



PARIGI 23>27 nov 2012

Resoconto del partecipante Alfredo Angelici

Partenza per parigi. progetto europeo. wow! suona meraviglioso. incontrerò partner europei del progetto. la francia , il portogallo, l'irlanda, l'italia, un pizzico di germania e poi la grecia...in realtà vedo che incontrerò principalmente paesi cosiddetti p.i.i.g.s. (portogallo italia rlanda grecia spagna). ok, c'è anche la francia che fa da moderatore. insomma incontrerò quei paesi che in un modo o in un altro, per usare una metafora comune, hanno mangiato troppo alla cena europea e, una volta arrivato il conto, si chiede invece ai paesi che sono stati morigerati, di dividere il totale. famo alla romana. nel momento che siamo a parigi, l'ue deve decidere la tranche di aiuti da 10 miliardi per salvare la grecia. la delegazione greca è autorevole. la storia e la cultura sono più forti di qualsiasi default. sono arrabbiati, principalmente con la germania. lo sceriffo d'europa. evo dire che nel gruppo , un sentimento di astio nei confronti della germania è abbastanza comune. perchè i numeri (debito ed economia) non tengono affatto in considerazione le persone. "come glielo spieghi alla casalinga di voghera?" come può la gente comune capire che "ce lo chiede l'europa".

ci riuniamo intorno ad un tavolo e parliamo della nostra situazione culturale, parliamo della crisi e mi accorgo che non ci conosciamo affatto. io sò dove è il portogallo e gli altri paesi, io conosco la storia dell'europa, ma mi accorgo che ci vuole confronto , mobilità, conoscenza diretta...come sta accadendo tra di noi, per non cadere nel cliquet. per non vedere solo il toro spagnolo, la baguette francese, la corruzione italiana e così via.

ripeto. questo accade, sono tornato in italia con una duplice sensazione. non ci conosciamo affatto e non abbiamo un'identità comune. questa crisi grida unità europea, come vaccino. ma quello che stiamo facendo è creare una forzata identità neanche politica (magari) ma economica.

queste riflessioni che mi zampillano mentre gli esperti ed invitati dagli amici francesi ci parlano, mi portano a capire che la chiave della natura è la biodiversità, e il rispetto della stessa. uno dei concetti che abbiamo condiviso , un dubbio, è se , questa crisi non sia frutto una diversità, culturale, storica, politica, della quale non si è tenuto adeguato conto.

bene. sono arricchito, ma non so se sono anche ottimista.

parigi è meravigliosa, vivrei viaggiando e scambiando culture per sempre. io sono un attore, e quindi la possibilità di tradurre "fisicamente", attraverso improvvisazioni e mise en espace, guidate con affetto da bruno, mi ha dato la possibilità di ascoltare col corpo cosa significa crisi.

ma cosa significa crisi? economica, e se sì, quale?, quella del debito o quella del 2008 della leman and b? crisi di valori, crisi di motivazioni? decrescita è la risposta? si dovrebbe cominciare dalle persone oppure il processo deve cominciare dall'alto?

insomma domande che mi accompagnano e che mi fanno sentire più vivo e parte di un processo.

thanks to this paris journey!!!

alfredo angelici

Resoconto del partecipante Diego Pierini

1. Do you think that the session aims and objectives are attained? If not, why not, what has to be changed?

I think this meeting reached a primary aim that's giving each of us further info about every particular national situation. It was a good chance for sharing opinions and a nice way to do some international brainstorming. Nevertheless, I'd say that the aims themselves should be more focused and also declared at the beginning of the session. Maybe a more "narrow" range of interviews and meeting, with a larger time for coming to concrete proposals and ideas for solutions to the crisis would be a fine thing.

2. Do you have the feeling that you were able to contribute to the session? If not, why not, what has to be changed?

I was in the group mainly for documenting the work. This said, considering I spent the majority of time shooting and trying to listen, my contribution was not so ample. As I said in p.1, the brainstorming should be more "factual" in my opinion, in order to give the outsiders like me a way to introduce different patterns of approach to our current state of things.

3. Did you attain new knowledge and skills during the participation in project activities? if not, why not, what has to be changed?

Someway I did, someway less. Talking with the others was a fine way of improving my knowledge about arts' situation in different countries, and moreover I got the chance to assimilate new ideas about how to aim my personal work - comparing the different approaches and working scheme the others told they use. The interviews themselves were interesting, but sometimes not so "challenging", especially the first one about media/TV/journalism: I personally found the answers very obvious and I think that maybe we should have prepared some "harder" questions all together in order to get deeper into the reasons why the information systems is nowadays malfunctioning.

4. Is the communication within the session appropriate and efficient for you? If not, why not, what has to be changed?

The communication was fine.

5. Are you and the project team members working together towards common aims and objectives? if not, why not, what has to be changed?

See P.1. If the common aim is sharing information, we are certainly doing that. If it's a matter of coming up with solutions, I'd rather say "not exactly". But it has to be said this session was a starting point. I feel doubtful about the project of "rotating" participants: this would make this starting point less useful. A much better way would be gathering together again, jumping the icebreakers, and telling something like: "Ok, now we know each other, we told each other what's going on, let's try to make a concrete plan to work together to solutions". Otherwise, it's just new information: global information, maybe, that is pretty interesting indeed, but in the society of communication, with global media at hand, I feel like we are doing a great effort to achieve a not-so-relevant result. And considering the crisis, I think we might find a more concrete way to use our resources.

6. Did you complete the agreed tasks? If not, why not, what has to be changed?

See P.5. My personal task was also having good footage about interviews and I came back with some fine stuff. So thumbs up.

7. Is the project helping to raise your achievement levels?

The question is too generic. Achievement levels are in my opinion always rocketing when different professionals all very clever and with good skills face each other to discuss a topic. But this can happen in different situations. What's still out of reach, for me at least, is a way to understand how to connect foreign experiences (that were interesting to know!) with my national environment - and I'd guess this problem is the same for other people. For example: I know about some countryside big theater-music-arts community based in Sweden, and that's really intriguing. But I should try to work with those people who set it up to know how to pragmatically adapt it to make it something suitable for Italy. Or other countries. This was lacking: I achieved some ideas, but not much of the path to build them. At the same time, I felt like the main point I achieved is that Europe is actually an abstract concept: different communities are pretty far from each other when it comes to funds,

praxis, technical issues, cultural environment they have to face. This is something we must work on - the cultural environment and education - and I think that should be our main focus (building a common sense for art and culture over Europe, networking in order to spread our approach: this is what we must "project"), otherwise any practical solution might end up being useless.

8. *Have you developed skills and increased your motivation to learn from the project theme, if not, why not, what has to be changed?*

I think it depends on the future. It was a good starting point.

9. *For you, did the project achieve a greater awareness of a multicultural and intercultural dimension? If not, why not, what has to be changed?*

See P.7. Good awareness, but we should find a way to use this awareness.

10. *Do you think the session was offering a relevant mixture of activities? (e.g. icebreaking, activities, didactic sessions, workshops, social activities, free time)*

Even too much. I personally prefer a little less fragmentation. I'd say less icebreaking and some free time to socialize: this will work. Then, try to find a topic and split it into different steps - knowledge, brainstorming, proposals, new knowledge. The theater workshops are off my area, so I can't say much.

11. *Do you think the session was offering an appropriate content, clearly related to the aims and objectives of the event?*

Partially. The aims were sometimes a bit hard to fully understand, the content was great, but maybe too wide to focus on. Let's say: be more vertical, less horizontal.

12. *Do you think the session was offering Effectiveness of content and appropriate range and balance of activities?*

See above.

13. *What do you think about the quality of the management of monitoring and evaluation by the session coordinators?*

I'm not into the evaluation process, I felt the moderation was fine, but the monitoring can only be evaluated when you know what kind of results it brings. So I'd say this question should be asked after we meet again and see if the evaluation brought improvements.

14. *What do you think about the Input into the event by the project partners? What do you think about the evidence of partners sharing roles and responsibilities during the event?*

See above.

15. *What would be your personal conclusion on the Pace Paris Session ?*

Really nice opportunity, but it has to be continued, or the results achieved will be lower than the technical and economical effort made.

16. *Is there any question we didn't ask that you would like to answer?*

Not yet.