

Some practical collective concerns about what lies after 2008.
A brief and personal outline.

*"A different world is possible; this one, most probably, is not"**

Even the most naive among, at least, the Europeans and North Americans, with whom the present author has direct contact and not just contact through written accounts, like with other cultures, seem to wonder why the left parties' percentages in their countries are at most in the one-digit region, if not even below 1%; and most seem to answer (leaving aside the repetition, here, of the well-known rightist stereotypes for this failure, both the trivial and the precise) that since these parties do not try to organize towards transnational mutual collaboration the people do realize they cannot hope to face the multinational interests that are organized in that way, and then become indifferent and then become prey to the local and short time hopes given during election campaigns by the two mirror image parties, growingly and cynically both financed by the same interests and lobbies, and equally powerless with regard to facing the decision making in crucial issues, since that one is centralized outside individual countries whereas the left opposition hardly has such an international organ. The opposition is thus left to the, mostly non-party and often transnational, groups of the so called "alertness movement type", that seem to at least respond to the hope of transnational collaboration for at least open discussion of what must be done. Whether this, e.g. European, alertness is of the Europe activating or already activated or already activist or of the just awakening etc type (same goes for US alertness), most of their members and audiences, when hearing of things like e.g. global warming as threat or as myth, or things like decline of the welfare state as option or as natural necessity etc, wonder why the media or the politicians, governments and opposition parties alike, or the educators, do not ever invite the specialists who, supposedly, are our opinion-sources to speak live on nationwide TV, in the presence of the specialists holding opposite views, and to illuminate the public about where they base their positions, attitudes and options; saying that things are too technical to be followed by the layman is no excuse since politicians and journalists are laymen too and yet they do reach opinions and decisions which they try to pass too. So why don't they watch, along with the public, the specialists defending their positions against each other, and show they represent their voters in also publicly showing that they do follow the arguments of the dispute or that they do not. (And in the second case they again have to convince their voters for the decisions they reach.) And what could push them into doing any of that? Let us not, in this file too, repeat, or at all go into, the many and mostly well-known reasons or conjectures and speculations about these issues. Let us only underline that the transnational motions of concerned citizens in several parts of the world which are joined by similar environmental and economic problems are growingly oriented to issues of global survival that are so severely and urgently present that the stereotype that left movements are fixated on the past and not free to move to the future, is quickly becoming itself an obsolete and hollow such fixation, when issues are examined with any openness and depth. Can any practical upshot for the near future come from the above haze of forming and unformed, starting and unstarted, ideas and motions? Probably the following: If enough of these movements concentrate their efforts and resources towards the direction of forcing politicians and "specialists" to confront hot issues and each other publicly and in full view on some of the briefing media, then the common denominator of all these movements will expand, solidify and polarize them more than their differences and fixations divide and weaken them, and then, maybe, some tangible and feasible proposal will arise for some groups to again become parties claiming votes too and not just attention, and then the political cost to the power monopoly formed by the two mirror image parties will be too much for them to bear if they play deaf to the demands for more briefing and more participation by a more informed public, and so on and so forth, and then a more self-respecting West and North might make to East and South more respectful proposals for dialogs and mutual help between civilizations on our way whether to salvation or to destruction of the planet and, hopefully, some reasonable proposal by some more global alertness and collaboration about what is to be done, if there is time, might be made (is there time finally? Even on that we need briefing by debating specialists and "specialists".) It is to such ideas and motions, like the ones of "alertness" sketched just above, that the present author dedicates the effort just completed in this site, an effort mainly concerned with the psychological maturing that political education both needs and effects, a maturing that he both underwent and shared with his reader during the period '99-'07, before starting towards joining the efforts that are necessary for, and by, all reasonable people of our days, efforts for which political education is only a beginning, not, of course, an end nor an end in itself.

John Alevizos/January 2008

* Line heard more and more frequently in our days.