

For my resilience provocation I suggested to the organisers that I might use a chapter by Joseph Masco exploring ways in which narratives about the atomic bomb, through the 1950s and 60's in particular, were changed from ones of risk, fear, sickness and death to one of safety, security, health and saving lives. The bomb had brought a profound sense of the precariousness of existence. A generation was uncertain about the wisdom of bearing children. The population needed to be cleansed of panic and instead characterised by individual resilience. Along the way, Valium became the most prescribed drug in the history of the World.

But where once many thousands of young people marched against the bomb, now millions strike for the climate. 4 million in 180 countries on one day this September! In April I saw Blythe Pepino, founder of the UK's *Birthstrike* movement, arrested on Waterloo Bridge. After September 20th, over 2000 young men and women in Canada pledged not to have children. And October will see the largest act of civil disobedience the country has ever seen.

Resilience. Questions of whether distress is found inside the body and brain, in the thoughts and decisions or from circumstances, have been replayed time and time again. Although the language changes a little the arguments are virtually identical and so are the political positions that lurk just below the surface of what many imagine to be a conversation primarily about evidence. Instead, it is mostly a never-ending role-play of political philosophy disguised as health, calling upon silos of evidence.

If you study the role-play, a pattern emerges that you have to be in the grip of some kind of groupthink not to see. Frustratingly, that means that almost no one who works in mental health sees it. The pattern is that, no matter which profession, faith group or survivor movement is championing it at the time, critique of psychiatry has generally been either from left-libertarian positions, anarchist positions or right-libertarian ones and its defence has been authoritarian and usually right-wing. Arguably, in the 1800s, The Moral Treatment was driven by the libertarian politics of the non-conformist faith groups in the same way that today's dissent is driven by Foucauldian and feminist analysis of the negative operations of power. If you don't know that Baptists were once anarchists, just repeat the phrase 'the priesthood of all believers' a few times and you'll see it. The current pretence at natural science of contemporary psychiatry has always been the ready justification of authoritarians for maintenance of 'natural' dominant hierarchies and for their assaults upon diversity. It is nothing more and nothing less than what philosophers call 'the argument from nature', writ large. The right defends psychiatry because it fits their sense that an inability to be autonomous is a weakness and refusal to be self-sufficient is to be dysfunctional as an adult. They also find an opportunity to monetise the emotions of otherwise 'unproductive' people through the pharmaceutical industry.

Many have noted that with the rise of recovery and resilience models in mental health care, we effectively first make people precariously well, requiring constant monitoring, non-negotiable treatment and psychoeducation, then we make them precariously ill; they must not fail to get better and back into roles that make them and someone else some money (Harper & Speed, 2012). The outsourcing of recovery to the private sector and the mental health assessments to job centre employees continue this trend of what critics have termed 'psychocompulsion' (Friedli & Stern, 2015). In a capitalist society, health is employment and employment is health (Kirkland & Metzl, 2010).

Thomas Szasz, still a popular voice in critical circles within the USA and Canada, could have shared a platform with Sarah Palin. The contemporary American Robert Whitaker, though a brilliant scourge of the pharmaceutical industry, is also a right-wing libertarian. Resilience is all about standing on your own two feet without interference for them, and it

is the prevalence of their politics that indirectly led you to ask me to talk on 'resilience' at all. We have had proper Marxists here in the UK. To read philosopher psychologist David Smail, who spent many years working here in Birmingham, is to find oneself reaching for a socialist revolution. For him, the very idea of personal resilience is an Orwellian tool of neoliberalism. In the UK, the new Power Threat Meaning Framework (Johnstone & Boyle, 2018), published last year, is left-libertarian and, while undoubtedly scholars of Europe lean left, one wonders if it will for some time continue to sit there like a brilliant intersectional cat among big pigeons that remain in charge. The role-play is better argued than ever.

So, the language of psychiatry and its critics has changed a little but really the only real difference is that when William Tuke reconceived madness in the 1800s there were a few thousand people in Britain considered to need help. It is now widely claimed that 1 in 4 of us - that is perhaps 15 million of us - are vulnerable to mental health problems at any one time. Foucault's 'practice of normalisation' has proliferated to become the normal practice affecting the lives of all of us, our friends and family. What we can say is that whatever 'resilience' signifies, it seems to be in short supply.

But I want to argue that all of this is about to change. Extinction Rebellion is founded on a difference between two kinds of ecology. This they take from the writer Joanna Macy. It's Macy rather than Masco for this talk. She says:

What does it mean or matter to be interdependent with all Earthly life? In exploring this question, deep ecology arose, both as a philosophy and a movement. Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess, a mountain climber and scholar of Ghandi, coined the term in the 1970s.

In contrast to reform environmentalism, which treats the symptoms of ecological degradation - clean up a river here or a dump there for human benefit - deep ecology questions fundamental premises of the Industrial Growth Society. It challenges the assumptions, embedded in much Judeo-Christian and Marxist thought, that humans are the ultimate measure of value. Often expressed as biocentric, this perspective holds that we must break free from the species arrogance that threatens not only humans but all complex life-forms within reach. (Macy & Brown, 2014. p43)

What does it mean to be delusional when our recycling bins are being emptied into containers and shipped to Asia, diesel propellers turning night and day? What is paranoia when a zero carbon target of 2050 is shown by science to be a suicide pact? Who is dissociated, the one who hears their past abuse as disembodied disowned voices, or the one who drinks their Starbucks from a reusable bamboo cup? Is it bad to know these things or just bad to panic? When sanity is madness, is there no longer reality and unreality, but just shared and unshared beliefs? Solidarity - the extent to which others share my delusions - is what makes a belief healthy, it seems, exactly as Foucault described. Psychiatry is there to return the outliers to the middle of the bell curve. But what if that middle is manifestly killing us? For the outliers, is it depression or is it clarity? Is it a panic attack or is it your resistance? Is it generalised anxiety syndrome or is it your extinction rebellion? Eventually the mental health services do not even attempt a coherent ideology. With a few brief moments of science you can let all the air out of the psychiatry's tyres and it still goes to work each morning. The 1990's were proclaimed by George Bush to be the decade of the brain. We didn't learn very much of use to mental health services, and during the twenty years that have followed in which the credibility of psychiatry has become less and less, use of the Mental Health Act has gone up year on year. Just like Putin, there is no knowledge base, evidence base or coherent model; there is only power. Doctors and nurses say they are pragmatic, compassionate even, justified by distress,

justified by risk, it is an art as well as a science, maybe the chemical imbalance thing has been debunked this is still in everyone's best interests. But as the planet roasts we begin to wonder... as Mental Health Nurse and environmental activist Ed Lord memorably said at the RCN conference last year: if one in four of us have mental health problems at any one time, what is the matter with the other three?

The climate crisis tells us that the truly insane person is the one who wants to get back to normal. We've heard that before, but I believe there is now something new in the role-play.

Let's first see what is not new:

After reading Wendell Berry, the British nurse-academic Benny Goodman wrote that 'the smallest unit of health is a community' (Goodman, 2012). Can a doctor really give a person a clean bill of health when they have no friends, no family, no home, no money, no meaningful roles, no relationships of belonging? But even this view of health, which springs from the left, is being challenged and furthered here. What sense does it make to talk of *community health* when the planet is on fire and we are in the sixth mass extinction, and when we see that human experience only makes sense as a part of a super-organism? Deep ecology tells us that *the smallest unit of health is not a person or a community. It is a planet.* That is massive, but it is really not more than an extended version of the sentiments that anarchists and socialists have had about psychiatry before - that personal pathology is a falsehood and it is a reflection of a troubled environment, not a faulty mind. Just as those that go green also tend to go red, politically, those that inject green into health move towards public health perspectives. And public health perspectives are so far from usual psychiatric practice that the UN has recently accused psychiatry of having no public health agenda.

So when Joanna Macy suggests that emotional pain really says something rather wonderful about a person - that they are in tune enough to have *compassion* - literally *with suffering* - for the damage they see around them it is a version of something that others have said before. Likewise, that it has a purpose:

When we deny or repress our pain for the world, or treat it as private pathology, our power to take part in the self-healing of the world is diminished (Macy and Brown, 2014 p66).

So what is new?

Sixty years ago John Lovelock proposed that the world was a super-organism called Gaia and now the science, with emergence, epigenetics, ecology, systems theory and some very weird neurology and some even weirder physics, seems to be catching up. Gaia is out-living some of her critics. We've seen placards on the street many times and we've seen them proclaim 'the end is nigh' before. We haven't seen them say 'read the science' too often, though. And it is the science that is very different now, and it is that which deep ecology brings to our tired role-play. Psychiatry has borrowed the language of medicine and of biology to give itself credibility. However, since the end of the 1990's and the completion of the Human Genome Project, science has changed and psychiatry can deploy it less and less well. Looking for a distress that is confined to a brain is not just bad philosophy now, it is most definitely dodgy science. Our changed understandings suggest that individuality is not what we thought it was. In the past, we were fascinated with the relationship between the genotype and the phenotype (that is, the body that houses the DNA) and yet in essence we thought of that relationship in a neo-Darwinist way, one of changes in DNA leading to effects in the phenotype, occasionally made preferential by the natural environment. But biology and many advances in other sciences have shown us that

that is a very limited understanding of the relationship. DNA is a planetary-wide language and we are caught up in its conversations - and it is caught up in ours. Natural selection has never really acted upon individuals, but within individuals within societies and cultures on a physical planet alongside other species. The planet's biosphere - even its atmosphere - the societies and individual bodies, our ideas, thoughts and beliefs are part of this conversation, which is a reflexive one. The gene is not 'selfish' is it massively distributed, shared, and, as crucial recent science shows, it is altered by experiences and ideas. The changed sense of ourselves and nature is driving post-humanism in the humanities but it also undermines the division between the natural sciences and the humanities. Exciting though that is, we are we are being accelerated into this new enlightenment by the frightening consequences of our ignorance.

This, then, is the main difference. Within academia, it has been, for a long time, a heresy to say that science implies a political view. That is *teleology*, it is the 'argument from nature', the intellectual equivalent of a shampoo advert. 'You can't get an ought from an is', said a long line of philosophers from David Hume onwards, which is the basis for many critiques of psychiatry (and all kinds of establishment thinking). However, in this 'post-humanist' landscape, it is proposed that you *can* get an ought from an is, but that far from supporting psychiatry's individual pathology, the view you get is even more hippy than most climate protesters. Science and politics, fact and value, nature and morality, the body and cultures, yes, the very divisions we structure our universities around, have been falsely divided. It is no longer adequate to say 'the mind is what the brain does' since the brain is also what the mind makes, and the mind is all of us. It's a big moment. There is ignorance, denial, continuing regardless, but very little in the way of credible counter arguments. It really looks as though these deep ecologists are onto something. Utopia and snake oil are there, and a bit of good old fashioned anti-establishment sentiment mixed in, but really excellent science as well. Yet playing with the is/ought divide does have a history of going very wrong indeed (remember social darwinism, anyone?) and so we should all be very very cautious about what we say. Does anyone else wonder whether when we finally get the green politics we may long for, we might find them very frightening? So far, Extinction Rebellion seem to be a movement that is determined to protect diversity in every sense - long may that continue.

In summary, is Extinction Rebellion anything more than the Occupy Movement was? And is the beef between 'deep ecology' and 'reform environmentalism' anything more than the continual insults of some socialists to others of being 'revisionist'? Yes, to both, because Deep ecology does not merely note that the invisible hand of the market is pulling us over the cliff, it begins with new understandings from the sciences. 'Biocentric' Deep Ecology proposes that we feel pain because the Earth feels pain and that when we feel pain we are the Earth feeling its pain. Resilience is utterly changed by this way of thinking. Our pain becomes a collective consciousness and its individual sufferers become our litmus papers, our pressure gauges, our thermometers, our scalded fingers to snatch back from the flames. This is much more than being 'alienated from each other by capital'. This is the planet's conscious grief at its own condition. We are not pitted against nature, it is not our failure to work with nature, *we are nature* and that is why we are in pain, and it is nature that is directing us away from the madness of the Industrial Growth Society.

We are beginning to see what they see from the right of politics and work so hard to disrupt, that the climate and ecological emergency and its attendant sciences both reveal and require that health (and therefore resilience) is to be found only in forms of connection and collectivity and through the death of our current economic system. It's like the planet has been reading Naomi Klein.

It is better to deny that there is an emergency at all than to be a person sitting on a trillion dollars of unsold oil right now. If we all conclude with the deep ecologists that our

pain is the Earth's pain and our resilience is not a personal characteristic but directly depends on that oil's value being entirely written off, then someone has to agree to lose a trillion dollars. I don't think you have to be a genius to work out that the contest over the meaning of the word 'resilience' is going to start wars. I don't think you need to be a genius to wonder if it isn't already.

Goodman, B., 2015. Wendell Berry—health is membership. *Nurse Education Today* 35, 1011-1012.

Friedli, L., Stearn, R., 2015. Positive affect as coercive strategy: conditionality, activation and the role of psychology in UK government workfare programmes. *Med Humanities* 41, 40-47.

Harper, D., Speed, E., 2012. Uncovering Recovery: The Resistible Rise of Recovery and Resilience. *Studies in Social Justice* 6, 9-25.

Johnstone, L., Boyle, M., 2018. The Power Threat Meaning Framework: Overview.

Macy, J. and Bown, M. (2014) *Coming Back to Life: The Updated Guide to the Work That Reconnects*. New Society Publishers.

Metzl, J., Kirkland, A. (Eds.), 2010. *Against Health: How health became the new morality*. New York University Press.

Smail, D.J., 2001. *The nature of unhappiness*. Robinson, London.

Whitaker, R., 2011. *Anatomy of an Epidemic: Magic Bullets, Psychiatric Drugs, and the Astonishing Rise of Mental Illness in America*, 1st ed. Broadway Books (A Division of Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group Inc).