase in complexity in the E social context, because of the ambivalence present in it: It is under the eyes of all how the new constraints, the new steel cages, given by today's social structure harness the life of all (living a hectic and hyper-organized time, deny the fragility to always be prepared and ready to compete, delude themselves that they can have endless potential to awaken And become aware that this is not the case, build as people in a context that is increasingly without models and protective nets especially for young people).

And again, there seem to be evident known aspects of daily life: a) the appearance of a new individualism that overshadows groups, organizations, intermediate social bodies that have produced a dynamic reading of the situations and problems that people live (even if there are examples not exciting, in fact of new forms of associationism that are neither spontaneous nor full of content); b) also, another useful element for reflection, the loss of the desire to relate (as a result of what was said above). The alternative seems to be the construction of instrumental (interested) social bonds that generate what is defined as liquid modernity, as a new form of communal modernity as a refuge from an insecure world.

2. Prevention and social planning

It is clear that all this makes it difficult to promote interventions of prevention and social planning; also because some have thought of putting prevention as a player at a personal level or at most between two institutions; In reality, it must be understood as a process that brings into play in the local community many actors who are called to put themselves into the network to develop an idea of prevention as a time to seek new social meanings, new social coexistence, new visions of the social world to relaunch social ties and implement new forms of construction of the common good. However, it is no longer possible to experiment with new forms at random, but neither should we try to bridle reality by lowering, from above and in an a-contextual manner, behavioural models, rules of conduct, when instead a prevention is needed that is designed, centred on the Person as a resource and not as a problem, and that involves the whole community.

Prevention that does not impose models but the dialogue with the situations, that reads the specific situations and declines interventions in a perspective of support and change within the processes participated with the protagonists of the prevention. Planning prevention means translating an intentionality, linked to values and premises often implicit, it means seeing what you want to do, what you can do, what you do. In a word it means awareness. Through a conscious vision of the choices that are made and what happens, the design process takes a direction, a guide. Through design, the values that animate the subjects in the field are translated into objectives and therefore become goals, the realization of which can be evaluated.

It must also be engaging and have an impact on everyday life contexts. But it must also be an act of continuity that concerns families, peer groups, schools, sports organizations, religious or cultural groups. In this sense, those who promote prevention are placed in the perspective of promoting the network of social ties and use as a resource the group and its potential both systemic and ethical: this also means promoting social capital, such as the set of relational elements that can enhance the social rationality itself; therefore, social capital is characterized by the presence of relationships of trust, cooperatives, in which the meso dimension (between macro and micro) of families, groups, organizations that the prevailing individualism has mortified is recovered. And social capital then becomes a sort of resource for the community, as it puts people in a position to act together for the achievement of a common goal, even in the absence of particular constraints.

And so all this means putting relations back at the center, that is, rediscovering that bonds are a resource as well as a bond: they can be generated and regenerated in the family but also in the community, the world of work, in the world of associationism, as well as in politics. To do this we need to get out of the false dichotomy between the individual and society, to recognize that the encounter, the crossbreeding, between the individual and society always sees the presence of multiple mediations, whether they are groups or organizations, artificial or natural, and that all are combined with the promotion of quality of life. It is, therefore, necessary to promote and support the capacities of individuals and groups to generate and regenerate bonds and improve the quality of life, which in any case lead to the promotion of networks and dynamism in local communities.

Prevention means building and rebuilding as well as relaunching social ties; prevention and caring for the ties, of people, of the community. In this perspective, taking care takes the form of accompanying in paths of reconstruction and regeneration of bonds, the laughed meaning of events, of assuming responsibility towards oneself and others: in these cases what counts is the search for meaning, a search that implies the relationship with the other, but also doing something for the relationship, that is, for the bond. And it is also a search for new affiliations, new mutual recognition, new pacts of social coexistence, and participation for a new season of self-organization as a promotion of community development.

It would not make sense, however, if we did not connect everything, not only to the construction of social bonds but also to the idea that all the actors put in place and called to collect, to the need that they are not passive recipients or users of rigid and standardized services, but active protagonists (or if you like, co-actors) of possible responses in a perspective of strengthening the Welfare State.

All this is not second-line sociology; the path that this community is following (for some time now) is the proof of involvement of rational social actors, within their social arena of reference (work, the world of associations, the religious world, the peer group, the family, relations in general), who want to decline their life experience into a new dimension, more dialoguing, more open to participating and building reflection. A reinterpretation of the territory, then, that passes through a reinterpretation of Politics and Politics for what Don Milani often mentioned: going out of problems alone is greed, going out together is politics.

In a certain sense, it is the era (and I say this as a provocation) of community utopia, of the now lost hope of a good society inhabited by better people. And if Hannah Arendt speaks to us of politics as love for the world, Ulrick Beck - lucid in his looking at the horizons of everyday life and a future still waiting for radical changes - spurs us on to look for new paths for Politics as love towards the human race and towards the community, towards the sense of community.

3. Conclusion

The local community is at the center of the processes of renaissance, or at least this is what all decision-makers declare in their planning. In reality, programming (at all levels, from European to local) needs to confront the demands, values, resources, and power (even perceived) of change that belong to the local community, as an expression of relationships and power. The relationship between external/internal agents of change is not only limited to policymakers and stakeholders (both of the different levels of programming and the different sectors of the same local community), but also to the view that they have of the dichotomies (sometimes stereotyped) such as: health/health, well- being/disease, development/protection, investment/cost, participation/delegation. A delicate and important role then belongs to all of us called to combine, catalyze and facilitate the processes that respond to a sort of institutional mandate but above all to the demands of the community.

References

1. Arendt, H. (2004). *Politique et pensée*. Paris: Payot & Rivages.
2. Beck, U., Beck, U., Sociologist, G., Beck, U. and Beck, U. (2008). *Costruire la propria vita: quanto costa la realizzazione di sé nella società del rischio*. Bologna: Il mulino.
3. Biorcio, R. and Vitale, T. (2016). *Italia civile: associazionismo, partecipazione e politica*. Rome: Donzelli.
4. D'Alessandro, R. (2010). *La società smarrita. Quattro letture del presente fra paure, crisi e migrazioni*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.

5. Gallino, L.(2005). *Globalizzazione e diseguaglianze*. Roma-Bari: Laterza.
6. Gallino, L. (2006). *Dizionario di sociologia*, Vol. 1 e 2, Rome: Gruppo Editoriale L'Espresso.
7. Giddens, A., (2004). *Le conseguenze della modernità*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
8. Mastropasqua, I. (2004). *Architettura delle reti sociali: teorie, luoghi, metodi*. Roma: Carocci Faber.
9. Pratola, V. a cura di. (1998). *Educazione, scuola e disadattamento : riflessioni e proposte*. Pescara: Libreria dell'Universita Editrice.
10. Veraldi, R. (1999), *Analisi di processi socio-culturali attraverso la scelta emozionale e la dinamica dei gruppi*. Firenze: AIDA.
11. Veraldi, R. (2007). *Globalizzazione e società locale: case studies sulla realtà giovanile abruzzese*. Romane: GAIA srl-Edizioni Univ.
12. Veraldi, R. a cura di. (2008) *Analisi dei dati 2000-2007 sulle cause di morte, infortuni e malattie professionali nel lavoro in Abruzzo : rapporto finale di analisi secondaria*. Roma: EUR.
13. Veraldi, R. ed. (2017). *Mundos sociológicas y campos de acción*. Romane: Edizioni universitarie.