

parameters at play by Enrique Martínez Esteve

identity and change

status quo

Voters, the population at large, no longer want representation but participation. But how is that achieved? The technological means are certainly there for each one of us to express opinion, bring forth ideas, mobilise groups with common purpose.

The growth of the social, political, and professional consciousness has gone beyond the stage of conformism and acceptance. The time is ripe for mechanisms that create profound bottlenecks to be superseded by better means, less procedure, less posturing, full involvement at grass roots.

Why are we satisfied with a democracy that commonly represents only a third of all its voters, a quarter of the people? What tells us that a 51% majority will do the job? Don't we agree that in not listening, not changing, society loses all those who become estranged in the process. And that, in doing so, in creating minorities, society must find other means to facilitate their happiness, their fulfilment, the individual control they seek and need but has been effectively removed from them. These individuals are now constrained into ghettos, ¹ virtual ² or otherwise, where they work alone or in small groups to develop strategies that will eventually aim at debunking / destroying / disavowing the status quo or lead them to their own demise.

In some recurrent ways, the struggle, visible and evident as it is across vast stretches of our world in both affluence and poverty alike, reminds us of the long-lasting scrap out of slavery, alas, not totally realised.

How is this change achieved? What are its premises? What are the pointers to the attainment of a more fulfilling, common world?

the law of return

We aim at what we know is possible, because we have already seen it, felt it, experienced it in some personal way. Such is the state of origin we long for as humans, a state that encompasses a fair, equitable life in peace, in the pursuit of our freedoms. Such premise holds within itself the seed of a return. To return to it means to fulfil the nature of origin and to exalt the state of union with it.

The fulfilment of origin exacts, in itself, a self-propheying return. It provides the image of time complete, the ideal of near perfection and, therefore, allows for the re-determination of identity.

¹ <https://www.npr.org/sections/codeswitch/2014/04/27/306829915/segregated-from-its-history-how-ghetto-lost-its-meaning>

² <https://stayhipp.com/glossary/what-does-cyberghetto-mean/> and <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9641655/>

It is because identity was lost, because, through the hardship of struggle, we may lose grasp on what our identity is, that we feel dissatisfied. When dissatisfied, we push to pre-empt and, if at all possible, avoid the effects of such discontent.

Preparation, learning, and practice are the prerogatives of the human form; they promote understanding. They facilitate the adoption of the new in the light of history, of memory, and of change.

The words 'fulfil' and 'understand' each express a type of union, energetically bringing together what is connected yet removed, afar yet in plain view. This bridging action is sometimes called conviction, belief or even confidence.

Both concepts, 'understanding' and 'fulfilment', demand a live, active, material and reciprocal exertion. They can be accepted and taken to heart, or they may be repeatedly forsaken for the benefit of ease (idleness) or negligence (selfishness or lack of concern for others), the two clear forms of conscious ignorance.

These two forms of ignorance, in one way or another, contribute to the adverse tension between origin and return, union and separation, frustrating them. They are what keeps the world from peace and people from identification in agreement, from co-operation, compromise.

change

To this very day, that is what we see in the socio-political debate: an inability to understand the roots of change, to compromise swiftly and efficiently, to implement practical decisions and finally, to fulfil the destiny of a people.

A union of countries is an agreement, an entente. Whenever it becomes an obstacle to freedom inside or without, to independence, whenever it is hijacked by the cult of personality and the nurture of power, by structural collusion, it is bound to fail in the delivery of its functions, in the fulfilment of the needs of its people through the means of understanding and unencumbered action.

Participation is the 'level playing field' for any society. The tools to encourage it, develop it, devolve it *ad infinitum* are now unavoidably here. However, where in the established politics is the willingness to forge ahead and research evolving structures; look at the failures and successes of our past? Must we succumb to passion, war, neglect, and harm each time in order to effect changes, must there be loss of life? Is a little, timely, personal sacrifice worth the avoidance of destruction, the sadness of adversarial loss? Where is the acceptance of inevitable change, the well-established knowledge that prime of place and power are borrowed only for a time and that personality cannot be the sole measure of success? Where is the desire to allow an unfolding of the irrepressible strength that no longer lies in wait to shape and produce the next age of freedom, union, and redress?