

PSYCHE AND SOCIETY

May-2013

CONTENTS

Editorial

Socialised Medicine In The U.S.S.R. 3

Hiren Mukherjee

György Lukács, Fanatic of Reality 7

István Försi

Remembering an epic battle that decided history 14

Premen Addy

Marcuse, Freud and Revolution 17

Dhirendranath Gangopadhyay

Environmental, Economic and Ethical perspectives of Bioprospecting and Biopiracy in a globalized world 28

Sayan Bhattacharya

Society as a Biological Experiment 34

J.B.S. Haldane

'Why Do You Study Ancient Philosophy?' 41

Ramkrishna Bhattacharya

Not all pleased as Stalin makes a comeback 45

Vladimir Radyuhin

From the desk of the Mind-Painter 46

Goutam Banerjee

Report 50

Rehabilitation of Chronic Mental Patients of 52

Correctional Homes

Basudev Mukherjee

Cover :

Unakoti, Tripura

Monoj Dey

Publication of *Psyche and Society (PAS)* started from May, 2003 as a bi-annual journal of Pavlov Institute, 98, M.G. Road, Kolkata-700 007, Ph. 2241-2935, a Registered Society Under Societies' Registration Act, XXI of 1860 (Vide Reg. No. S/20300). The Journal will be available in the first week of May and December each year. *PAS* publishes articles in the fields of Biology, Sociology, Psychology and Psychiatry. Manuscripts for publication should be sent to the Editor, *Psyche and Society*, 98, M.G. Road, Kolkata-700 007. Communications, letters to the Editor and book reviews may also be sent to our e-mail address : basudev98@gmail.com.

Each issue is priced Rupees forty (Rs. 40/-) only, and the annual subscription Rupees eighty (Rs. 80/-) only inclusive of ordinary (Book Post) postal charges. Subscription may be sent by M.O./DD/A/c. Payee Cheque (Kolkata only) in favour of **Pavlov Institute and Hospitals**.

Vol. 11 No. 1

PSYCHE AND SOCIETY

May-2013

Editorial

It is a matter of fact that Indian cotton is famous for its fabulous varieties. People interested in fashion-design regularly gather for this occasion in Delhi and Mumbai in 'fashion weeks' to choose their requisite variety. In this exhibitions Indian cottons are displayed for getting better market and with the help of Indian cotton Europe and America's cotton clothing growth has surpassed everything. But the irony is, a few hundred kilometers from Mumbai, that is in the Vidharba, where cotton grows, at least ten people commit suicide in a week. So the Maharashtra government has given a notification that there would be no loadshedding in the hospitals of Vidharba area. Excellent indeed! Not a single deadbody would suffer from decomposition after postmortem! But who are this people suffering from high level of *Thanatos*? They are the cotton-growers. They do not get the fair price of their cotton and unable to pay the debt to the moneylenderers and do not get any subsidies and finding no other way out they have to take this ultimate decision.

But according to our Finance Minister Mr.Chidambaram we should be happy as our 'inequality' index is much less in comparison to some advanced industrialised countries. Such as the rate of inequality of India is 5.6 whether it is 7 in Australia, 8.5 in America, 9.8 in Singapore, 7.8 in Britain. This is the recorded data in the latest economic survey of Govt. of India.

So here is the paradox - if any country wants to thrive then its inequality index would be much higher. Here development means the country would spend at least 4700 crore dollar in pet industry. This is the picture of America where the pet animals get that amount of care. This is the essence of inequality. This is the law of bourgeois economics. Even when a country faces a terrible natural disaster its economic investment and activities would be highten at all time record level. This has happened in South-East Asian countries as aftermath of Tsunami in last week of December of 2004. This is also a kind of inequality where we need a huge loss of material and human capital for vibrant economic activities!

Now here is a simple example of our growing economic activities. It is health tourism. A large number of people from advanced countries are pouring here for low cost (in comparison to their countries) health check up, treatment, sex-tourism etc.. To accomodate this demand a huge number of five star hospitals, clinics, Ayurvedic tourist centres are mushrooming at disturbing regularity all over our country specially in the southern part. But we must not forget that thirty percent of our population do not know what is modern system of medicine! But why we should care for it? Because at least in this way we are earning foreign money! Sorry this is also a kind of inequality.

Our formal and informal economy is run by this five basic sectors such as textile, leather, handloom, powerloom, transport. But for the last twenty years this five sectors are gradually dwindling to a lowest level. Whereas the consumer goods for a marginal upper class are taking upperhand in production accumulation. The price of all the materials for bare subsistence are skyrocketting for the last few years. This is also a kind of inequality.

Now consider a simple statistics. In our country in every three hours 538 children die of malnutrition, four peasants commit suicide, 275 peasants leave their profession permanently and join as unskilled labour etc.. Because it is not possible to give them subsidies for their mere survival. On the other hand in every three hours industrialists, rich businessmen and upper echelon of our society would get an incentive of 171 crores of rupees in the form of relief from excise duty, customs duty, corporate tax etc.. Of course this is also a kind of inequality.

But if you want to be in good book of *Time* magazine then Down Down subsidies and Long Live incentives. **PAS**

Socialised Medicine In The U.S.S.R.

Hiren Mukherjee

Socialisation of medicine was the slogan raised by Dr. Nikolai Alexandrovich Semashko, who had been in exile with Lenin from 1907 to 1917, and was entrusted by the Bolshevik leader with the task of organising in July 1918 the People's Commissariat of Health. The central and local organs of the Soviet State must take over the responsibility of providing for every one, at his earliest need, free, accessible and skilled medical treatment. "Only then will disappear, like a shadow before sunlight, all private hospitals and all commercial private practice. This is the perspective of communist medicine." The Soviet government had inherited from its Tsarist predecessor a terrible heritage of insanitary conditions, considerably accentuated by the devastating effects of the Great War. It was a well-nigh impossible burden which has to be shouldered by Semashko and his colleagues, but they set about their task with characteristic heroism, and the impress of the revolutionary transformation of ideas implicit in communism can be seen in the goal that they set up. The reason Soviet medicine works, they pointed out, is not only for healing but for the prevention of ill-health, the creation of the positive health of the people. From the beginning, Soviet medicine has been free from the historic distinction between preventive and curative treatment. The object of the Soviet health service has always been to cover the whole space of human life, not excluding even the period that is antenatal. It has never known any limits of age or sex or race or nationality; the Uzbek and the Kirghiz and the host of other peoples who had been deliberately kept under by the Tsars, share equally, as Soviet citizens, in the health service of the community; it has always tabooed any idea of philanthropy and charity about the care of the sick, which in capitalist countries helps, in effect, to keep down social discontent and prevent organised social effort. Civil war, foreign intervention and famine in the Soviet Union made it impossible to have anything but a new start in the first five years of its history. But since 1921, there has been progress, which in quantity and in quality is without parallel anywhere else in the world.

The health service of the Soviet Union is completely centralised. Each local Soviet works under a single directing body which prepares a uniform plan for, among other things, the best utilisation of the existing system of hospitals and clinics and for the construction of new ones, for the most effective distribution of the available medical cadres, particularly of the special-

ists, for raising their qualifications and for the technical re-equipment of medical institutions. The local Soviets organise antiepidemic measures and sanitary inspection of food, housing and public utilities (water works, drainage, laundries, etc.); they have to protect the health of the workers and peasants, take special care of maternity and infancy, control health resorts, organise pharmaceutical and medical supplies, train physicians and their assistants, and provide for the sanitary education of the masses. The central Commissariat distributes the medical personnel to serve not only the main industrial regions and the Collective and State farms, but also the most distant regions and districts.

Another feature of the health service is the participation in its work of many members of the Soviets, who according to law must take part in the work of one or more of the different departments. These representative citizens keep the service in continuous touch with the needs of the people. Other workers, who are not members of the Soviets, may also, if they are interested, join in its work, and as a matter of fact, many do, and establish "Health nuclei" in every factory and in every Collective and State farm, and help to organise the sanitary education of the masses. "The protection of the health of the workers is the task of the workers themselves"—such is their slogan. A part from millions of pamphlets and leaflets, the cinema and the wireless is used for health propaganda; there are special sanitary education institutes and museums and exhibitions; sometimes the railways would have exhibition carriages, propaganda plays would be staged, and sanitary propaganda trials (drunkard trials, trial of a prostitute, etc.) be held. Is it too much to expect that we in India shall also, in the near future, start work on more or less the same lines for the sanitary education of our people?

To prevent the development of disease—such was the object laid down by the Communist party of the Soviet Union. This prophylactic policy, apart from its importance, was specially necessary in the Soviet Union where as in our own country, the old insanitary conditions of life had largely survived. Mere curative measures were thus not enough. Prevention is achieved, in the first place, by the structure and methods of the Soviet health service, which is organised with a view not only to curing disease, but to abolishing its cause by studying the working and living conditions of every patient. It is achieved, in the second place—and this is very important from the Soviet point of view—by the whole system of socialist construction, by the establishment of public utilities in towns and villages, housing, communal feeding, etc. and by such enactments as the five-day working week, compulsory and paid holidays, insurance against old age and sickness and disability, maternity vacations, etc.. Medical stations in the factories, for example, are not content with rendering first aid; they take part in all measures for the improvement of labour conditions. As communal feeding is exceedingly widespread at present and has percolated even to the villages—it helps, one must remember, to emancipate women from domestic drudgery and raises the productivity of labour—doctors are commissioned to supervise the dining room and the proper storing and preparation of food and to provide dietetic food for those who suffer from intestinal diseases. Sidney and Beatrice Webb have given a graphic description of what they saw in the Stalingrad tractor works in 1932. One hundred and ten qualified doctors (four-fifths of them women), together with 135 nurses catered for 40,000 operatives. Apart from ordinary treatment of some 2500 daily applicants, the health centre gave, free of cost, many forms of specialised treatment, including radiant heat-therapy, psychotherapy, mud-baths, and special baths for rheumatism

in sand brought from the Caucasus. The immense factory restaurant daily provided six different invalid diets in separate dining-rooms, and children were taken care of in creches, etc. so that the mother could look after her own work at home or in the city.

The noted Irish playwright, Sean O'Casey once said that two reasons were enough to make him a communist; one was that Moscow housed the world's best single collection of modern French paintings, and the second that women and children were better cared for in the Soviet Union than anywhere else in the world. In Tsarist Russia, the working woman was the most downtrodden and exploited of beings. The November Revolution of 1917 made the woman man's equal in every respect. Protection of female labour, the provision, for example, of compulsory leave with pay before and after childbirth, has been a special care of the Soviet State. The mass participation of women in industry has been made possible by the provision of creches which admit children up to the age of four. The little Chuvash Republic, for instance, which under Tsarism, was a criminally neglected and backward province, had 5000 creches in 1932. From 1929 to 1932, the number of creches in the Union increased from 251,400 to 4,529,000. Milk kitchens, children's food stations, "breast-milk stations", women's consultation bureaux, maternity homes (the slogan being: "No woman must give birth to a child at home"), mother-and-child carriages on long-distance railway journeys, the fight against infantile infectious diseases, the propaganda against abortion and at the same time its legalisation, with the results that abortions are much less in number there than in countries where it is prohibited—these are some of the features of the Soviet health service that must compel interest and admiration. The non-Russian regions of the Union, cruelly and systematically ignored by the Tsar's government, are now equal participants in this great experiment.

The principal diseases are systematically tackled by organised concentrations of medical forces. There are special institutes for plague and typhus, enteric and smallpox, venereal disease and malaria, etc.. We may take the campaign against tuberculosis, for years the greatest scourge of the Russian people, as typical of the way the Soviets are struggling to ensure health and happiness to the people.

More than a score of institutes are engaged in scientific research, and they are situated not only at such places as Moscow and Kharkov, but at Minsk, Tiflis and Samarkand. Month by month, ever since 1923, the record of their work is published in the voluminous Russian journal, "Problems of Tuberculosis." Special tuberculosis dispensaries, which aim not only at curing the sick, but at examination of his living and working conditions and action accordingly, have been spread out all over the Union. In 1918 they numbered only 4; in 1929, 273; in 1933, 404. There are, besides, numerous tuberculosis hospitals, large and small, for every manifestation of the disease. In 1928 there were 2,757 such hospitals; in 1933, 4007; in 1928, 10505 tuberculosis sanatoria; in 1933, 16, 242; in 1928. 7447 localities providing convalescent homes; in 1933, 10,556; in 1928, auxiliary tuberculosis institutions, 7637; in 1933, 10,181.

An important achievement in this line is the so-called "night sanatoria", in Moscow and various other cities, which is a unique Soviet speciality. They are meant to deal with the early stages of the disease when the patient need not give up work and go to a hospital or sanatorium. At this stage the patient often works, goes to the night sanatorium, washes himself, changes clothes, receives proper food, sleeps under hygienic conditions, and is

given necessary medical aid, and returns to work in the morning. Moscow has ten of these sanatoria, this is a 1933 figure—which admit not only sufferers from tuberculosis in its early stages, but also suspected cases, and convalescents of all kinds, persons suffering from nervous exhaustion or digestive troubles, and sometimes even from over-work or neurasthenia, find a welcome there.

The task of recruiting doctors have not been easy for the Soviet authorities. There was, in the beginning, reluctance on the part of many qualified doctors to serve the Soviets. But the recalcitrants are now almost a non-existent minority. A most striking example in the change in their attitude is provided by the late Professor Tarasevich, reputed all over Europe, who began heading the anti-Soviet Pirogov Society of Doctors in 1917-18, and by the end of 1918 was so convinced of Soviet good faith as to work whole-heartedly as Chairman of the Scientific Council of the Commissariat of Health till the time of his death.

Tsarist Russia had fewer than 1,300 qualified doctors, or less than one per 700 of the population, and in rural areas less than one per 21,000. By the middle of 1935, the qualified medical practitioners had been multiplied seven times and had become one to every 2000 of the population. Candidates for medical training, who may be of any age, are nominated by all sorts of bodies, mostly by trade union and school committees, though individuals also may and do apply. The recommendations of local Soviets are examined by an expert body; there is now no exclusion, as there was earlier, of sons and daughters of the intelligentsia.

The training for the medical practitioner, which lasts five years, combines an unusual amount of practical work with theoretical teaching. Students completing their course are immediately appointed by the Commissariat of Health, usually for a three years' term in a rural district: doctor members of the Communist Party have to shoulder, as a rule, the heaviest and least attractive jobs. Hours of work of the doctors in the Union are restricted to a maximum of six per day; there are, besides, annual vacations on full pay, in addition, for those practising in rural districts, to six months study leave on full pay every three years. Private practice, not entirely forbidden, brings only a very small additional income to the few elderly men in the larger cities who mostly take advantage of it.

The most important cities furnish, naturally, the highest degree of medical organisation. Sidney and Beatrice Webb have given a picture of Moscow where, we find, the population is divided for medical purposes into units of between 40,000 and 80,000 people, subdivided into groups of 2000 or 3000 persons, in charge of doctors and nurses and health visitors allotted to them. The members of the clinical staff see their patients in their homes, if necessary; but if well enough, they come to the health centre. The Webbs saw a centre in Leningrad, where 2000 patients are seen every day, by appointment. Lectures are given in a large hall; on its walls are posters and health diagrams; cases containing samples of proper food, clothing and even children's toys. In the prophylactorium is the birth control clinic, with samples of the apparatus required; a lawyer attends regularly to give advice to women concerning their rights and those of their children; psychotechnical examinations are made of school-leaving youths to determine what vocations they are best suited for. An English workman, engaged on constructing the Moscow underground railway, gives an entertaining description, which the Webbs have quoted, of the way he was treated for what he thought was a common cold; his throat, nostrils and ears were examined and his lungs too; he was then sent on, protesting all the time to the dentist who found he needed a set of false teeth;

this and the medicine was, of course, given him free. Whoever is interested should also read the Webbs' account of the splendid provision for street casualties in Moscow which can give points to the great cities of Western Europe and the U.S.A.

I wish to refer, in conclusion, to the great scheme which forms part of the Second Five Year Plan—the construction, on a site of more than a square mile in the Silver Forest near Moscow, of the "Medical city", designed to be the largest and most modern medical institute in the world. The director is Professor Lev Nicolasvich Feodrov, pupil of the great Pavlov. A feature will be the "Clinic of the Healthy Man", where the behaviour of normal individuals after the normal activities will be observed and studied. A technical staff of 5500 doctors, nurses and research workers; two hundred patients, each in a private room; almost one laboratory per patient; shops, theatres, libraries and all the paraphernalia of city life—such are the features of this gigantic scheme. The total expenses for its establishment reach into astronomical figures. But the results of this experiment may well prove of immeasurable importance.

A recent estimate in our country showed that the proportion of doctors to the population is 1 to 10,000. This is bad enough; but it looks worse when one finds that for lack of a co-ordinating social policy, the proportion is as high as or even higher than 1 to 1000 in certain urban areas, where medical unemployment is most acute! The Soviet system, of course, is based on a philosophy which is yet to win its way in India. The Soviets have not only multiplied medical facilities, they have injected into the health service a new spirit. That is why one finds, for example, Dr. M.A. Meyer, formerly director of the New York Psychoanalytic Institute, saying that the number of cases of neurosis, depression and suicides is lower in the Soviet Union than in the capitalist countries, because the Soviet citizen is relieved of certain anxieties, fear of unemployment in particular, which exist elsewhere. The Soviet system, therefore will differ in quality so long as the Soviet way of looking at society is not adopted elsewhere. But there is something about the quantity of Soviet achievement which is almost staggering. Shall we refuse even to learn from Soviet example?

Reprinted from *Calcutta Municipal Gazette* (1936). **PAS**

György Lukács, Fanatic of Reality

István Eörsi

[The following essay was written after the death of György (Georg) Lukács (1885–1971), one of the most controversial and at the same time the most influential Marxist literary critics and philosophers of the twentieth century. István Eörsi (1931–2005) was a poet, playwright, critic and translator of Lukács's works from German into Hungarian. Eörsi was also a close associate of Lukács and instrumental to the publication of his autobiographical sketch, *Record of a Life* (London : Verso, 1983).]

If I were able to discuss with him this proposed essay of mine, he would most certainly direct my attention to its objective nature. "For," he would say, "it is not altered in the least by the

fact that I have died." I would venture to object that his death would be certain to have an emotional effect on the author and, not unlikely, on the readers of this article in their attitude to the subject. Because the latter would appear, by the fact of death, unexpectedly final and closed and we would not have been prepared for it. "All this is very likely," he would reply, "but what we are prepared for is one thing and what the subject is quite another. The subject is not altered by the state and character of our preparedness."

The subject of this essay—the life and work of György Lukács, the philosopher, aesthete and practical revolutionary—has often occupied Lukács himself. He considered himself strictly a product of the history and society he lived in, this being one of the salutary differences between him and most of his disciples and opponents. The prefaces written to the first volumes of his collected works in German are masterful studies of an ideologist of the same name who had worked several decades earlier. Some of his judgments—especially those pronounced on *Die Theorie des Romans* and *Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein* I thought too severe. "Look," he said, "I've never declared that those volumes were written by an untalented person, merely that they were still a mixture of ..." And he went on with a criticism of the volumes. I thought to myself, "he is critical of his own work, very well, but why is he so pleased with the criticism?"

He never could understand those thinkers who wasted their time mending their own theories. A philosopher must insist on the truth rather than on his own truth. He came to think more and more highly of Sartre, for instance, because of his moral and political views yet he often reproached him for not even trying to draw the philosophical consequences of his political development and for bringing together the most varied tendencies in a fictitiously unified Sartrean philosophy.

Lukács is not open to the same charge. Without the slightest self-conceit, he left behind theories and even systems of thought only when he felt he had transcended them. This is how it has happened that history has produced at least three Lukács : an idealist thinker, a Messianistic-Revolutionary Marxist and the late systematizer who was anxious to further a renaissance of Marxist ideology after its debasement during the Stalinist era. But there were some "transitional" Lukács also. The Lukács of the Stalinist period who took up a position of "my party, right or wrong" at the time of Hitler's advance and was loyal to Stalin even at the risk of sacrificing his whole life's work. Or course in the meantime, he was unable completely to deny his qualities as a thinker and, thus, from a platform of fundamental solidarity with Stalin, he managed, together with a few others, to preserve through all kinds of compromises the continuity of Marxism.

Which one is, then, the genuine Lukács? He gave the identical title, *Mein Weg zu Marx*, to two of his autobiographical articles, in 1933 and in 1957. A fragmentary sketch from the last months of his life, which he penned for a projected spiritual autobiography, could also well have borne the same title. If anyone can look upon his life as a road—and such people can rightly be regarded as happy—he is evidently right to believe that his real self is unfolding as he approaches the goal. Naturally Lukács too voted for the last period of his life whenever the question arose. He ran a race with time perhaps for just this : that in his three concluding

works *Aesthetics*, *Ontology* and *Ethics*—he should reach his journey's end, as the Marx of this day and age.

It is the irony of history that these works were only partially completed. They were delayed by the absence of an adequate economic map of present day societies, by the almost insurmountable subjective and objective obstacles of his understanding and, last but not least, by the fact that Lukács himself had not started, until the final phase of his life, to separate *Sein* and *Sollen* consistently in every field. Another irony of history is that, in the same period of time, attention has turned mainly in left-wing movements to the other Lukács, the messianistic revolutionary who coupled his dialectic materialism, his objective analytic force, with the *Sollen*, the demands of world revolution. The Left can consider this Lukács genuine one today, because the Left itself has likewise become sick and tired of the polluted atmosphere of compromises. Faced with bothersome facts—just as György Lukács was half a century ago—those on the Left yearn for revolutionary practice, a truth (derived from Fichte) of "so much the worse for the facts." To do away with the myth of facts through action is to take sides with the method against the system, since the method—dialectics—is the revolution itself.

But the old Lukács who, incidentally, followed with great sympathy the various leftist movements, stood up for the priority of method. In an essay he wrote in 1967 when *Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein* was republished, he reaffirmed one of the fundamental theses of his old book: "Let us assume for the sake of argument that recent research has disproved once and for all every one of Marx's individual theses. Even if this were to be proved, every serious, 'orthodox' Marxist would still be able to accept all such modern findings without reservation and repudiate all of Marx's theses—without having to renounce his Marxist orthodoxy for a single moment. Orthodox Marxism, therefore, does not imply the uncritical acceptance of Marx's investigations. It is not a 'belief' in this or that thesis, nor the exegesis of a 'sacred' book. On the contrary, orthodoxy in the problems of Marxism, refers exclusively to method."

This statement of faith in the priority of method to some extent lessens the contradictions among the various "Lukács'". In the search for the "genuine" Lukács, it directs attention to those of his features that have characterized him and his relationship to reality in each of his periods.

His hypersensitive critics, so willing to cavil at his style (without bothering to read his writings in full) have failed to notice the pleasure of discovery and recognition beneath the surface of the objective, sometimes studiously dry manner of writing. Aesthetes, past masters of observing the niceties of detail, have called in question his aesthetic sensibility. Yet, already in his youth, Lukács proved himself to be exceptionally perceptive and original in dealing with the most central—and most neglected—aesthetic problem: the relationship of world history and artistic form. Later as a Marxist, he expounded a comprehensive and inspired theory of the interrelationship between the two. Many apply his method today as a matter of course, and all too frequently they simplify it in an intolerably schoolmasterish way. But those who can read cannot but be aware of the joy experienced by the philosopher in being able to relate two seemingly unrelated events, e.g., the Napoleonic wars and the

emergence of the historical novel. It is a joy, comparable to that felt by a poet who has successfully linked two distant images in a metaphor. In the case of Lukács this joy is due to the discovery and expression of an objective relationship; it stems from the recognition that the world is meaningful even in its meaninglessness—that is, comprehensible and alterable. This joy persists through uncomfortable, even outrageous, truths. It is the joy of completeness in an age when particular interests tend to grow above the interest of the Whole; when the moment tends to hide the process, tactics theory, and individual truths those of humankind.

The absorbing delight of completeness has followed Lukács through every stage of his development. This led him to the two decisive intellectual experiences of his youth: to Ady (1877–1919) the great revolutionary poet who, as he said in one of his finest poems, "Wanted everything," and to classic German philosophy, above all, to Hegel, who claimed that "only the Whole possesses virtual reality." Lukács himself saw the special character of his early development very clearly. For him the conservative, idealist epistemology of classic German philosophy was combined with leftist ethics, a unity artistically embodied in Ady. From these two concepts of completeness consolidated in a way peculiar to none but himself, it was a straight line that led him, under the impact of the events of universal history, to Marx. Apart from his interpretation of world history Marx also introduced into the philosophical notion of totality the changing of the world, i.e., social praxis. For György Lukács this meant above all that he chose "to live dangerously." It was a choice not in the Nietzschean, romantically daredevil sense of the phrase, but in a very workaday sense; instead of an academic career or of becoming a private scholar he chose the movement. This means that he chose permanent uncertainty of life, emigrations, the underground, and the many perils to his person that this involved. More important than this, he had to extend his personal and intellectual responsibility as an ideologist to the entire activities of the movement. As early as 1919, before he joined the Party, he had appraised the full significance of his decision: "Everyone who decides for communism is ethically bound to undertake a personal responsibility for every single life lost in the struggle for it as if he killed them each himself. On the other hand, everyone who joins the opposite side must bear the same personal responsibility for the continued existence of capitalism, for the devastation caused by the new imperialist wars of revenge ... etc., which will inevitably follow ..."

As early as then he clearly saw that the individual can only choose between different evils in certain historical situations, and "he chooses correctly if he sacrifices his inferior self on the altar of the superior one, on that of the Idea." This choice helped Lukács to the community he himself chose of his own free will, and to a purpose that has filled his whole life. Later, when the movement turned against its own interests, Lukács unflinchingly chose a course which he considered to be the "lesser evil": he manoeuvred, he made tactical compromises, and he adjusted himself to the given possibilities. I have already referred to the foreign political motives and to the world historical causes of this adjustment; the difficulty, however, is that the "external" adjustment became eventually "internal" in no slight measure. Lukács, who was philosophically as well as instinctively a fanatic of reality, was forced to work out for himself a complicated system of ethical and tactical pretexts so that he might deceive himself as to the real nature of certain features of the reality surrounding him. As in the case of his great predecessors in philosophy, this manoeuvre led to a certain contradiction between an expounded system of thought and the revolutionary-dialectical method. It has the

tragic consequence for Lukács's work that for decades he wrote only essays and partial monographs instead of major works of synthesis and systematization for which his talent most suited him. As a private man he may have deceived himself in some questions, but he was too honest a scholar to have built a philosophical system on the foundations of external or internal self-adaptation. Thus, it was only long after the elimination of the contradictions of the system and the method that he was able to write his *Aesthetics* which embraces the entire theory of reflection beyond the sphere of the arts. He had no time to complete his *Ontology* in a manner satisfactory to himself and to write an *Ethics*.

Making the choice of the "lesser evil" as he did, Lukács never wanted to associate himself with the crimes the movement committed against itself. I am convinced that this was the reason why he put forward his partisan theory, once so vehemently and so often attacked. Although he applied it to poets, it applies by implication to philosophers as well: the poet-and the ideologist-is not a leader nor a regular, but a partisan in the movement.

This is all very well, but partisans are uneasy bedfellows in peace time. György Lukács has often proudly called himself a disquieting author. This is also one more of the features that characterize him in all his periods. At the very outset of his career he stood, with his theoretical cast of mind, alone within the Hungarian bourgeois-liberal movement centred around the magazine *Myugat* (The West). The Hungarian intellectuals, less inclined toward philosophy, felt his mental disposition to be alien, even lifeless. To all this was added his political radicalism which, with a few exceptions was regarded with suspicion by the leading spokesmen of *Myugat*. Right up to his very last years, he was proud of the circumstance that he was tolerated rather than loved within his own camp. Later, as a communist in exile, he found himself repeatedly in a similar situation when he came forward with his untimely truths. As a communist ideologist he provoked the bitterest attacks from the most diverse quarters at the same time. Many a wise representative of the bourgeois intelligentsia saw in him a traitor of the intellect; some of them called him the Bolshevik Goebbels, others equated him with Zhdanov. The dogmatists regarded him as a revisionist or as a Hegelian pedant. He was no more fortunate with his occasional adherents, either. From time to time they used views to support their own, constructing the support out of his half-sentences. Lukács was more often than not amused by all this. "I've stuck in their throats; they can neither swallow nor spit me out," he would say with satisfaction. Generally, he relished writing some inconvenient truths, waiting for the effect as though he had been up to some mischief.

And sometimes the effect came soon enough. The thunderbolts from the clouds of stupidity came thick and fast in reaction to the uncomfortable truths he uttered at inopportune or wrong times. Or to use a less appealing metaphor: at times the whole stock of rotten eggs of a country or party faction was consumed in replying to Lukács. He scarcely took notice. One secret of his sovereignty was that he did not pay a writer's tribute to so-called public opinion, to this massive stupidity of great weight even in its unorganized state. On one occasion-it was in 1955-I told him indignantly about a particularly unsavoury slander. After a few moments of reflection he said, "Look, I've always said that as long as I'm not there, I don't mind if they hang me."

Lukács's standing apart within a movement he himself joined to end once and for all a burdensome isolation, deserves analysis. I am using the expression "standing apart" instead of the more fashionable "loneliness" because Lukács as a private and public man was never lonely. It was a habit with him to place his own life in the perspective of world history. After all, it wasn't for nothing that he regarded it as the task of both philosophy and art to free man from his particular characteristics and to raise him to the generic level of mankind-and this attitude of his *ab ovo* prevented his ever feeling lonely. But his standing apart indicated an objective state of affairs rather than a subjective feeling about the world. It meant the permanent, though occasionally deliberately eclipsed, presence of sovereignty in an age which demanded, especially of persons with a high sense of community, self-adaptation, and an almost ascetic renunciation of the personality.

It must have been this aloofness that caught the unfailing eye of Thomas Mann when he invested Naphta of *The Magic Mountain* with several of György Lukács's characteristic traits. Naphta is Jesuit who is greatly esteemed by his order but, despite his exalted intellectual humility. It is an ironic, but nonetheless rather characteristic fact, that it was none other than Lukács who drew attention to the proto-Fascist features of Naphta's character. He was of course aware who Thomas Mann's model was but he considered it the writer's private business where he took his models from. He was persuaded that as a literary critic he had only to do with the objective nature of the work as it had been realized and with the relationship it bore to reality, and he thought that he could well leave autobiographical matters, not bearing directly on the essential issues, to the painstaking care of philologists.

If it left him cold that Thomas Mann made, could make, him a Jesuit for his artistic purposes, he was unaffected in the same way by what the author might say of his judgment. He applied his objective, philosophical method to them, which never dissected the intentions of the writer but rather the result, often independent of the intentions. He often quoted Goethe's Philine: "And if I love you, what's that got to do with you?" as the critic's ideal standpoint with regard to artists and to people in general.

But he was left cold not only by the predictable effect of this critical pronouncements, but-particularly in the last years of his life-by press opinions concerning him and his work. When praised or censured he could smell the stench of petty self-interest a mile away, and he was only interested in people in whose voice he could hear the sterling note of sovereignty of the same calibre as his. All this does not mean that he was indifferent to the reception of his work. He was particularly pleased to hear that young people were buying and reading his books. He was a pedagogue every inch of the way, the classical Greek kind at that, who expounded his doctrines to his visitors almost every morning at his private academy, that is, his Budapest flat on Belgrade Embankment. He felt particularly in his element when he was challenged and, still more so if he was cornered by an opponent. He fought himself out of the most hopeless-looking plights and then encouraged his interlocutor to write his counter-arguments.

Such encouragements were not dictated by courtest. Lukács was too confident in the fundamental truth of his position to have been disturbed by a refutation in this or that question. One could perhaps even go as far as saying without exaggeration that it was

precisely in the partial refutations that he saw a justification of the soundness of his entire philosophy. He regarded himself as a philosopher of a transitional age, and he would have been very pleased to welcome an attempt towards a new Marxian synthesis which takes him as one point of departure and transcends him. History nearly completely denied him this pleasure.

Why did it happen as it did? Left-wing intellectuals cannot avoid his life-work, his thoughts make their presence felt in every department of life. But even the need for a synthesis is on the wane. Is it perhaps that talent is lacking in those who come after him? Or is there no ground on which one can construct a synthesis? It is none of these, since the fulcrum of philosophy is not to be found outside of this world (if it can be found at all). Or, have the issues of the world got so confoundedly confused that it is, for the time being at least, impossible to arrive at a unified point of view? In the course of writing his *Ontology* Lukács often said that he needed fifty years for what the young Marx had recognized in a flash. With self-ironic seriousness Lukács inferred from this Marx's higher order of philosophical talent—but one may perhaps come to a different conclusion. One may conclude that apart from the personal endowments of the two thinkers, the circumstances of their respective societies may also have something to do with the synthesis being so long delayed. For a precondition of the latter is that the historically necessary illusions should first be mercilessly shown for what they are worth.

"My talent in the last analysis may consist in no more than a certain ability to keep the objective and the subjective apart." I heard him say this some ten years ago, and ever since I have not been able to decide whether he said it out of modesty or pride. Smiling archly, he waited for the effect of his utterance.

The faint reflexion of the same smile glimmered at me in the hospital room. Every little movement was a painful effort, his slight figure seemed almost lost in the bed; the horrible physical transmutation has shaped a hard, larva-like mask on the appallingly sunken face. I spoke to him but the face remained impassive. "Am I disturbing you, Comrade Lukács?" I asked him embarrassed. "No, you're not. The only problem is that you want to break through the wall of my indifference, and you can't succeed in that." "I could of course say some cheerful things too...", I started again. "No, you couldn't, because the thing itself is not cheerful." The thing itself—*die Sache selbst*—we had come to the distinction of the objective and the subjective, the ontological starting point, and it was at that moment that the smile I mentioned began to break feebly. It was meant for the debate that predictably was to ensue. I for my part was ready for the fray. The indifference, so I began the argument, concerned his plight, his illness, that is to say, the fact that for the first time in his life he felt he could do nothing toward having a say in the affairs of the world. But this indifference, I want on briskly, was his own private affair, his work of a lifetime, that is, all that his name signified in the world. His name continued to divide those who loved to think, it continued to arouse love and hate, and it was more suited to everything else than to producing a mood of indifference. "All that's possible," he said with a heavy tongue but with a satisfaction due to the recognition of a truth, while the slowly breaking smile made the larva-mask vanish. "All that is possible, and I don't deny that this may be so objectively, but this does not alter the

fact that I can no longer feel anything of it." Stubbornly and unnecessarily I reminded him of what he had written in connection with *The Death of Ivan Ilyich*. That only a meaningful life is associated with a meaningful death, but he stuck even more inflexibly to the previous distinction. "All that may be true, but I don't feel it, and I'm not interested in it..." While I was looking at him and listening to him, some dark joy mingled with the grief and despair: what a triumph that even on that bed, cancerous and sclerotic, he preserved that ability of his to which he had once referred with so modest a pride.

The New Hungarian Quarterly Vol.12, No. 44 (1971). **PAS**

Remembering an epic battle that decided history

Premen Addy

Seventy years ago around this time, the Battle of Stalingrad reached its formal conclusion when the ragged remnants of the *Wehrmacht's* famed 6th capitulated. On January 30, 1943, the 10th anniversary of his accession to power as German chancellor, Adolf Hitler received news of the imminent destruction of this elite formation. The Führer promoted its commander, General Friedrich Paulus, to field marshal, hoping that he would do the honourable things and commit suicide since no German field marshal had ever endured the purgatory of surrender. The freshly minted field marshal disappointed his Führer by choosing life over death. The next day, January 31, came the *denouement*, as Paulus and his staff of 24 general and 90,000 men of all ranks surrendered and went into captivity. The titanic struggle that had gripped the world from the opening day of the city's siege on August 25, 1942 had run its course.

The first notable comment appeared in *The Washington Post* on February 2, 1943 in an article by Barnet Rover. "Stalingrad's role in this war," he wrote, "was that of the Battle of the Marne (1914), Verdun [1916] and the Second Battle of the Marne [1918] rolled into one."

In May 1944, President Franklin D. Roosevelt presented a 'scroll' from the people of the United States of America to the city of Stalingrad "to commemorate the gallant defenders whose courage, fortitude and devotion during the siege... will inspire forever the hearts of all free people. Their glorious victory stemmed the tide of invasion and marked the turning point in the war of the Allied Nations against the forces of aggression".

Their Great Patriotic War also saved Europe from its worst crisis since the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

Britain's prime minister, Winston Churchill, paid tribute to Russian valour at the Tehran Conference of the Big Three in November 1943. Then followed a solemn presentation of the honorary "Sword of Stalingrad—a gift from King George VI and the British people." Joseph Stalin, deeply moved raised the sword to his lips and kissed it. Some witnesses detected tears in his eyes, others were not so sure, but Stalin's bearing and the spontaneity of his gesture left an abiding impression on all privy to the scene.

Seventy years on, the battle of Stalingrad has lost none of its allure, it is now the stuff

of legend. The heroism, courage and fortitude of its Russian defenders resonated in the conduct of their German adversaries. But the odds were too great: as the struggle intensified and hopes of a German victory receded. Stalin's exhortation "Not a step back!" (Order No. 227) was Russia's moral moment comparable to Churchill's May 1940 "blood, toil and sweat" speech. Russians and Germans fought for every building, room and stairway. Each step became a mile. Soviet snipers, men and women, hung in dark corners taking a heavy toll of enemy lives. The cry of despair from the diary of Lieutenant Weiner of the 24th Panzer Division transcends time. "We have fought during 15 days for a single house with mortars, grenades, machine-guns and bayonets ... And imagine Stalingrad, eighty days and nights of hand-to-hand struggles ... Stalingrad is no longer a town. By day it is an enormous cloud of burning, blinding smoke ... And when night arrives, one of the scorching bleeding nights, the dogs plunge into the Volga and swim desperately to gain the other bank. The nights of Stalingrad are a terror for them. Animals flee this hell; the hardest stones cannot bear it for long : only men endure."

German columns had marched across the southern steppe amidst clouds of dust, setting alight villages and towns, killing and maiming the local population in the total war of ethnic extermination and plunder. *Lebensraum* and the oil and mineral wealth of Soviet Russia took the *Wehrmacht* to Stalingrad, where *hubris* met *nemesis* in a contest of wills. At stake was the new dark age of perverted science.

Cometh the hour, cometh the man. In General Vasily Chuikov, the Soviet 62nd Army, entrusted with the defence of Stalingrad, the Red Army possessed a genius for urban warfare. The battle hung in the balance, when across the Volga came the telling reinforcements of General Alexander Rodimtsev's 13th Guards Division, an elite combat-ready formation, and Siberian forces.

The supreme command and the general staff, with Aleksandr Vasilevsky and Georgy Zhukov in the lead, along with the supreme commander-in-chief Stalin, devised the vast Soviet counter-offensive of encirclement in three stages (code-named Uranus, Little Saturn and Kessel). The trap would be sprung by a large formation led by Generals Konstantin Rokossovsky and Nikolay Voronin, the chief of the artillery, with both presiding over the final rites of the 6th Army.

The military historian, Chris Bellamy, set the result in context. "Along with the Carthaginians' encirclement and annihilation of the Romans at Cannae in 216 BC, Zhukov's destruction of the Japanese at Khalkin Gol in 1939 ... it was from a purely military point of view one of the greatest encirclements of history. But its staggering scale in spatial and human terms, especially given the very thin margins available to the Soviet High Command, and its strategic and political consequences must make it the greatest encirclement of all time."

When the guns at Stalingrad fell silent the picture was one of utter desolation, bodies of men and horses strewn every where, in common possession of a spectacularly gruesome ground.

Germany and its Axis auxiliaries, Hungarians, Romanians and Italians on the Eastern front, suffered a million and a-half dead, wounded and captured. Nearly 50 divisions almost the equivalent of five whole armies, were eliminated. The losses in material were of a similar order. Blown was the myth of German invincibility.

"Russians," writes the authoritative Geoffrey Roberts, "distinguish between *povorot* (a

turning point) and *perelom* (a breaking point). Moscow and Kursk were undoubtedly great turning points in the war on the Eastern Front, but Stalingrad was also the breaking point, the point of crisis and of radical transformation in the strategic situation .. Collectively, the battles of Moscow, Stalingrad and Kursk determined the outcome of the Soviet-German conflict and hence the outcome of the Second World War as a whole."

The Soviet Union bore the brunt until the Anglo-American landing in Normandy, *Operation Overlord*, June 6, 1944, opened the long-awaited Second Front. *Operation Bagration* was launched on June 22, three years to the day, of *Operation Barbarossa*. Germany's unparalleled 3.8 million-strong invasion of Soviet Russia. *Bagration* decimated the *Wehrmacht's* vaunted Army Group Centre, releasing the trapdoor for the Red Army's drive to Berlin. The scale of the German defeat—their most catastrophic of the war—doomed the state itself, said the Panzer commander, General Niepold.

Soviet losses in the Great Patriotic War totalled 27 million dead, of whom 11.7 million perished on the battlefield. The Red Army, for its part, demolished 600 German divisions. Hitler holed up in his bunker, watched, broken and helpless, the *Gotterdammerung* of his projected Thousand Year Reich. Trapped in a psychedelic bubble of daily injections of drugs and stimulants and the enabling fascist salute, the Führer played his final card with a shot to the head, so escaping the ultimate ignominy of witnessing the Soviet flag aloft the Reichstage from the unprepossessing garden of his bunker and crematorium.

The prophetic warning by General Erich von Ludendorff at the end of World War I—"A mistake in strategy cannot be made good in the same war"—was ignored, as the hubristic *Wehrmacht* commanders committed not one but many strategic errors in their Russian campaign. They were outfought, outthought and outflanked through the deception tactics of *Maskirovka*, by a galaxy of stellar Soviet generals, Zhukov, Vasilevsky, Koniev, Rokossovsky, Malinovsky. Bagramian *et al*, each a master of the operational art. The pivot of the war effort, however, was Stalin. Zhukov affirmed, his voice taking on a special tone, that "here was a real military commander of modern world war on a large scale [and] a worthy Supreme Commander-in-Chief". The memoirs of Vasilevsky, Rokossovsky and Koniev endorse the verdict. Field Marshal Lord Alanbrooke, the chief of Britain's general staff, noted in his diary that Stalin possessed a "military brain of the very highest calibre", while Averell Harriman, the wartime American envoy to Russia, in a conversation with the writer, Albert Axell, called Stalin "one of the greatest war leaders in history". "Without Stalin they never would have held," he said. Churchill, post Potsdam, wrote of "this amazing and gigantic personality". M.N. Roy, who knew Stalin well from his comintern days, joined the chorus of critical acclaim.

The Georgian Djughashvili, son of a freed serf and cobbler, grew into the all powerful Russian Stalin. The Russia he inherited, loved, admired and identified with, had been broken on the wheel of the First World War, the Civil War and the Allied intervention. With blood and iron, The Man of Steel and The Grand Inquisitor, gulag, terror, warts and all, forged a colossus, the 20th century's sole rival to American global hegemony.

Marcuse, Freud and Revolution

Dr. Dhirendranath Gangopadhyay

The name of 'Herbert Marcuse', as the symbol of revolution and synonymous of modernism to the intelligentsia, students and a section of the neolefts of America is like Marx, Lenin, Mao, Guevara. In the fifth decade (Twentieth Century) Eric Fromm had tried to synthesise Marxism and Freudism as a way out for socialistic transformation of society. Marxists were intimately familiar with his writings. Many youths were highly influenced by his views. But he had emphasised much on the change of mind than the change of society and as he has given preference regarding the change of mind so he cannot have a permanent impression in the minds of the youths. Herbert Marcuse was ex-colleague of Eric Fromm.

They together with some other colleagues started a project at Frankfurt in Germany regarding research on Socialism. Their topics of research was the crisis of capitalism in between the period of two World Wars. They consider the crisis of capitalism is the crisis of civilisation and they make propaganda of it. They are much more disturbed regarding intensity of helplessness of individual essence and individual alienation. They have heard the terminal wailing of the individual due to merciless exploitation of capitalism. They have realised that man has lost all control over this society and about his destiny and becomes a tool of the production-power. They think in this situation we need to shape a new image of man. To see the problem of crisis and find a solution for it they seek help from anthropology, psychology and Freudian psychoanalysis. And regarding solution of this problem they conclude that the fundamental cause of this crisis embedded deep into the individual mentality, not in the society.

Of course we cannot say that they have totally neglected economics or politics. They have also started research regarding gradual development of technology, commodity-centred society, society of material abundance etc.. In this article we should try to acknowledge one important aspect of the theory of Herbert Marcuse who is considered as the most accomplished theoretician of Frankfurt school as well as the revolutionary model of the American students-youth. This part of his theory is related to the Freudian repression theory of sexuality. Now before analysing his theory regarding interrelationship of sexual suppression and revolution I want to present a simple sketch to make an acquaintance of Marcuse to the readers. With this it would be a bit easy to realise the problems of 'Eros and Civilisation'.

Herbert Marcuse, being a German, is a student of philosophy. At the time of upsurge of Hitler he came to America. As he is extremely critical regarding the Nazi-philosophy he was forced to quit Germany. At the time of Second World War he was attached to Defence department. Presently he is a professor of California University. Few days ago no body recognises him beyond the academic circle. Now he is world-famous because of his neo-left philosophy and as an exponent of student-unrest. The name of his world-famous book is 'One Dimensional Man'.

In the introductory writings (1936-38) Marcuse was very much inspired by the neo-

Hegelian concepts. Though the critics opine that there are much differences with the imperialist neo-Hegelians and the views of Marcuse. According to Marcuse, Marxism is the simple and spontaneous conclusion of Hegelian philosophy. Marcuse has neglected the other sources of Marxism. According to his opinion Engels and Lenin have not enriched Marxism, on the contrary they have implemented only some extra materials that is not included into Marxism. He has accepted the commodity circulation of Marxist economics but neglected the theory of commodity production process. To start with Marcuse has 'Hegelised' Marx. Next he has purified Marxism with Freudism. According to Marcuse only in Hegel we can find the transcendentalism of philosophy. Marx has only discovered the laws of changes of social realities crossing the boundary of philosophy.

Marxian dialectics cannot become totally materialistic overriding the Hegelian philosophy. Marx failed to grasp exactly the reality and revolution. So uptill now all the revolutionary endeavour was unsuccessful. We have failed to eradicate the tendency within individual psychology to accept surrender and being tortured so this 'negation' is embedded within revolution. As Marx had no intention to cut all connection with anything past, so revolution had transformed into counter-revolution and a new kind of exploitative society had emerged.

Production-tools that is the tools, implements, technology, division of labour, state infrastructure required for production of commodity cannot remain intact at the time of revolution. If we cannot tear all relationship with the past then it is impossible to get freedom. Marcuse cannot consider that the working class would do this job to tear all relationship with the past. They are the part and parcel of this old productive institutions of this society. This Frankfurt philosopher is in no way related with the working class and working class movements. So he does not recognise them, acknowledge them and cannot give the requisite roles of the working class in the drama called revolution.

We cannot deny that the antifascist stand of Marcuse is genuine and the scathing criticism of Marcuse and Fromm of contemporary capitalism of our society have disgusted many intellectuals and a section of students regarding the role of capitalism. As a result it creates the scientific propaganda of Marxism and extensions of its principles in the society. It is also correct that regarding individual mind and against capitalistic system they are stating new statements, that we not ever heard from the Marxists. Again due to the animosity of Marcuse and his assistants of the organised working class movements, working class institutions and working class parties have already suffered a lot and are still suffering. Marcuse's revolutionary philosophies is a stumbling block to create broad-based united democratic front against fascism. As a result there is revival of anarchist terrorist groups and in many areas the revolutionary possibilities have thwarted and the reactionary forces have become much more strong.

Marx has identified emancipation and happiness. Marx has considered that in the emancipated human society individual can actualise his all innate endowment. I do not consider that Marx anyway indulged the hedonism. Marxists do not consider emancipation and hedonism are similar. But according to Marcuse, 'Mankind becomes free only when the material perpetuation of life is a function of the abilities and happiness of associated individuals'

There should be a gap in between austerity and accomplishment, desire to obtain something and something desired. Individual man's desire, satisfaction and transcendence are not the subject matter of Marxist philosophy. Man should advance to shape, to build up this

world. To make this society more beautiful more even before, man shall advance all times steadily. In all times man would sacrifice, he would ignore the failure and unsatisfaction. It would be a great mistake if we think that the pathway of transformation from Socialism to Communism is less thorny. Man can be satisfied with small things due to ignorance, he can be happy with vulgar gratification of the senses. There is no relationship with Marcuse's hedonism and Marx's actualisation of human potentialities. Non-exploitative socialistic society is not for hedonism of man but it is for actualisation of human essence, innate endowment, spiritual development. It is for to achieve the difficult to obtain. The anxiety for self-expression and pain of an artist would continue in a communistic society. No Marxist would desire the hedonistic principles of Marcuse.

Another characteristics of Marcuse's theory is to deny historical materialism. According to Marx, transition from Socialism to Communism means emancipation from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom. Marcuse also thinks in that way. But he cannot agree with Marx that this transitional process is controlled by some specific laws. According to Marcuse the capitalistic society is chained by laws but as the socialistic society is a free society so there should not be any discipline or laws. If something happens due to a cause, if something happens that is controlled by cause then where is the freedom of this phenomena? The performance of the person, suffering from compulsory neurosis we say involuntary. When the action or thought of individual are not voluntarily controlled by man then only individual and his work is not free. But according to Marcuse only the autochthonous and spontaneous actions are free.

Marcuse denies the continuity of history and ridicule its uninterrupted process. His post-revolutionary utopia tears all relations of the past and the formal structure of that society is blurred. The link bridges of the past are all jeopardised. We do not need to know the past and the future is also completely unknown to us. Is it all devouring totalitarianism or absolute dictatorship of an individual - who can say? We have to struggle hard to break the chain of slavery. But the result of this struggle is uncertain. We do not need to learn from our past experiences. We only need struggle and act of jumping. We do not need to organise ourselves, we do not need any central leadership, we do not need any quantitative changes as there is only qualitative changes in one jump.

We have to shift ourselves from this capitalistic-imperialistic planet but that is not to the socialistic planet. Not here, not here, somewhere but not here. No past, no capitalism, no socialism, no communism. It is negation, negation and negation. It is move, move and move. Burn the refuses and proceed on. All this are the theories of Marcuse. It is sufficiently fascinating and intoxicating. Over and above it is abundantly full with romantic idealism. So Marcuse's revolutionary philosophy is highly attractive and irresistible to the inexperienced youth's mind. The message of Bakunin was that much popular in a special situation of Europe in the middle of Nineteenth Century. And today in a new historical situation Marcuse is equally popular in America.

Now we can try to highlight a little the negative side that is the aspect of sexual-psychology of this revolutionary philosophy. The method to purify Marxism by Freudism is specially rousing curiosity to any psychologist.

Our reader's are acquainted with Freud's *Repression* and *Sublimation* theories. Yet we can repeat it briefly.

Only the father of the primitive pastoral tribe had the right to enjoy the companion of all the women of the hoard. He could dominate over his sons but the sons could not enjoy the females. The sons united in a band, revolted against their father, killed him and ate up him. With killing their father they developed a sense of guilt. Driven by this sense of guilt they thus united and willingly made some social laws to ban incest and thereby build up the foundation of primitive society. They also made a contract that they would not struggle within themselves to capture and monopolised the throne of father. They willingly ceremoniously left their consumerist instinct. In this way, "Thus there came into being the first form of a social organisation accompanied by a renunciation of instinctual gratification; recognition of mutual obligations, institutions declared sacred, which could not be broken-in short, the beginnings of morality and law." S. Freud, *Moses & Monotheism*, New-York, 1949. p.129)

It is needless to say, later this history of development of human civilisation is not accepted by the nation-based anthropologists. Freud was conscious regarding the incorrect data of the Robertson Smith, then why he had embraced this theory? "I have often been vehemently reproached for not changing my opinions in the latter editions of my book (*Totem & Taboo*), since more recent ethnologists have without exception discarded Robertson Smith's theories and have in part replaced them by others which differ extensively." (S. Freud, *Totem & Taboo*, 1939, pp. 251-58) Admitting this fact Freud had not discarded the theory of Smith because he got advantage to explain his libido-theory with this moral play.

Marcuse has also accepted unhesitatingly the historical fact of building human civilisation as depicted by Freud. There is tremendous incoherency in this theory as it is not accepted by the nation-based anthropologists. "Yet Freud's account is in fact internally incoherent and self-contradictory. As in Hobbe's account of the social contract what has to be explained in how the transition can have been made from a condition in which the relations between men are purely those of force, in which each seeks to impose his own will on others, to a condition in which there are socially established norms and institutions which regulate human behaviour in an impersonal fashion." (*Alasdair Mc Intyre*)

Why the sense of guilt had been created after murdering their father? There must be some taboo or contract in the lifestyle of the so-called 'primal hoard' so the sense of guilt has been created. Apart, "A contract cannot be made except when the institution of promising and norms regarding the promise keeping are established. Thus the allegedly primal state is not pre-institutional, pre-legal or pre-moral at all."

Based on this story Freud developed his theory of 'Repression and Sublimation'. Repressing instinct specially sexual instinct man could able to build up civilisation and the sublimation helped him to develop higher form of culture. On the one side there is the rule of 'Super ego' i.e. internalised parental authority, on the otherside there is the continuous struggle of 'Id' for self-expression and in between this conflict of this two opposite tendencies 'Ego' is trying to make some balance. In this way Ego is maintaining the integrity. We have to control and repress our sense of gratification of our instinct due to external pressure.

The history of civilisation is the history of repression of primitive instinct, history of self-castigation. Super ego is the base of all sorts of social development. It is the transformed taboo of religious moral social restrictions of ancestral patriarchal society. Today's man born with innate unconscious taboo against all sorts of incestual activities. In every period of our civilisation is the history of Repression and Suppression of our instinct. This is the opinion of

Freud that influenced Marcuse. Apart Marcuse has accepted the 'hedonism' theory of Freud.

Why Marcuse has taken the help of Freud to Sanskritize and purify Marx? Because Marx has correctly enumerated the causes of break down of this capitalistic society but he has failed to depict the exact causes and methods how the working class would be conscious and organised for revolution. I have said earlier that Marcuse does not think the writings of Engels and Lenin are related to Marxism. To eradicate this poor state of affair of Marxist philosophy Marcuse has surrendered to Freud and he has also revised Freudism according to his wish.

Marx was concerned with the common people and people at large. He was not interested with individual man and largely he was non-interested and silent about individual people. Marx did not realise this theory that individual man is self-seeker and guided by gratification. One cannot find any revolutionary social psychology. Marxists always avoid any discussion of individual psychology. The followers of Marx think that the causes that would create the fall of capitalism the same causes would develop the revolutionary consciousness as an 'automatic reflex'.

This conception is crude and mechanical and it shows ignorance regarding individual consciousness and revolution. If we analyse the history of capitalism then we can see that from 1848 to 1929 he has correctly realised the actual flow of history and has depicted it exactly; but during the later period his prediction and imagination did not follow the right way. The working class of Europe did not take the lead of international communist movement. They failed to be the determining factor and did not control the whole situation. On the contrary they became the silent helpless spectators and they ultimately meekly surrendered to the belligerent Nationalism.

For this changed situation Eric Fromm and Herbert Marcuse are very much reluctant to accept the working class as organiser and leader. The narrowness of Marxism is in this way exposed to them.

They think that the oppression, exploitation, control of the rulers and owner's are not the only cause for creating as a stumbling block for emancipation of the working class. The power to resist their emancipation are within their level of consciousness, in their perverted mindset. To recognise this tremendous opposition force they seek help of Freud. As the revolutionary of Frankfurt asking assistance from the middle class conservative intelligentsia of Vienna. "It has been conjectured that Freud, while a youngman at Paris acquired the fear of the politics of the masses which he afterwards exhibited. Certainly a contrast between civilisation on the one hand and the masses on the other was part of the ideology of French conservatism, nourished as it was on fear of the Revolution and more of the Commune, which reappears in Freud's writings. (Mc Intyre)

He tried to enrich Marxism with the theory of that person who consider revolution and people at large are inimical for any civilisation. Fromm discovered the power of opposite force in a compulsive manner. And Marcuse discovered the poverty of consciousness and emancipation within the one dimensional perversion.

Civilisation and culture have been erected from repression of sex-instinct and constriction of sex-desire. All forms of art and literature have been created depriving the sexual instinct. Even the unskilled physical labour is also the result of self-penance. In the history everywhere we could find this self-repression. As a result in this industrial era the mindset of people are perverted. Common people are habituated in one-dimensional thinking. Only the

momentary reality is reflected in our psyche.

It is imperative that future planning, creating revolutionary philosophy, spiritual upliftment nothing is possible to build up conceptually for one-dimensional man. "The advancing one-dimensional society alters the relation between the rational and the irrational. Contrasted with the fantastic and insane aspects of its rationality, the realm of the irrational becomes the home of the really rational..." (H. Marcuse). The revolutionaries have the same tendency of one dimensional thinking. If there should not be any radical change of their instinctual-permutation, all the revolutionary endeavour are bound to fail and if there is any revolution later it would turned to a counter-revolution.

The social theory of Freud is based on the opposition of sexuality and civilisation. Marcuse does not agree with this oppositional theory. Freud thinks that emancipation and hedonism are oppositional to each other. Marcuse thinks that emancipation and hedonism are similar and unilinear.

According to Freud emancipation is free from the bondage of all instinctual desires and civilisation is sublimation of sexuality.

Marcuse does not ignore this proposal directly but he says, what Freud visualise as contradictory between emancipation and self-gratification or sexuality and civilisation are not the actual nature of mankind. It is created due to specific social condition.

Yes, in the initial phase of civilisation we desperately need primary repression of sexuality. Without vigorous austere endeavour to achieve an end there were no other way to meet up the demand of this first phase.

But always men were forced to accept the special process of distribution of commodity and working organisation and for that reason to make this process continuous and intact as somewhere the habit of excessive repression was practiced. One has to sacrifice his personal happiness. Today in the era of abundance of consumer articles and high technological development we need repression and penance only in some special type of society or in the class interest of some particular group to sustain their influence in the society. In the language of Marcuse excessive surplus suppression is not inevitable and the special type of society and civilisation are also not unchangeable.

Marcuse has purified Freud's reality principle with discovery of his theory based on performance principle. All sorts of pleasures were sacrificed not due to the direction of concrete situation but due to the direction of the social headmen. Authoritative rulers have framed some rules as necessary to serve their vested self interest and men are abiding by this rules indiscriminately.

Repression of sex and abiding strict penance according to rules are in today's society not only unnecessary but evil and against all sorts of progressive ideas or revolutionary thoughts and mindset. It is some kind of attitude of slavery. The precondition of man's emancipation is free from sexuality and to follow the pathway of unrestricted gratification.

Except someone like Trotsky usually all the Marxists consider the libido theory of Freud is useless, unreal and is not sanctioned by Marxism. Regarding materialistic psychology they give due importance to Pavlovian conditioned reflex and the theory of reflection of Lenin. Today what is the purpose of revivalism of Freudian theories? Is it truly to search the individual psychology or it is a bad endeavour to guide the revolution in the muddy slippery instinctualism?

Marcuse has accepted all the high fantasy-laden theories of Freud. He does not criticise the theory of *Thanatos*. Though he has given a hint that the libido theory is partly incorrect. Yet we can say that he has bewildered the youth's mind of modern American society at the name of reformation of asocial destructive part and to depict it as more charming, more palatable. According to Freud, in childhood days sexuality is disseminated throughout the body. As the child grows up this sexuality centralised in some areas of the body. A normal young adult person gets pleasure in normal gender-based sex. As a result the person develops attraction to opposite sex, courtship, marriage, procreation, formation of family and to lead a disciplined family life.

Though according to the Marxists this statement is not correct yet there are much potentialities for development of some human qualities such as love of man and woman, care and affection of mother in this statement. Due to excessive repression, gender-based sex and monogamous relationship sprouts normally. So according to Marcuse monogamy is irrational and improper for couple and as well as family-based relationship. According to him the role of parents and family regarding rearing of children is non-revolutionary mentality. Testing sexuality all over body would enhance revolutionary activities. One may ignore it (as Mc Intyre has done) as an idiotic thinking but then he would miss its most negative side.

Though there is male domination in the first phase of capitalism yet we could find the beginning of healthy couple relationship. In socialistic society this family relationship of man and women become more beautiful and comprehensible for equal rights of them. Now Marcuse has started to attack the monogamous marriage-based couple relationship and creating chaos and indiscipline, not the revolution. In several cases in the capitalist state love, affection become commodity, female body is purchasable. Though there couple relationship is unhealthy yet there family environment is not that much polluted. Do Marcuse want to unite his concept of free love with revolution cleverly and publicise unrestricted sexual-union as a part and parcel of revolution and in this way to pollute the environment?

When many of the followers of Freud are suspicious regarding the existence of 'death-instinct' then Marcuse is ready to accept the presence of death-instinct in our mind. He writes that man sometimes cause to indulge in a revolt involuntary death game. He has seen the destructive side in the expression of death-wish of man in modern technology. "Beneath the manifold rational and rationalised motives for war against national and group enemies, the deadly partner of Eros (that is, Thanatos, the death-instinct) becomes manifest in the approval and participation of the victims." (*Eros & Civilisation*, 1955, p. 55)

Without the imagination of *Thanatos* Marcuse can say easily that today's man is habituated in thinking unidimensionally so they are accepting death voluntarily. In fact, somewhere he has said, "The tolerance of positive thinking is enforced tolerance-enforced not by any terroristic agency but by the overwhelming anonymous power of efficiency of the technological society. As such it permeates the general consciousness-and the consciousness of the critic. The absorption of the negative by the positive is validated in the daily experience, which defuscates the distinction between the rational appearance and irrational reality." Then why he has tried to establish this theory of death-instinct?

I do not think in this context what Mc Intyre said criticising Marcuse is not sufficiently reasonable.

Usually man does many such work, expresses many such statements about which he is

not totally conscious specially about its sources or its consequences. Freud had imagined of unconscious mind for its explanation.

In everyday life by the mistakes, joke-humour what we want to say or do consciously are actually not our conscious endeavour but this are inspired by our unconscious mind. According to Freud our majority activities are unconsciously motivated. Marx did not take the help of some imaginary unconscious to explain our involuntary activities on the other hand he explained all this matters by our social organisational characteristics. We have created our society, social organisation, institutions; but they are run according to their own rules. Majority people are ignorant about this rules. They failed to influence this working rules according to their preferences. As a result they fail to realise the sum total consequences of their activities. It is not at all possible in greater perspective.

The capitalism is following a destructive pathway and the capitalistic activities are accelerating this destructive consequences. But certainly capitalists do not want this destruction. As they are not well conversant with the rules and laws of economic world so they are very much active of this self-destruction. They are also incapacitated to control this power even those who can realise this. The intelligentsia and capitalists are also alienated like the working class. Though like the working class they do not think this capitalistic society as infallible power. Because their labour values are not stolen. But their labours or works are not self-directed or self-controlled.

Mc Intyre has also considered Freud's sexual unconscious theory and Marx's economics-based 'alienation' theory in comparison as the same thing. The unconscious theory is totally speculative. On the other hand though we do not explain the 'alienation' theory totally with the help of human physiology or its socio-economic sources are still speculative yet we cannot ignore it totally. Why we confront ourselves in war? The reason given by Mc Intyre, "... If we could explain the occurrence and destructiveness of modern war by referring to the workings of economic system (as in fact we cannot) we should not need to invoke unconscious destructive instinctual drives to explain the same phenomena ... Perhaps both causal agencies are at work". (*Mc Intyre*)

With the help of 'alienation' theory we can not understand totally the war, violence, beastly attitude, cruelty. The destructive instinct lay hidden in our depth of mind. Do we need any theory to understand this? Everybody see violence in the society where we reside. Where is the problem to accept it that we developed violence and to strike others as conditioned reflex based on our self-defence and unconditional reflex? When in wars all the fighting soldiers feel insecurity. There is a continuous publicity to make an environment full of violence. A majority persons lost their balances regarding many good side of our mind. They become highly suggestable like the hysteric patients. They are overwhelmed and lost their common sense due to obsession of fear. They suffer from 'paranoid' delusion. They after believe everything indiscriminately about the truth or false of enemies. Even they do not feel any shame in the act of beastly violence against others due to some vindictive attitude believing some rumours. They think their attack is justified as it is the only way of self-defence. Can we explain our act of violence and beastly attitude in this way?

However in the long run as a critic of 'Eros and Civilisation' Mc Intyre does support the theory of Marcuse. Mc Intyre has given the following statement against Marcuse regarding his new revolutionary theory developed by uniting with a wedding knot of the 'alienation'

theory of Marx and the 'libido theory' of Freud, "It is worth finally noting that in *Eros and Civilisation* to young Hegelian theme recur. The project of explaining human culture as involving the alienation of man from his sexuality, of his seeing Eros at the heart of human things and alienation in the forms under which Eros is apprehended and encountered in essentially Feurbach's."

That person who can free his libido and extinguish his alienation with sexuality, would be the complete man, a true revolutionary and he can be able to emancipate his species also. Those who are residing in the industrialised institution-ruled society, are all the part and parcel of the establishment. They cannot bring the emancipation. Marcuse does not give enough emphasis about the crisis and contradiction of its society. He is giving emphasis the external forces of this society. While giving an interview to Gunther Busch he comments, "These young people no longer share the repressive need for the blessings and security of domination-is in itself incapable of exercising decisive political pressure. Only in alliance with the forces who are resisting the system from without can such an opposition become a new avant-garde."

The student-youths of America are not the true revolutionary, the true revolutionaries are residing elsewhere. In the conclusion of 'One Dimensional Man' he writes, "The totalitarian tendencies of the one-dimensional society render the traditional ways and means of protest ineffective..."

"However underneath the conservative popular base is the substratum of the outcasts and outsiders, the exploited and the persecuted of the other races and other colours, the unemployed and the unemployable. They exist outside the democratic process."

But can they pass the examination of revolution? Are they free from the 'surplus suppression'? Is revolution possible without the revolutionary consciousness? Marcuse is not sure whether if they win and if they establish a savage kingdom so that we can find an open-society.

If they can unite with the advanced conscious people of this society then actually the revolution is possible. "But the chance is that, in this period, the historical extremes may meet again : the most advanced consciousness of humanity and its most exploited force. It is nothing but a chance."

Who are this 'advanced consciousness of humanity'? Majority of this society are the followers common men. They do not know actually what they want. According to Marcuse there are few chosen people who can understand what the people want and how they could be emancipated. They are the persons who have eradicated the sexual alienation and became a free man and the true revolutionary. Actually Marcuse is the believer of specially conscious 'dictatorship of minority'. What Marx wants that man would bring his own emancipation and here Marcuse wants to 'contribute' emancipation to the people. "The philosophy of the young Hegelians, fragments of Marxism and revised chunks of Freud's metapsychology; out of these materials Marcuse has produced a theory that, like so many of its predecessors, invokes the great names of freedom and reason while betraying its substance at every important point." with this Mc Intyre has finished his criticism of Marcuse.

Is this revolutionary theory of Marcuse original and unique? 'Eros and Civilisation' was published in the year 1955. Before that the bourgeois thinkers have left any kind of logic. Second World War, Hiroshima, 'Cold War', Korea invasion by America all this had specially

shaken the philosophers, litterateur. Values, ethics nothing remained. Before that helpless pitiful alienated picture of industrial-age man had been depicted by the powerful litterateur like Kafka. The cry of human essence and 'absurdity' of society had become the subject matter of art and literature. Many of the thinkers had the search for a free life leaving this society. Much ahead upsurge of Fascism had created the artists and litterateur already vacillating in Italy and Germany.

When Marcuse was compelled to left his country due to opposition of Nazi-philosophy, at that time within a decade Camus, Sartre, Becket formed a barricade in the street of Paris to fight against the Hitler commandos. Later all of them were suspicious regarding the justification of this struggle. We do not think it is necessary to enumerate the causes. Of course Sartre was exceptional. Leaving the habit to see life traditionally, conventionally and instead of thinking to change this society by the old style revolution, the 'absurd' viewpoint was preferred and the art and literature were full of personal loud protest of the angry youths. There were bold expressions of incidences of polygamy, homosexuality in the literature. The feeling of bohemia were newly realised in the mind of sensitive youths. This philosophic feeling of bohemia and its organised propaganda could be seen in the writings of Marcuse.

"What traditional Marxism saw as petty-bourgeois bohemia closely allied to the Lumpen-proletariat has become in Marcuse's latest theoretical, stance the potential of change" (Mc Intyre) The new definition of bohemia is 'outsider' and this word became rapidly familiar and much research works were began with this outsiders. We found stories enumerating to see and strike remaining outside the society. Composing dramas on revolution and sexuality Jean Jeen had actually made a stir in the intellectual circles. Within one year that the year 'Eros and Civilisation' published, everyday there were loud discussion about Jean Jeen's drama 'The Balcony' on the opposite side of Atlantic. So far as I know about Jean Jeen's life, he could be the true ideal revolutionary representative of Marcuse.

He has candidly admits in his autobiography that, "For a time I loved stealing, but prostitution appealed more to my easygoing ways. I was twenty ... Abandoned by my family, I found it natural to aggravate this fact by the love of males, and that love by sterling and stealing, by crime, or complicity with crime. Thus I decisively repudiated a world that had repudiated me." It is natural for Jean to express his anger against this merciless society. But the nature of his anger specially his artistic creations are unnatural at least in the eyes of Marxists. What revolutionary picture Jean has depicted in his drama 'The Balcony' is very much similar to the ideal revolution of Marcuse. This drama has been written based on death-instinct. What the dramatist wants to say that, "sex is essentially a matter of domination and submission." The individual of this society is impotent. Revolutionary zeal develops from sex-instinct and drive of domination. Society does not change in revolution. The reality cannot be controlled easily.

In contemporary art, literature and philosophy of post Second World War era the powerless anger and sense of alienation of intellectuals and petitbourgeois have been expressed in various forms. We have seen all this materials as an echo from Marcuse. The fear, anxiety, tension regarding automation and atomic warfare as contemporary thoughts of the bourgeoisie have been expressed in Marcuse's statement. Marcuse has not enriched Marxism but actually distorted Marxism.

It is absolutely necessary for the Marxists to study about the social theories and social psychology. We should enrich and update the materialistic psychology sociology with contemporary thoughts. Those days are gone when we can ignore the individual mind as the mere 'subjective' part of the collective mind. But Sartre, Fromm and Marcuse these three persons have tried to study the individual psychology with Freudian libido theory and they want to update, purify Marxism but actually they have damaged Marxism. Marxists will remain aloof for good for this 'Coprophilia'. It is impossible for them to develop this mindset to handle this excrement and refuse of drain by any means.

It is a matter of pity that a section of American 'Radicals' specially the drama-lovers are indulging their politics with this 'Coprophilia' of Marcuse. 'Eros and Civilisation' is now their *Gita* and *Bible*. According to them the pleasure of art is like primitive enjoyment like sex. "Art is like sexuality - a primal pleasure." When there would be suppression of art then the sex would be repressed. "The reification and repression of sexuality will go hand in hand with reification of art." This two quotes are from a famous progressive magazine of drama-movement. Now I shall describe to our readers regarding Marcuse's definition of art.

"Art is perhaps the most; visible 'return of the repressed' not only on the genetic level, but also on the genetic-historical level. ... Art challenges the prevailing principle of reason : in representing the order of sensuousness, it invokes a tabooed logic-the logic of gratification as against tirade of reason." It seems that one group of radicals have accepted this definitions. They have also accepted this opinion of Marcuse that "Stell and taste give, as it were, unsublimated pleasure"

It is correct that in the bourgeois country art and literature have transformed into commodity and also the interhuman relationship and many other things. But that does not mean that it is the result of suppression of primitive instincts. It happened due to the internal laws of capitalism. Marxists do not think that art and sexuality are of the same category. They are a bit constricted, suppressed and shy about free discussion of sex but they do not find any aesthetic pleasure regarding enjoyment of primitive instinct. They would not find any interest regarding body odour and taste of licking body like the Marcuse followers. We are hopeful that the other section of this youth are not that much intensely devoted to Marcuse. Ken Bendit has clearly stated, "Some people have tried to force Marcuse on us as a mentor: that is a joke. None of us have read Marcuse."

We need radical change of this society, this world, this lifestyle, this values. Change not in gradual step by step. If we can banish the present and vanquish the past by a sudden immediate strike then after the holocaust we would find the shore of golden island. The dawn of happiness would appear after much sufferings and miseries. In the era after era men believe in this statement and they are hypnotised with this message. This is the cause that men have thrilled with the message of God, old stories, mythology.

The theory of Marcuse or any theory like this would attract the simple hearted students and it would influence the distressed, poor people as a whole. As the sufferings of man develops into a most critical stage so the problems seem to be without any solution. As the oppression, cruelty against man increased so he tries to escape from this reality in the world of fantasy, eutopia. He expects that he would listen the happy arrival songs of 'Millenium' (*agamani-gan*) of heaven. All his faiths are shattered but he tries to build up a new faith so

that he can advance to sacrifice everything in this faith.

The hippies are in the way of invasion of the mystic East in search of this heaven or to wait for God in the drama of Becket. So there is reformation of Marxism by Sartre with the help of existentialism. So there is ultrarevolutionary transformation of Marxist theory by Marcuse with the help of Freudian metapsychology.

October 1970. **PAS**

Environmental, Economic and Ethical perspectives of Bioprospecting and Biopiracy in a globalized world

Sayan Bhattacharya*, Ritwija Bhattacharya and Aniruddha Mukhopadhyay
Department of Environmental Science, University of Calcutta, India.

*Corresponding Author: sayan_evs@yahoo.co.in

Introduction

In terms of resource use, there are two categories of communities in the world. The ecosystem people are those who depend on the natural environment for satisfying most of their material needs. In contrast, biosphere people command recourses from anywhere in the world, and are not dependent on the local resources for their survival. Here lies the anthropocentric philosophy of sustainability and consumerism. Because of this close interdependence of humans and their environment, the culture of societies is greatly influenced by their environment.

The concept of environment, when explained in terms of biological rights, must also respect the right of other species to survive on this planet. There are millions of species of plants, animals, and microorganisms in the biosphere, and each has a value of its own, a role to play in a vast, complex web of interdependent connections. Human existence and survival is ultimately dependent upon the existence of other organisms. This range of species, the habitats they live in, and the internal genetic diversity they display, is called biological diversity or biodiversity. Such diversity is part of our daily lives and livelihoods, constituting resources upon which families, communities, nations and future generations depend. Biodiversity has numerous uses in agriculture, medicine, food and industry. It helps to maintain ecological balance and evolutionary processes, and has spiritual, cultural, aesthetic and recreational values. For thousands of years, biodiversity has been source of useful compounds and materials for food, energy, shelter, medicines, and environmental services. The economic relevance of biodiversity is increasing because of the changing patterns of consumerism, globalization and emerging environmental problems. It is very difficult to express the overall value of biodiversity in economic terms. However, a recent attempt estimated that biodiversity ecosystem services amounts about US \$ 2.9 trillion for the

entire world. Among those estimates, \$ 500 million represents for ecotourism, \$ 200 million for pollination, \$ 90 million for nitrogen fixation, and \$135 million for CO₂ sequestration worldwide.¹ A natural ecosystem acts like its own chemical laboratory, with each species experimenting over time with various chemical defenses to ensure survival in the world of natural selection. They have been synthesizing these compounds for millions of years to protect against predators, infection, pests, and disease. So the plant species are excellent reservoirs of bioactive compounds with the potential for application to treat human diseases.²

Biodiversity, Bioprospecting and Biopiracy

Historically there has been prolific scientific interest in the lifestyles, knowledge, cultures, histories, and worldviews of indigenous peoples. Rural communities depend on traditional knowledge for food, health and agriculture. This traditional knowledge forms the basic cultural identity for them, contributing to social cohesiveness and thereby reducing vulnerability and poverty. 80% of the world's populations, mostly the 'undeveloped' regions, still rely on the indigenous medicinal knowledge of local plants for their medical needs³. In India, around 70% of the population directly depends on land-based occupations, forests, wetlands and marine habitats for ecological livelihoods and cultural sustenance.⁴

Today, the genomics revolution is fueling a new wave of scientific research in the form of bioprospecting, and it is impacting the lives of indigenous peoples around the world. Bioprospecting involves searching for, collecting, and deriving genetic materials from biodiversity samples that can be used in commercialized pharmaceutical, agricultural, industrial, or chemical processing end products.⁵

The megadiversity countries with 60-70% of the world's known biological diversity have significant stake for harnessing the potential of biotechnology and bioprospecting for achieving sustainable economic development.¹ The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the first international treaty provides opportunities to biodiversity rich countries to realize benefits arising out of the utilization of their bioresources. The CBD mentioned that national governments have authority to determine access to their genetic resources, and calls on governments to provide for conservation, sustainable use and equitable sharing of benefits from commercial use of those resources.

Between 4 and 40 million biological species are still unknown in the world. New species are being discovered even today. In the last few decades, biotechnology has developed and played a vital role in the development of the agricultural, pharmaceutical and medical industries. As the importance of the biotechnology industry increases, many useful biotechnological inventions can earn their inventors millions of dollars. The real pirates are those developed countries, especially the US, who benefited and prospered from the plundering of natural resources from the developing and less developed countries without paying any royalty to the source countries at all. Between 25-50% of current prescription pharmaceuticals come from plants, either directly or through modifications by biochemical methods, and the value of drugs to the U.S. pharmaceutical industry coming from plant species is estimated at over 30 billion USD per year.² A multinational company or individual who wishes to develop a new product often makes use of the traditional knowledge of local people in deciding upon a plant, animal or other biological source to study. After the successful production of commercially useful products from those organisms, the company applies for a patent in its own name on

those products. In most cases, the inventor not even acknowledges in his patent application that his product was derived from information provided by a local community. Biopiracy therefore can be described as the unjustified extraction of the environmental heritage and traditional knowledge from various regions of the earth for economic exploitation and industrial monopolization.⁶

Global emergence of Biopiracy

A recent report of United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) mentioned that "if unpaid royalty payments were being made to developing countries and indigenous peoples for the plant varieties and local knowledge used by multinational food and drug companies, those providers would earn approximately 5.4 billion USD per year".² Examples of countries not receiving their full share of these royalties include Tibet, India, Sri Lanka, South Africa, Samoa, Madagascar, Ecuador, Mexico and the Philippines. Since the 1980s, individual inventors or corporations in some countries, such as the United States, Japan, and some European countries, successfully lobbied government to permit exclusive rights to certain biological materials they developed through patenting. They were given exclusive rights to plant and/or reproduce and market them and have the right to prohibit others from planting, reproducing and selling the material provided.

Biopiracy in India: few examples

In the recent past, there have been several cases of biopiracy of traditional knowledge from India. First it was the patent on wound healing properties of *haldi* (turmeric).⁷ *Curcuma longa*, a type of turmeric, is an Indian herb that has been used as treatment for sprains, inflammatory conditions and wounds. The orange coloured root is native to the subcontinent and South East Asia, and for thousands of years has been a one of the major components of Ayurvedic medicine. In 1995, two US scientists from the University of Mississippi were granted US patent 5,401,504 on the use of turmeric. The scientists claimed that turmeric could heal wounds and claiming this to be novel. They have mentioned in their patent application that turmeric has long been used in India as a traditional medicine for treatment of various sprains and inflammatory conditions. But they claimed that there was no research on the use of turmeric as a healing agent for external wounds. The Indian government vigorously challenged the patent and provided numerous research papers predating the patent, proving that turmeric has long been used in India to heal wounds. As a result, the US Patent and Trademark office rejected all patent claims related to turmeric.⁸

The Neem tree case is another significant example of biopiracy of Indian medicinal plant. Azadirachtin is one of many active compounds present in bark, leaves, flowers and seeds of the Neem tree or *Azadirachta indica*. The remarkable properties of this compound have been utilized in India from ancient times in the form of extracts of various kinds produced by Indian farmers and small industrial firms in medicine and agriculture. Use of neem had been described in ancient Indian texts written over 2,000 years ago as an air purifier and effective medicine for almost all types of human and animal diseases because of its insect and pest repellent properties.^{7,8} A US timber importer studied the curing properties of neem and began importing neem seed to his company headquarter in Wisconsin since 1971. He successfully extracted a pesticidal agent from neem extract called Margosan-O. In 1985, the bio-pesticide

derived from neem tree received clearance for the product from the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The patent for the product was sold to the multinational chemical corporation, W.R. Grace after 3 years. Since then, many US and Japanese firms gained patents on formulae for stable neem-based solutions and emulsions and other products. The W.R.Grace approached several Indian manufacturers and industries to purchase their technology. The company ultimately managed to start a joint venture with a firm called P.J. Margo Pvt. Ltd to set up a plant in India. The plant processes up to 20 tonnes of seed a day and also established a network of neem seed suppliers in order to guarantee a constant supply of the seeds at a cheap price. In May 2000, a coalition of groups successfully overturned the patent held by the US company, WR Grace and the US Department of Agriculture over the Indian neem tree.⁸

Basmati is produced largely in Punjab, Western India and in Pakistan. Basmati rice has been one of the fastest growing export items from India in recent times. It is evident that Basmati has been grown for centuries in the subcontinent. After centuries of observation, experimentation and selection, the Indian farmers have developed numerous varieties of the rice to meet various ecological conditions, cooking needs and taste.⁷ On 2 September 1997, Texas based RiceTec Inc. was granted patent number 5663484 for a new plant variety that is a cross between American long-grain rice and Basmati rice. RiceTec claimed that the new varieties have the same or better characteristics as the original Basmati rice and can be successfully grown in specified geographical areas in North America. The patent covers the genetic lines of the basmati and includes genes from the varieties developed by farmers. RiceTec has already been trading rice under brand names such as Kasmati, Texmati and Jasmati. RiceTec's strain possesses the same qualities and characteristics of the Indian traditional varieties of Basmati. On the question of consumer deception, RiceTec clearly labels its product as 'American type Basmati rice'.⁸ No case has been filed in the US so far by any interested party from the Indian subcontinent regarding this serious issue. By mid 2000, however, the Indian government decided to challenge some of the claims of the RiceTec patent. World's largest importer of Basmati rice, Saudi Arabia and the UK, recognized that Basmati rice is unique to Northern India and Pakistan. Furthermore, the Agricultural and Processed Food Export Development Authority and Trade Mark Watch Agency of India have managed to win the Basmati patent case in at least 15 countries (including UK, Australia, France, Spain, Chile and the UAE). In the Basmati case, RiceTec's action would really become a threat to the sales of Basmati rice from India, and could affect the economic conditions of the rice farmers in India.

Some cases have been highlighted with a success story, but there are also numerous stories of deprivation in the context of biopiracy. Corporate patents usually do not recognize or compensate the indigenous people who are the main conservators of those resources. Indigenous communities, over the centuries, have identified and classified plants native to their lands and found their beneficial characteristics. But, the tribes do not have access to legal information that would protect their plants and cultural knowledge nor do they have the finances to obtain them.⁷ The profit incentive companies often overexploit the beneficial plant resources for commercial use, which ultimately result in the loss of forests and genetic material, crisis of land, plants and cultural knowledge of the indigenous communities.

Biopiracy and food security

The stealing of biological resources and indigenous knowledge would affect food security, livelihood of indigenous people, and consumers' choice. More than 70% of our food supply is dependent on a small number of edible plant resources, mainly wheat, maize, rice, and potato, which are fundamental to food security. Patenting of these plants varieties will definitely pose threat to the consumers. The patenting of biological technology will encourage monopoly control of plant material by Western transnational corporations. Farmers will become dependent of on corporations for their input in agriculture, i.e. seeds, fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides. It has particularly troubling implications for the developing world as the farmers cannot afford to buy seed each year and traditionally set aside a portion of their harvest to plant in the next growing season. Moreover, with the introduction of the genetically modified crops and high yielding varieties, the local crop varieties are being lost and outcompeted.⁹ The farmer's rights to choose the desired crops have become difficult to implement. The technology can execute a devastating effect on the economy and food security of the farmers in developing world and can eventually destroy the locally adapted, inexpensive traditional crop varieties. The entire process will eventually lead to the monopolization of trade, which is ultimately against the principle of free trade fostered by the World Trade Organization (WTO).

Legal perspectives of Biopiracy

In politics, biopiracy has triggered the problem of the intrusion of national sovereignty when a corporation or a government from other countries utilizes and benefits from the patent varieties of genetic resources which derived from genetic resources or traditional knowledge from another sovereign state. This can violate the international merit of a state's sovereign rights on its own resource.

A study prepared for the UNDP discussed potential strategies to assist indigenous peoples in claiming biodiversity as their own property and to claim financial royalties owed to them by industry.¹⁰ Some of the proposed steps in this new (intellectual integrity framework) are:

1. Discussion with indigenous communities to learn what steps they wish to take to preserve biodiversity and to properly acknowledge their contributions.
2. New deposit rules should be implemented that would identify biological inventions as to their origin, mentioning the names of individuals or communities concerned, when they are deposited in gene banks or when patent application is made. Failure to provide such 'passport data' could nullify a patent.
5. Tribunals that could resolve disputes between indigenous communities and patent claimants.
6. The creation of a fee structure in each patent jurisdiction that would pay for expenses incurred by indigenous communities for deposits, tribunals and legal representation.

Conclusion

Biopiracy is a complicated issue. The concept is intimately linked to the concept of intellectual property rights on biological inventions, which is, by itself highly controversial. It is further confusing when the patenting of biotechnology inventions involves a lot of international agree-

ments. There are several concepts that are concerned with biopiracy, including the principle of proprietary intellectual property rights, community rights, national sovereignty, and the common heritage of mankind, all of them jointly have increased the complexity of the concept. There has not been any law punishing biopiracy because biopiracy is a new kind of crime that specifically emerged only two decades ago. And another reason is that industrialized countries have dominated main international conventions and make the rules accordingly. However, in the past few years, developing countries have become more vocal in the international arena. They have begun to work cooperatively with each other and form stumbling blocks to industrialized countries. This would help developing countries in the political bargaining with developed countries and can help to solve the problem of biopiracy.

References

1. Ministry of Environment and Forests, Govt. of India. 2002. *Biotechnology and Bioprospecting for Sustainable Development*. India's presentation for the Ministerial Meeting of Megabiodiversity Countries. Cancun, Mexico.
2. Zakrzewski, P.A. 2002. *Bioprospecting or Biopiracy? The Pharmaceutical Industry's Use of Indigenous Medicinal Plants as a Source of Potential Drug Candidates*. University of Toronto Medical Journal 79(3): 252-254.
3. Shankar, D. 1997. *Traditional Medicine and Biopiracy*. Ancient Science of Life 17(1): 67-71.
4. Kothari, A., Patel, A. 2006. *Environment and Human Rights*. National Human Rights Commission, New Delhi.
5. Hamilton, C. 2006. *Biodiversity, Biopiracy and benefits: What Allegations of Biopiracy tell us about intellectual property*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd., Oxford.
6. Udgaonkar, S. 2002. *The recording of traditional knowledge: Will it prevent 'bio-piracy'?* Current Science 82(4): 413-419.
7. Shiva, V. 1999. *Biopiracy: The Plunder of Nature and Knowledge*. South end press. India.
8. Rungtaphan, T. 2004. *Biopiracy in Asia : a case study of India and Thailand*. University of Hong Kong, China.
9. Yusuf, M. 2010. *Ethical issues in the use of the terminator seed technology*. African Journal of Agricultural Research 9(52): 8901-8904.
10. TWM. *Bio-Piracy Cheats Developing Countries and their Indigenous Peoples of \$5.4 Billion a Year in Plant and Knowledge Royalties, Says Study Conducted for UNDP*. Retrieved March 2002 from the World Wide Web: <http://twm.co.nz/Biopiracy.html>.

PAS

We are very much agog to know what is happening in Sahabag Dhaka, Bangladesh. Is it a movement actively participated by only student-youths? Is it a political movement? Is it a political movement against imperialism or feudalism? Is it anyway participated by the working class? Or it is just a romantic movement of intelligentia of that country? In spite of anything we are always with them and we will remain always them. Long live Sahabag movement!

Society as a Biological Experiment

J.B.S. Haldane

Most animals live either alone or in family groups consisting of one or two parents and their offspring so long as the latter are dependent. A few are aggregated into larger societies. These again are of several types. They may be greatly enlarged families consisting of a parent and very numerous and active offspring, like a wasps nest. Such societies imply the specialization of a few individuals for reproduction, and are therefore unlike any actual or possible human community. Among societies where there is no reproductive specialization we have at one end of the scale large groups with complete sexual promiscuity like a shoal of herrings, at the other monogamous unions only ended by the death of one partner, such as are found among many birds. Between these there are all kinds of intermediates; for example, small aggregates of mated couples like a rook colony, groups which unite temporarily for a special purpose such as migrant bird swarms, and many other types.

Where do human societies fit into this classification? The answer is not simple. A civilized man does not belong to one society only. During most, but seldom during all of his life, he belongs to a family or some other small organization (e.g. a club or an artel) practising some form of internal communism. He belongs to a group of producers which is now rarely coextensive with the family. He belongs to a nation. And he belongs to the world economic organization. This last fact is particularly important in a country like England, whose dependence on imported food is a hard biological fact.

All forms of society larger than a tribe of a few dozen families represent an experiment made in the last ten thousand years. What has made them possible? The primary cause has been the extension of human society to include the domesticated plants and animals. This has made it possible to increase the density of human population subsisting on a given area of land several hundredfold. And this mere quantitative change has brought about a change in the quality of human intercourse family or small tribe, a necessity. Society may be defined as man's reaction to the increased density of population which began in neolithic times with domestication. A people of hunters can, at best, only develop complex social organization during the brief period when they co-operate for some great purpose like the annual buffalo hunts of the Indians of the North American plains. An agricultural community cannot avoid a high degree of social complexity, even though, until fairly definite class distinctions develop, a state is probably rarely if ever developed. Anarchism has been out of date since palaeolithic times.

Besides domestication, at least two other important causes have contributed to the formation of society. One is a change in tradition. By this word I mean all forms of behaviour handed down from one generation to another, including language, techniques of agriculture and industry, morality, religion, beliefs, and organizations: in fact, all features of human existence which are not determined by biological heredity on the one hand, or the natural environment on the other. The other cause is a change in human nature that is to say, in the

characters determined by biological heredity. The extent of this change is highly questionable. Beyond doubt our innate immunity to disease has altered. It is much less sure whether those innate dispositions which, interacting with the environment, determine our moral and intellectual activities, have changed to any great extent.

In the last few centuries a fourth set of causes has come to mould the form of society. We are becoming increasingly dependent on machines which cannot be manufactured without a great deal of co-operation. This calls for a far more complex form of production, and therefore for a far more integrated society, than was needed in a community based on agriculture and handicraft. It also makes a greater density of population possible. Both the complexity and density raise problems which are still unsolved.

Now when we consider the biology of human society we must be very careful to limit ourselves. Biology is and must be materialistic. This does not, of course, mean that it must be mechanistic. But so long as we are biologists we are considering men as animals. The biologist should not try to do the work of the psychologist, economist, or sociologist. He can very frequently tell them where they are wrong. He must try not to tell them where they are right. He can tell him that farm labourers live longer than urban workers, and coal-miners than potters. But he cannot add that, therefore as many people as possible should go back to the land, or that the pottery industry should be abolished. That would only be admissible if it were agreed that long life was the only thing worth having. He can say (though not, I think, on very adequate evidence) that, by certain radical interferences of the population could be improved. But family life, sexual love, and personal freedom are good things (or at any rate things desired), and it is not the duty of the biologist, as such, to weigh them against hygiene or intelligence.

On the other hand, he can, and should, point out the biological consequences, measured in terms of life and death, health and sickness, increase or decline of population, of various social measures. And it is futile to suppose that in doing so he can write or speak as if he were discussing an ants' nest. He is himself a member of a particular society, and a member of a particular class and profession within it. The first pre-requisite for a relative objectivity is to realize that these facts make an absolute objectivity impossible.

Let us now consider our field of enquiry. The biological needs of human beings as individuals are air, water, a temperature within a certain range, food, and protection from violence and poisons on the one hand, and from parasitism by smaller organisms on the other. Given these, the individual can live healthily if not always happily or morally. If society is to go on, its members must reproduce, and in the long run births must balance deaths very exactly. (The closeness of the balance may be realized by the fact that a community which increased by 10 per cent per generation would increase ten thousand fold in 100 generations, while a 10 per cent decrease would reduce it to less than one thirty thousandth.)

So much for mere existence. Society also demands a certain standard of quality in the individuals composing it. But here at once we get on to debatable ground. Do we want a population of athletes? Or is muscular development a waste of time for city dwellers? Do we want a high general level of intelligence? Or is not intelligence a handicap for those engaged in certain monotonous and menial tasks? These are not questions which the biologist as such can answer. But he can, at least, put them clearly to the politician, though he is most unlikely to get a clear reply.

Let us go to our primary needs. Almost everyone gets enough air, though it has to be forced down shafts of collieries to reach coalminers. The air of ill-ventilated houses and factories is dangerous, not because of the lack of oxygen in it, but because of the disease germs, dust, and other poisons. Similarly with water. Few civilized people die of thirst. A great many die because their water supply has been contaminated with dangerous bacteria.

We keep the air next to our skin at a satisfactory temperature by means of clothes, houses and heating apparatus. Thanks to these, men can live in every region of the earth. It is generally believed that climate plays a big part in shaping the various human races. In the last few generations climates have become more and more artificial. The climax is reached in North America, where, during the winter in many regions, the climate in arctic out of doors and tropical indoors. Within a generation, the development of refrigerators should make it possible to cool houses in the tropics. This will give us another new and experimental climate.

Food is put to three uses in the body. It is required for fuel, for maintenance, and for growth. The fuel value is measured in calories (heat units), and the amount needed depends largely on how much work is done. For fuel purposes one food can largely replace another. When it comes to maintenance and growth, about thirty different substances are needed in the food and perhaps more. Some of these are inorganic elements such as chlorine, potassium, iron, and zinc. Others are fairly complicated organic substances, including the so-called vitamins. When the fuel value or the amount of any of the chemical essentials falls below a certain level, we die. But this minimum level is often far below that needed for perfect health, and most people are somewhat short of one or more of the essentials. For example, most middle-class women in England are short of iron, as shown by the fact that if more iron salts are added to their diet they make more blood. In the working class things are naturally worse.

We already know most of the essentials of diet, and can generally say whether a given diet is satisfactory or not. In another fifteen years our knowledge should be complete. And in industrialized countries most people buy their food instead of producing it themselves. It is thus becoming possible to ensure that everyone should have an adequate diet. But nowhere is the knowledge put into practice. The nation which first does so will undoubtedly raise the standard of its health to an immense extent, but such an achievement will mean the scrapping not only of our present wage system, but of the housing system which involves the provision of meals by each family independently.

Meanwhile, however, the view is generally held—and many who do not formally hold it, vote for it—that the provision of a proper diet is no part of the States business. It is generally admitted that in England neither the unemployed nor the worst paid workers can afford an adequate diet for their children, but it is thought that other forms of expenditure are more important than that needed to feed these children.

Industrial civilization brings with it a new group of dangers from violent death, in particular, factory, mining, and traffic accidents. A good deal of effort (though in my opinion not enough) is being made to keep them down, and they certainly do not occur on a scale large enough to be a serious danger to the stability of society. Violent death in war is another matter, which will be dealt with later.

In the past the principle check to urbanization has probably been disease. If men or any other animals are overcrowded, the spread of infection among them is enormously facilitated,

and in any large town the death-rate can only be prevented from outstripping the birth-rate by artificial means.

Infectious diseases may be divided into four main groups. The organism causing them may be passed from one person to another by water and food, by insects, by contact, or by air. The list is not exhaustive but covers most of the great killing diseases. Some may be carried in more than one way. Thus diphtheria can be transferred by milk, air-borne drops, or by such contact as kissing.

If a family lives on an isolated farm no great harm is done if their water supply comes from a well contaminated by their own sewage. A water-borne outbreak of typhoid fever can only arise from a visiting carrier, and will not spread beyond the family. But in a town with wells and no sewers, a single case of typhoid or cholera may infect thousands.

There are two methods of preventing such diseases. Water may be brought from an uncontaminated source, as in modern towns, or it may be drunk as beer, wine, or tea. Under the Roman Empire, almost every large town had a water supply brought by aqueduct, and this made a considerable increase in size possible. With the destruction or disuse of the aqueduct the population inevitably declined. The universal consumption of beer did a great deal towards allowing populations to increase once more. To-day, however, beer is out of date as a prophylactic against water-borne disease.

Insect-borne diseases include malaria, carried by the mosquito, typhus fever by the louse, and plague by the flea. The former is the curse of irrigated tropical lands, and probably accounts for the repeated conquest of their enfeebled populations by small bands of, invaders from hill or desert countries where mosquitoes cannot live. The louse can be eliminated by frequently washing the body, and particularly the clothes. Bubonic plague is borne by rats, and is therefore not a menace in properly constructed houses where food is not left lying about.

We have not yet solved the problem of air-borne diseases, as was shown by the influenza pandemic of 1918. But we can very greatly check their incidence by diminishing overcrowding. Contagious diseases such as syphilis have been historically important, killing or maiming whole populations in the past. Where transmission is venereal, their spread can be prevented by chastity or antiseptics.

Until the nineteenth century, there were no rational means of preventing disease, and the fate of a civilization might be determined by an apparently trivial custom. Our traditions regarding cleanliness, which, according to the Freudian psychology, are in no way rational. They have rather survived by natural selection. Only in a culture where certain forms of cleanliness were obligatory could dense populations remain comparatively free from a large group of diseases.

If civilization is ever based on reason, the sight of a mosquito in a tropical country will arouse the same emotion as that of a decaying corpse, and we shall be as shocked by overcrowding in our houses as by open sewers in our streets. Meanwhile, the tendency is rather to link up hygiene observances with the feelings of disgust at certain smells which are inculcated in infants. In consequence, a good many so-called hygienic measures are thoroughly superstitious.

In a society with a given system of production there is a certain population in a given area which is better off than would be a smaller or larger population. The exact size will, of course,

depend on the standard of well-being adopted. Thus a denser population might have a higher average income, but a greater death-rate from disease. It is worth noting that we cannot decide on an optimum population at present because the conditions of production and trade are changing so rapidly. London is probably over-populated as things are. But it would not be if the population were concentrated in skyscrapers, leaving room for broad streets and for numerous gardens and playgrounds. Germany is over-populated if it is to be economically self-sufficient, but could comfortably support a larger population if, like England, it traded manufactured goods for large amounts of foreign grown food.

In the long run, as we saw, births must balance deaths very closely. In the past, a high birth-rate has balanced the high death-rate. During the nineteenth century the death-rate fell earlier than the birth-rate, and the populations of most civilized countries increased enormously. The birth-rate has now fallen, so that, although the populations of civilized countries are generally increasing, the fertility of women is not sufficient to keep up the population in the near future. That is to say, a million girl babies born in this year will have less than a million daughters unless they are, on the average, more fertile than their mothers. Where the population is not falling this is because of the large proportion of women of child-bearing age.

We do not know the reason for this fall. It is certainly not due entirely to contraception, as is shown by the fact that it began in southern Ireland, where contraception is almost unknown, earlier than in any other European country. But beyond question contraception is partly responsible. The fall is also due to the tendency to postpone marriage, but probably a great variety of physiological and psychological causes are at work.

Some fall in the birth-rate prevalent in the nineteenth century was needed if the planet was not to become a vast slum. But the compensation has gone too far. The present Italian and German Governments have tried to check the fall in the birth-rate. The former has failed; the latter succeeded during its first three years, but it is too early to say whether the birth-rate will not fall again to its pre-Nazi level.

One question of extreme interest, which will not be answered for a generation, is this: 'Will industrialism be followed by a great fall in the birth-rate in the Soviet Union as it has been in Western Europe and America?' If not, the Soviet Union is likely to dominate the world for this reason alone.

The most striking feature of the situation is that to-day we are ignorant of the causes which govern the birth-rate of a community as we were ignorant a century ago of the causes which govern its death-rate. Until we can control the one as we control the other, society will be a biological experiment performed on men rather than by men.

Men differ as regards their innate characteristics. Some, for example are born blind, or with such a constitution that, in the existing state of medical science, they are destined to blindness. Others are born destined to idiocy, though once again it must be remembered that in many cases they could be saved from this fate if we knew enough.

Similarly, certain people are born with the capacity, in a given environment, to become powerful for good or evil. It is doubtful whether we can say that any particular innate disposition is always desirable. The combination of intelligence and aggressiveness may give a great constructive statesman or a bloodthirsty tyrant. We know that we do not want physical or mental defectives. We do not know what kind of innate characteristics we want. It is perfectly conceivable that a sudden rise of 10 per cent in the intelligence quotient of the rising

generation in England would precipitate a bloody revolution. And only a small minority such a revolution.

In the same way we do not know how most socially important innate characters are inherited. Let us take the simple case of criminality. This often runs in families, and is generally associated with fairly low, but not extremely low, intelligence. Where a child follows its parent in a criminal career, this may have been due to an innate deficiency in self-control, or to an innate tendency to imitate the parent, which, on the whole, makes for social stability. We do not know whether the child who becomes an intellectual if brought up in cultured surroundings would not have been a complete failure in a slum. And it will be the task of the psychologist rather than the geneticist to answer such questions as these.

It is, however, certain that different sections of the population reproduce at very different rates. The attempt was made in Hindu India to divide the population into a number of castes, so that occupation and social status were hereditary. Members of different castes did not intermarry, but they interbred to a certain extent. It is probable that innate abilities differ somewhat between different castes. A similar attempt is being made in some countries where different races live together. Thus, in South Africa and Australia, unions between Europeans and black are now forbidden.

A society of this type is really a compound of several different biological units. It is clearly a more precarious experiment than a society of the normal kind. Thus if one stratum of it increased more rapidly than another, the equilibrium will be upset. And unless supported by an *ad hoc* religion, as in India, it is likely to generate hatreds which will ultimately wreck it, unless the conquered race dies out, as well may happen in Australia.

Where the society is stratified into classes, but members may move from one class to another, things are rather different. Social rise or fall is at least partly due to innate characteristics. At present in most European countries, and in North America, the poor breed much more rapidly than the rich, and this is not offset by their slightly greater mortality.

It is claimed by most eugenicists that, on the average, the rich are innately superior to the poor, and particularly so in those innate factors which make for intelligence. If this is so, the populations of most civilized countries are getting innately stupider. Similarly, it is claimed that ill-health leads to poverty, and thus selection favours ill-health. It is also obvious that war is dysgenic where conscription is involved, since congenital defectives, e.g., blind men and deaf mutes, escape.

It is beyond dispute that social success and biological success, in the sense of leaving a numerous progeny, are negatively correlated. In so far as social success depends on inherited factors, these factors are dying out. This state of affairs is not peculiar to our civilization. In medieval Europe the most admired quality, sanctity, involved celibacy. In the Soviet Union the communist leaders seem to have fewer children than the average. Lenin had none.

If in any society the hereditary, make-up most favourable to carrying out the ideals of that society is gradually weeded out, the society in question must, it would seem, be biologically unstable. It has been claimed, without any adequate evidence, that the collapse of former civilizations has been due to this type of selection. As our own society is showing symptoms of instability due to other causes, this particular question need not perhaps concern us greatly to-day. However, any society which was planned for stability would have to deal with this biological problem.

The solutions which have been suggested for the problem of the differential birth-rate seem to be mainly determined by the sympathies of their authors in the class struggle. Some have proposed that the drain of innate ability from the poorer classes should be checked by making a rise in the social scale more difficult. Others hold the view that the birth-rates of different classes would be equalized if the economic differences between them were abolished. It is perfectly conceivable that differential fertility of social groups might be ended either by a rigid caste system or a classless society. If so it must be considered on grounds other than biological which of these alternatives is the more desirable and practicable.

It is, however, by no means sure that the differential birth-rate is undesirable. It can be argued that a rise in the economic scale depends as much, or more, on factors making for aggressiveness than on those for intelligence, and that our greatest need is for individuals whose innate tendency is to be co-operative rather than aggressive.

The opinion is commonly held that only members of certain races can form a society of the highest type. Negroes, in particular, are often regarded as ineligible. Others take the view that all races are equal in their innate capacities. The evidence on either side is extremely slender. It is, however, notable that those authors who believe in the possibilities of dramatic changes in the innate constitution of a race by selection of its best or worst members, commonly hold the view that racial differences are unalterably fixed, so that a negro people could not rise to European standards. The contradiction is readily explicable, since in many countries distinctions of race and class are associated. And on the whole the richer classes are the strongest supporters of imperialism in states such as England where this is not so.

A final problem arises in connection with war. It is possible that technical developments will render war so deadly as to become a real biological problem. It is not so at present. The available evidence, especially as regards India, suggests that the influenza epidemic of 1918 killed more people than the World War, and in a much shorter time. As, however, human beings hate one another but do not hate filterable viruses, probably less than a hundred men are engaged in work designed to prevent future epidemics of influenza, while many millions are engaged in "defensive" preparations.

It may be, however, that before the contradictions which lead to wars between nations and classes are resolved by the establishment of a classless society and a world organization (not necessarily or probably a state), a large enough number of people will be killed in wars to destroy civilization as we know it. If this state of affairs is even approached, defence will become a biological problem. It will, for example, be as essential to protect cities against aeroplanes as against cholera, and the human race will hurrow into the earth like so many rabbits.

Two things stand out, I hope, from this discussion. Most human problems are not biological problems. They are psychological, economical, or technical problems. And even within the biological sphere the questions which we ask, and the answers which we get to them, depend on our economic and political orientation.

If the initial premise is correct that society is man's reaction to increased population density, it follows that the most fundamental problems of human biology are the problems of urban life. It is primarily by their success or failure as experiments in the organization of urban life that the various types of society which are now being tried out on our planet will survive or fall. PAS

'Why Do You Study Ancient Philosophy?'

Ramkrishna Bhattacharya

'Why do you study *ancient philosophy*?'

I have faced this question so often that it is high time to give a reply in print.

The question may be answered rather tartly, following a famous mountaineer: 'Because it's there.'¹ Such an answer, however, will not satisfy everybody. Yet the answer is perfectly valid. 'The first philosophers' (as George Thomson called the Presocratics) succeeded in making the final break with mythology; by turning themselves into *physiologi*, observers of nature 'as it is without alien addition' (Engels 198) they laid the basis of the scientific method. Benjamin Farrington noted that they were more than mere observers of nature: 'The novelty of their modes of thought is only negatively explained by the rejection of mystical or supernatural intervention. It is its positive content that is decisive.' (41)

The comment is equally true of the ancient Indian materialists. They too rejected any preternatural creator and asserted that consciousness arises out of matter, not the other way round.

J. D. Bernal further points out why the Presocratics are of importance even now:

'Greek thought, for historical reasons, underlies that of later ages, and particularly the theories of modern science, social as well as natural. We cannot think rationally except along the lines the first philosophers laid down for us; most often we think in the very words they first invented.' (22)

Bernal explains why ancient Greek philosophy is particularly important for the Marxists:

'To a Marxist these are by no means just far away and long ago events to be studied for their intrinsic interest alone. They are part of the struggle of today and tomorrow. Marx himself wrote his doctoral thesis on the atomic philosophy of Democritus and Epicurus; Engels, notably in *The Origin of the Family*, discusses the social origins of the Greeks. Just because reaction is still able to use ideological weapons forged in defence of privilege in Ancient Greece, there is all the more reason to examine how and why this was done and to show the contrasting ideology which is arising in the making of a classless society.' (22)

Defenders of the existing forms of class society indeed often refer back to the glorious past of India and highlight only a part of it. They tacitly deny the existence of classes in ancient civilizations and speak of the idealist systems of philosophy as the greatest achievement of human speculation. Greece produced Plato, India produced Sankaracarya: they are projected as infallible guides for all times. Many people fall prey to such propaganda. Generations of scholars too have joined in reasserting this claim. If a challenge is to be thrown to them, one must learn what the other side of the shield was like, and explain why the other side had not been brought to light.

For example, was idealism the only form of philosophy cultivated in India through the ages? Was there no dissident voice at any point of time? It is not enough to conjecture that there must have been anti-idealists and anti-fideists in India. Concrete evidence would have

to be produced to establish any counter-claim. One can always assert that any view about the world is bound to produce its opposite: as early materialism was followed by idealism, latter-day idealism begot materialism anew. Such an assertion, however logical and convincing it may sound, needs empirical evidence to support it. All the evidence may not be available on the surface; they have to be unearthed.

This kind of attempt has its drawbacks too. It may lead to another sort of glorification of the past. Farrington cautioned long ago:

'There is great danger, in discussing these old thinkers, that one may read into them the meaning of a later age. It must always be remembered that they were ignorant of all the accumulated knowledge of modern science and all the refinement of ideas that centuries of philosophical discussion had produced. In the world of thought, as in the world of nature, everything flows.² The very words with which we translate the sayings of Heraclitus are charged with meanings unknown to him. It takes an effort of historical research and of historical imagination to put oneself back into the frame of mind of this great thinker when he supposed himself to have solved the riddle of the universe by saying that there was a tension in things, "like the bow and the lyre".' (41)

What is true of Heraclitus is also true of Kanada, the founder of Vaisesika atomism, and even of the Carvakas who were the last school of materialists in India. Hence a balanced view regarding the ancients, giving praise where it is due and keeping in mind the shortcomings that inevitably accompanied their achievements, is to be studiously maintained. The same approach would apply to the moderns as well. Notwithstanding the inroads they have made and are making, posterity will also judge them in the same way, acknowledging their credits but, at the same time, noting what they missed.

It may not be out of place here to remember how Frederick Engels assessed the value of ancient philosophers. After dealing with the new strides made in the fields of geology, physics, chemistry and biology, Engels concluded:

'Thus we have once again returned to the mode of outlook of the great founders of Greek philosophy, the view that the whole of nature, from the smallest element to the greatest, from grains of sand to suns, from Protista to man, has its existence in eternal coming into being and passing away, in ceaseless flux, in unrelenting motion and change.' (30-31)

More significantly Engels added a proviso:

'Only with the essential difference that what in the case of the Greeks was a *brilliant intuition*, is in our case the result of strictly scientific research in accordance with experience, and hence also it emerges in a much more definite and clear form.' (31. Italics mine.)

Does it mean that the nineteenth-century scientists had solved the whole mystery of nature and left nothing for their successors to explore? Engels was modest enough to admit that 'empirical proof of this cyclical course' is still not free from gaps, but said in defence that 'these are insignificant in comparison with what has already been firmly established, and with each year they become more and more filled up.' (31)

Writing in the 1870s Engels further argued that the most important branches of science 'have a scientific existence of barely a century, and the comparative method in physiology, one of barely fifty years, and that the basic form of almost all organic development, the cell, is a discovery not yet forty years old.' (31)

Let us go back to the question that was raised at the beginning of this essay. Engels provides an answer that concerns empirical natural science vis-à-vis philosophy:

'Empirical natural science has accumulated such a tremendous mass of positive material for knowledge that the necessity of classifying it in each separate field of investigation systematically and in accordance with its inner inter-connection has become absolutely imperative. It is becoming equally imperative to bring the individual spheres of knowledge into the correct connection with one another. In doing so, however, natural science enters *the field of theory and here the methods of empiricism will not work, here only theoretical thinking can be of assistance.*' (42. Italics mine.)

To those who have an insufficient acquaintance with Marxism, such a statement may appear to be somewhat unexpected. But Engels did emphasize the importance of 'theory' without any reservation. What he says next may appear equally startling to some:

'*But theoretical thinking is an innate quality only as regards natural capacity. This natural capacity must be developed, improved, and for its improvement there is as yet no other means than the study of previous philosophy.*' (42-43. Italics mine.)

How can 'previous philosophy' be of any use in the study of modern science? Engels the dialectician explains the matter lucidly:

'In every epoch, and therefore also in ours, theoretical thought is a historical product, which at different times assumes very different forms and, therewith, very different contents. *The science of thought is therefore, like every other, a historical science, the science of the historical development of human thought.* And this is of importance for the practical application of thought in empirical fields. Formal logic itself has been the arena of violent controversy from the time of Aristotle to the present day. And dialectics has so far been fairly closely investigated by only two thinkers, Aristotle and Hegel.' (43. Italics mine.)

Why is dialectics so important in the present-day world? Engels puts his finger on what has come to be known as the philosophy of science:

'But it is precisely dialectics that constitute the most important form of thinking for present-day natural science, for it alone offers the analogue for, and thereby the methods of, explaining the evolutionary processes occurring in nature, inter-connection in general, and transitions from one field of investigation to another.' (43)

At this point Engels deplors the lack of acquaintance of modern natural scientists with the history of philosophy. It has caused great harm to the advancement of knowledge. Moreover, what is now claimed to be something new may, historically speaking, not be true: in very many cases old wisdom has reappeared in a new garb. But modern scientists were not aware of it. Engels mentions a specific case:

'Since physics and chemistry once more operate almost exclusively with molecules and atoms, the atomic philosophy of ancient Greece has of necessity come to the fore again. But how superficially it is treated even by the best of natural scientists! Thus Kekulé tells us ... that Democritus, instead of Leucippus, originated it, and he maintains that Dalton was the first to assume the existence of qualitatively different elementary atoms, and was the first to ascribe to them different weights characteristic of different elements. Yet anyone can read in Diogenes Laertius ... that already Epicurus had ascribed to atoms differences not only of magnitude and form, but also of *weight*, that is, he was already acquainted in his own way with atomic weight and atomic volume.' (44. Italics in the original.)

George Thomson writes on the atomic theory of the Greeks in considerable detail (302-14). But he makes an important reservation regarding the 'atomist cosmology':

'The resemblance of the atomic theory of Demokritos and Epicurus to the atomic theory of modern physics is superficially so striking that we are tempted to regard the work of those philosophers as scientific. This is a mistake. *Ancient atomism is not science but ideology. It is, no less than Parmenidean monism and Platonic idealism, an exercise of pure reason reflecting the structure of the society in which it was generated.*' (312. Italics mine.)

J. D. Bernal, himself a practising scientist, however, looks at the matter in a different way. He concurs with Thomson's formulation that 'the truth of the matter is, not that these ancient Greeks anticipated the results of modern science, but that modern scientists have succeeded in reaffirming certain fundamental but forgotten truths and establishing them securely on the basis of experimental proof' (Thomson 162). Nevertheless Bernal insists:

'But this is only part of the story. Those truths would never have been reaffirmed, never indeed examined but for the form in which their first statement was made, a form clear enough to be grasped, tested, rejected, and improved upon. The Greeks were supreme as model builders. Even if the models came from clan organization *they are the linear ancestors of our modern scientific concepts. The atom of today is not a rediscovery, it is the original Democritan atom, hard, massy, impenetrable, that was recovered by Gassendi and passed through Newton to Rutherford.*' (31. Italics mine.)

This indeed is a strong reassertion of Engels's emphasis on the importance of theoretical thought, which is no less important than empirical research. Why is it so? The following observation made by Engels is therefore worth pondering:

'The fact that our subjective thought and the objective world are subject to the same laws, and hence, too, that in the final analysis they cannot contradict each other in their results, but must coincide, governs absolutely our whole theoretical thought. It is the unconscious and unconditional premise for theoretical thought.' (266)

This is why ancient philosophy has much to teach us even today, for much of it was grounded in sound theoretical thought.

Notes

1. George Mallory (1886-1924) said this in reply to the question, 'Why did you want to climb Mount Everest?' Reported in an article published in the *New York Times*, 18.3.1923.
2. The fragment, 'Everything flows' (*panta rhei*), it is now more or less certain, is not one of Heraclitus' sayings nor has it survived as a quotation from his works (all lost). Simplicius (c. 496-560), a neoplatonist, first refers to it. Plato (*Cratylus* 401d and 402a), however, uses a different verb: 'Everything moves' (*panta chorei*). The image of flux even then is Heraclitean and it is tempting to compare it with the Buddhist doctrine of impermanence (*kshanabhanga*). The image of 'the bow and the lyre' at the end of the passage quoted above, however, is an authentic Heraclitean saying (Fragment 51 (Diels)). See Barnes, 65-66 and Freeman, 28.

Works Cited

- Barnes, Jonathan. *The Presocratic Philosophers*. London and New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986.
- Bernal, J.D. 'The Birth of Reason,' *Mainstream* (USA), 10:6, 1957, 22-31. (A review of the US edition of George Thomson's *The First Philosophers* published by International Publishers, New York).
- Engels, Frederick. *Dialectics of Nature*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1982 (Strictly speaking, not a 'book', but the edited version of four folders consisting of unfinished drafts. Published posthumously from the USSR in 1925).
- Farrington, Benjamin. *Greek Science : Its Meaning for Us*. Hammondsworth : Penguin Books, 1966.
- Freeman, Kathleen. *Ancilla to the Pre-Socratic Philosophers*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962.
- Thomson, George. *The First Philosophers* (Studies in Ancient Greek Society, vol. 2). London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1955.

Acknowledgements : Siddhartha Datta and Sunish Kumar Deb PAS

Not all pleased as Stalin makes a comeback

Vladimir Radyuhin

Moscow : Russian authorities have taken a step towards returning the name of Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin to the city where the bloodiest battle of World War II turned the tide against Hitler.

On the 70th anniversary of Soviet Army's victory at Stalingrad, the lawmakers in what is today Volgograd voted to use the wartime name of the city for ceremonial purposes six days a year on memorial dates linked with the past war.

The five-month Battle of Stalingrad ended on February 2, 1943 with the humiliating surrender of senior-most German commander Field Marshal Paulus. Earlier, the Germans had captured 90 per cent of the city in fierce hand-to-hand fighting before the Red Army, in a pincer counter-offensive, encircled and destroyed the Nazi's largest Sixth Army, whose strength exceeded 1,000,000 men at the peak of the battle. As many as two million people were killed or wounded in the Battle of Stalingrad and almost 100,000 Germans were taken prisoner. The epic battle opened a string of Soviet victories that two years later led to the fall of Berlin.

The Volgograd legislators also decided that portraits of Stalin will adorn public buses in the city from February 2 to May 9, when Russia celebrates the defeat of Nazi Germany. 'Victory Buses' with Stalin's portraits will also appear on the streets of St. Petersburg and Chita in Eastern Siberia on February 2.

Civil rights activists and liberal politicians have criticised the initiative as glorification of the Soviet tyrant, but it appears to have support of the Kremlin as it increasingly relies on patriotism to shore up support for President Vladimir Putin in the face of mass protests

against his return to power last year. Mr. Putin is expected to attend V-Day celebrations in Volgograd-Stalingrad on Saturday.

Communists have led the campaign for Volgograd to be permanently renamed Stalingrad. Earlier this week, they handed over to the Kremlin a petition to this effect signed by 50,000. The city name was changed in 1961 after Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev exposed Stalin's atrocities.

Reference : *The Hindu*, 02.02.2013 PAS

From the Desk of the Mind-Painter

'Who says I am not there in that morning...'

Dr. Goutam Bandyopadhyay

I have not come here as a patient. Actually I am in a deep crisis in my world of thought. I teach Bengali in a Kolkata college. Literature and Philosophy are always my favourite subjects. I have consulted about my problems with my professor colleagues, those who are in this subjects. But I cannot overcome my crisis. And for that reason now all my activities are at the verge of collapse. So I consider let us see how do you think regarding this crisis as a man of psychology. Though I do not think myself to be a patient.

It is a habit of myself to think about life-death-existence. In spite of that I do not feel any crisis for this problems. One night in odd hours I cannot sleep due to this thought. There is pin-drop silence surrounding the area. In midst of this deep silence the sound of the clock was became a dangerous sound. It seemed to me that a bit of sound means the end of a moment for good. As if each bit of sound is the footstep towards the eternal darkness and inevitable death. In that midnight I could realise that truly the sound of the clock was proceeding towards death and it was impossible to stop this sound. My mortal existence was waiting on few millions of such sounds. So I could not tolerate that sound of clock. Raising from bed I felt a cold sweat. I sprinkled water over shoulder and face. I assumed death is the eternal truth and it is the absolute truth. In this deep space-time my existence is nothing but a flash of a light. After that I am nowhere in this eternal space-time continuum.

Following this incidence I became obsessed with the thought of death like poet Rilke. Whatever I did in between this always I felt what was the meaning of all this things. One day time would not recognise even Rabindranath also. The intense feeling of Rabindranath would one day vanish due to flow of time. After thousand years no body would response at the name of Rabindranath. There would be only an echo.

Meanwhile I had tried to say something immediately he resisted and exclaimed, 'Oh I know what you would say. That Rabindranath would survive within the consciousness of mankind, isn't it? That is the consolation word for many persons. Actually time is so vastly eternal that any sign would be signless. The relentless progress of civilization amidst of this

time is independent of Rabindranath's existence. Do we have found the best poet of Harappa-Mohanjedaro. Not only that, the longevity of sun is five hundred crores years and we had crossed only two hundred and fifty crores years. The earth would be perished much earlier than the sun. Is it not ridiculous to visualise any dream on the platform of this insignificance.

Few days after this incidence my wife became very much active to celebrate my 50th birthday. It was like rubbing salt in a sore. I could not understand how the birthday might be the day of pleasure to a person. It is just to remind a person that you are going one step forward towards death. Henceforth I used to feel depressed in the wake of my next birthday. I could not perform any normal activities. When the birth day passed silently then only I became normal. Now I have crossed fifty three but could not get the normal state.

There is a desolate field in front of our college. In the afternoon while sitting at the field I could realise that the matters surrounding me would remain only for few days. Suppose this big tree that was standing beside me would not exist one day and that day was approaching gradually. This was only matter of some time. Those who are now in this world would not exist after hundred years and those persons who will reside at that time are not now. Evening set in and while after returning to hostel I could find that the boys were playing table tennis in the common room. I laugh at them, feel pity for them as the poor fellows were now so much busy throughing their hands and legs only for a few days with the plastic ball. What a shame that this idiots do not know their extremities would be lifeless after a few days. In this way I could not attain my studies for some times. I avoid classes and used to sit at the field. After a few days everything became normal as I got mixed with this idiots and passed the college life with the same enthusiasm.

Do you think this kind of spending days are nothing but foolishness.

Now I think so.

Then what could you do as an intelligent person. Only to feel deep sigh placing hand in the cheek. But that is also to reach the inevitable doorstep of the fools after spending with unnecessary pomp and pleasure. As in both the cases we face death as an ultimate so why we should not spend our life with some joyous moment?

It is not possible to perform any intelligent work for man. He is totally controlled by destiny. He is predestined and helpless. His feeling of cleverness, idiocy, joy, sorrows all are mere food of this great space-time. Previously I used to make fun about this destiny. Now I think no ism has so profound wisdom. Everything is predestined, we are just pawn.

Do you believe in God?

No no if I am a believer than it would be much easier for me to remain quiet shouldering everything upon him. In my opinion the concept of atheism of *Sankhya* philosophy is more or less correct. God is not free, no creator is free. Because there is bondage in all creation. And if God is confined then He must be ignorant about the world beyond his perview. So I think God is neither confined nor free rather He is absent, want of proof. You just think if God exist then who is his creator? In this way actually there is no end. Rather I can say there is no beginning. There is no beginning or end in this space-time continuum. Infinite and eternity is the last word. We have nothing to do. Our solar system in midst of this millions of galaxy of stars is just a drop of water. It is just like a flash of light. In between this twinkle of time there are the whole civilisation from Mohanjedaro-Harappa to Moghul period to this

modern era and that is also like a flash.

But why you say all this is predestined?

If I proceed with the causal relationship, then I could find a cause for any phenomena, that is the result of the previous cause. Then where is the beginning? Is the seed come first or the fruit? Look there is nothing to do except keep mum.

If you are just an agent, if you are a puppet of this creation then why you are so restless? A puppet has no sense of pleasure or restlessness.

What you have said is not bad.

Do you believe in Vedantik Monotheism that is only Brahma is true and the rest is Maya?

Who can say. Sometimes I feel It may be true!

Then you are non-existent and I am also non-existent. And if I do not exist then why have you come me to consult about your anxiety?

In the beginning Dhireshbabu was taken aback and stare at me in a vacant look but afterwards he shown a glee within his anxiety laden depressed face.

Then I say, look you do not find any beginning or end of this creation. You just find an existence that we may call Vedanta Brahma. Where Kanad in his atomism consider atom as eternal, then if you consider that there is nothing exist except only one unit of power then I should enquire where that power exist?

That power is not visible, it is all-pervading.

Then it exist in all the molecule-atoms of this creation? Then it exist in you also as you are a part of it? So your external section is not that much forceful than your internal section. The internal section is the part of the external section. If the internal and external section are same then how it is possible that the external section is dominating you? How it is possible that you being the agent of someone? Puppet has no restlessness. The restlessness you have proved that you possessed some power that is it possesses some power. So you are not only an agent. Your lifestory is predestined but it is confined, still and against all infinite or eternal. As you are a believer of infinite-eternal so it is much easy for you to realise the matter. The frontside of your life is open, indetermined and that proceed towards the possibilities of its phenomena of infinite-eternal. And that is controlled by the exchange of power between external and internal section.

But our power is only of transformation not of any creation!

You are a believer of creation of infinite-eternal. Transformation has also its infinite-eternal. Transformations become creation when it reaches in infinite-eternal. And we are carrying the divided creation of power within us. The definite interface of creation and transformation is blurred. We are contributing according to our capacity. If in some day nobody can recognise Rabindranath then his ideas will intermingle within the mainstream of our civilisation. Though in much feeble intensity than Rabindranath yet all of our influence are continuously intermingling with the mainstream through generations after generations. If you are a believer of infinite-eternal then our contributions will not exhaust being insignificance because its insignificant existence extended towards infinite-external.

Actually it is true that this is not your mental crisis rather we can say it is the philosophical crisis of an artist. This cosmic alienation is the characteristics of a philosopher's brain type.

Whenever the fountainhead of our working capacity in speed and creation blocked then the cosmic realisation engulfs us. Again this realisation apart from other realisations with an acute intensity send one amuck in pleasure of creation. Then only we get the success of creation. The restlessness of existential crisis helped Rabindranath to create this song - "When there would not be any footprint of mine in this region ... Whoever says I would not be there at that time." All artists philosophers face this situation. So I think you would not consider everybody a puppet!

Bireshbabu smiles.

It might be that when you were studying at college, then somehow your natural expressions were blocked by something. Again you mix yourself in the mainstream with your dreams of life.

Yes, this is true that initially I got admitted to study chemistry. I could not like that subject. Then I lost one year and again admitted to study Bengali. At that time I faced this problem.

Your philosopher mind was not befitting to a subject of science so your mind did not get any way out for normal natural expressions. You have visited to the desolate field in search of life. And it lost your pathway in that silence embeded in cosmic alienation. Then your philosopher mind found yourself worthful in the literature and you could come out of this crisis. In this way our realisation of death remains hidden side by side. As if I am running in the train. The Moon in the sky is running with us at intervals of the trees. When there is no trees the Moon emerges. Again it is enveloped by trees. Our creation, our deep attention towards daily works branches like a sprouted tree that intercepts our views like the death. When the feeble stream of life like the worn out tree cannot cover the dynamic Moon, then only we feel death directly face to face. When we lack deep attention towards our life then only the realisation of death unnecessarily stands in front of us.

If you study, discuss, write more and more with this philosophical crisis of mind then it may not be a philosophical crisis. It will become a contradiction and that we can enjoy. According to the history that you have discussed you do not get any recent success that can fulfill your mind. But it was few years ago. In this situation I think your philosopher friends will be of great help than me. Exactly it is not a kind of illness it is only a crisis of realisation.

It is not possible and also unrealistic that from this discussion Bireshbabu came out from his problems and became free from all his crisis. Yet he started a thought process that without blocking the thinking we can continue with this discussion.

Making a bow at the time of his departure from the room suddenly something stuck to my mind - if we recognise the infinite-eternal then our existence is also eternal, then how it is vanquished? What I am thinking as extinction it is nothing but transformation! To mix with the dust of the earth may not be the last word. It may be possible to come back in the form of past. Because any possibility is infinity.

Bireshbabu stare at me in a vacant look.

I say, in spite of that if we run more than the speed of light we can visualise our dead being. Actually possibility of its being happened is infinite.

Now Bireshbabu made a final departure with a loud laugh. **PAS**

Incidence of drug-resistance tuberculosis is increasing

We know tuberculosis is caused by a bacterium named *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*. It is a highly contagious disease that creates a chronic degenerative pathology surrounding pulmonary tissues. It needs regular treatment for a long continued period for its total eradication. In the national health programmes of third world countries three communicable diseases are earmarked for its high rate of contamination. Even it has been thought that this diseases may cause epidemic at any time. Malaria, HIV/AIDS and Tuberculosis are this three diseases. This three diseases are intimately related. Among them HIV has a bad prognosis, Malaria has a radical cure though its *Falciparum* variety is malignant type and tuberculosis has radical cure with a long continued treatment programme and its treatment is also expensive. On the other hand poor people mostly suffer from this disease. It has been confirmed by various studies that malnutrition is an important factor for contracting this disease. So there is a common dictum that in this case soil is more important than seed. With the active help and assistance of WHO the Government of India, Health and Family Welfare department has launched a program to provide necessary treatment so that they can control the spread of tuberculosis throughout India. It has been enumerated that 40% of tuberculosis occurred in India. Among them 20% are new contamination and the rest 20% are reinfected. Every year 800,000 persons contract the disease and approximately 8,17,000 people dies of this disease or from its complication.

Recently the National Tuberculosis Control Programme has been revised to Revised National Tuberculosis Control Programme or RNTCP. It is also called Direct Observation of Treatment, Short Course Chemotherapy or DOTS. In this programme person suspected to be suffering from pulmonary tuberculosis are investigated whether they are sputum positive for this bacterium or not. Only the sputum positive cases are given medicines or DOTS. It is expected that this programme would be successful if - 1. Regular microscopic examination of the sputum of all suspected cases would be done. 2. Regular supply and taking of medicines by the patients. 3. Strict follow up for all patients so that there should not be any irregularity of treatment. 4. A political will is utmost necessary to make this programme successful.

In this context we should consider this programme is successful in any area if the 90% sputum positive cases are treated of that area successfully and 70% people of that community has been correctly diagnosed of this disease. We know in this DOTS programme there is a huge infrastructure throughout the country and also a good number of Primary Care Physician are also trained for this purpose. But it is nearly impossible to cover all the Primary Care Physician specially the general practitioners all over India. This is one the reasons that this programme is unable to get the result upto that expectation.

In India two people die of tuberculosis in every three minutes. If somebody suspected to be suffering from this disease immediately his treatment started and this DOTS treatment

programme is internationally recognised. In this treatment the tuberculosis bacterium cannot spread so the disease is sufficiently contained. It cannot infect a new person. But if there is irregularities of treatment specially as long as the patient is sputum positive then it can be dangerous as drug-resistance variety of bacterium. So after initiation of treatment the patient is being strictly observed whether he is taking medicines properly or not. The patient has to complete the treatment programme. If we find any patient who is sputum positive and is not getting any medicine then he would infect at least 10-15 people in a year. So the physician would consider two things in this case. One thing is the patient must be treated for one month rigorously to convert him as sputum negative. Because his potentiality to infect the other people would be zero. So if the patient makes irregularity of treatment in the first month there is every possibility that the patient would be a chronic carrier of drug-resistance tuberculosis bacterium. So he would infect other people not only with the bacterium but it would be a drug-resistance bacterium. The second thing is that among the drugs applied in this programme, Rifampicin is the drug that acts as a life saving molecule. So the physician has to take extra care so that the patient should not develop resistance against Rifampicin.

We should suspect the patient may suffer from pulmonary tuberculosis when it is seen that he is suffering from a harrasing cough for more than three weeks. Apart he may suffer from evening temperature, chest pain, loss of body weight, anorexia, haemoptysis, dyspnoea specially exertional etc..The common tuberculosis is 80% of pulmonary origin so tuberculosis is become synonemous with pulmonary tuberculosis and there are elaborate arrangement for examination of sputum to diagnose pulmonary tuberculosis. Even the intensity of this contamination of disease depends how much bacterium are being found per field of slide under microscope. Patients are classified as there severity of disease-contamination with this rate of infection. Generally sputum examination are done routinely for three samples in different occasion and if the three samples are negative then only we can say that the patient is not suffering from tuberculosis. How the patient is improving getting treatment that is also measured by repeat sputum exmanination after two three months of treatment. In previous days chest X-Ray was the only diagnostic criteria. But gradually it has been confirmed that there are many cases specially cases of pneumoconeosis that can mimic the condition of pulmmonary tuberculosis. So now the diagnostic procedure of applying chest X-Ray has been abandoned. On the other hand sputum examination is a much more confirmatory procedure. We should not forget that the patient suffering from HIV or diabetes are much more prone to contract pulmonary tuberculosis. So in all this cases sputum examination is considered a much more dependable and confirmatory procedure.

So what should be the responsibility of the person who is suspected to be suffering from pulmonary tuberculosis and also responsibility of his family members specially to protect the children? He should immediately contact with the nearest DOTS centre and continue treatment according to their advice. We should not forget that whole India is covered by DOTS centre. To say specifically there is not a single area where we would not get a DOTS centre. Treatments are provided from this DOTS centre free of cost. It is mandatory to be treated at least for six months continuously in any sputum-positive case. Not only that all the documents of the patient regarding his disease and treatment are kept with care in this DOTS centre. So think of it if somebody suspects that he is suffering from pulmonary tuberculosis

and consult with some private agency then in most of the cases 1. we would not be sure that he has started the treatment after a full-proof diagnosis. 2. He has to purchase the medicine from open market and there is every possibility that there would be irregularities of treatment for the poor patients. Because it is not an easy task to continue an uninterrupted treatment programme for a long period for a poor person. 3. No documents would be available for this patient from this private agency.

It is a matter of high regret that a good number of physican even the superspecialist are not concerned or you can say properly conscious about it, not to say about the poor illiterate people. So this physicians and specialists are treating this suspected patients randomly and doing much harm for the general population. Because after initiation of treatment there is every risk that the treatment would be discontinued. So there are every chance that a good number of this patient will ultimately developed the drug-resistance type of tuberculosis. It is also called Multi Drug Resistance Tuberculosis or MDRT. The most horrible side of it is that this drug-resistance sputum positive people would infect at least 10-15 new people a year.

This is the exact situation regarding irregularities of treatment of the patient lodged in prison or correctional homes and those who are migratory labours those who travel through-out India for better wages. The prisoners those who have started treatment may not be able to complete their treatment as they usually release from prison. Once they are released it is impossible to trace them. Because oftenly to evade further problems they give wrong address to the authority and they are very much scared to make any contact with any person of administration.

So we have to think the whole problem as a political movement to overcome this complicated situation. **PAS**

Rehabilitation of Chronic Mental Patients of Correctional Homes

Basudev Mukherjee

In the last issue (*PAS*, December, 2012) of this magazine we have discussed regarding conditions and fate of the mental patients in correctional homes generally prevailing in our state. There we have found a large number of various chronic psychiatric patients either accused or convicted for various charges of IPC are confined in this homes. That is they are chronic psychiatry patients and at the same time they have been accused or convicted of charges of murder, attempt to murder, dacoity, bride burning etc.. Some of them are confined for as long as 15 to 20 years, if not more. In the beginning sometimes ago they have attended trial court but now due to some complicated reasons their trial process have been stopped and they have been kept in this correctional homes as safe custody. Dealing with this section of chronic mental patients surprisingly we also find a large number of chronic alcoholics and substance-users specially in the correctional homes covering metropolis and megacities. They have also comorbidity with some psychiatric problems. This section of mostly undertrials is a menace to the other regular inmates of the home regarding peacefully maintaining their everyday life. They

perform all sorts of miscreant activities and they are the source of all sorts of pollution in this homes. Even they are the potential source of three important communicable diseases namely HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis that causing biggest public health problem of Asia, Africa, Latin America. So much so that this diseases can cause epidemic problem at any time. In this respect our correctional homes act as a potential source or hub to contaminate the outside world with this three diseases. So in every important general public health activities this correctional homes should be covered and if we take proper preventive measures among the inmates, then at least they would not be a potential danger for the greater community. This is equally true for mental health services.

Just take a simple example regarding depth and extend of public health problem in a correctional home set up. Generally we suggest to the people that they should use mosquito-net at night at the time of sleep. But it is impossible to provide the same to the two thousand inmates in a central correctional home simply for security reasons. Again their habitat is unclean, filthy and this home is a safe breeding ground for mosquito. So we can imagine what would be the consequence if we face an epidemic of Falciparum or malignant malaria in this home in any occasion. But for some unknown reasons this do not happen and actually they act as chronic carrier for any communicable disease.

Considering all this causes now we have to think that something should be done for this chronic mental patients residing in correctional homes for a long continued period. It is not that we are thinking about this problem just for few days or months. We are thinking about it for the last two hundred years but failed to get any effective solution. That is the reason now we can assume it is so much complicated and intricated that we have no short cut simple answer about this problem. But time is pressing hard to get an effective solution and we have to find it as early as possible.

After the bodily diseases have been controlled to a considerable extent we have started to think how we can control the psychiatric problems of the general population. Because gradually it becomes obvious that a huge number among general population suffer from psychiatric diseases whether major or minor type. So much so that we can say we suffer equally from physical and mental illnesses. The mental patients suffer silently and along with them suffer their close relatives, family members specially the children. They are actually poorest of the poor in the general socio-economic category of our society. They can not control their quality of life and sometimes continue a beastly lifestyle. Actually the mental diseases are not that much obvious like the bodily diseases. Again we do not feel any shame or regret for the bodily diseases like the mental illnesses. Whereas everybody try to hide the mental problems even within close relatives. They do not want to be exposed to the outside world. As a consequence they simply avoid it and even ignore it. Only in extreme pressure that they divulge any problem of psychiatry illness to others. Suppose the parents do not want to divulge of their sons or daughters mental illness at the time of matrimonial contract. As they know specially for their girls, nobody would accept her as a bride if she has any psychiatric problem.

Another most important thing is that in major psychiatric illness patient definitely suffer from their cognitive aspect of mental faculty. As it is most important for a person to remain self-dependent, self-reliant. When they gradually lost their cognitive faculty they lost their all sense of goal directed movements of day to day activities. He transformed into a gross vegetative person. Still at large we do believe that some unholy 'spirit' is the cause of our mental illness. So people at large take some measures to drive out this spirit which is not scientific. They will apply all this indigenous methods as long as possible to the patient to cure him from this problem as it is caused by some uncanny spirit and this will take much valuable time for early intervention

and necessary relief. This also intervene the process of reahabilitation. When they find no other way out then only they would receive the psychiatric assistance. But that is also not easily available in our state specially in the remote areas.

What we want to say that this kind of superstitions, believes of possession of 'spirit' are stumbling block for any proper treatment and rehabilitation programme. This are also some important causes why we do not make any effective solution of this huge problem. It is gradually becoming a tremendous burden on our day to day activities. This problems are multiplied when we find that a chronic psychiatric patient is confined in a correctional home for a homicide charge for at least 16 years, if not more. We are taken aback as how it could be possible to rehabilitate him properly? Because within this time he has transformed into a gross vegetative bundle.

We know according to the Mental Health Act (1987) no psychiatric patient would be kept in any prison or correctional home whether he is undertrial or convicted. It is mandatory to shift him to any psychiatric hospital. This direction is just and humane. What is the utility to give punishment in the form of incarceration curbing his her freedom to a person who has not any insight about his whereabouts, about the consequences of this process? But the most difficult question is can we stop entry for any psychiatric patient to correctional home? The answer is simple, no. Because this is the hard reality as we can find in any day in a central correctional home a large number of psychiatric patients have taken shelter in cells of this institution as inmates. Generally we have seen the persons who are unfit to navigate in the mainstream of our society for any reason they get shelter in prisons. This is happening from the inception of custody in the society. This is also true for the law-breaking persons. But in comparison to general miscreants this psychiatric patients are a stagnant population and they gradually swelled in number in this homes as their clearing up process is not good. Now we have to think why their evacuation process is so much slow. In this respect we think their are two main reasons for their not getting proper attention. If we can effectively solve this two problems then it would be much easier to solve this gordian knot.

First of all we have to remember that the inmate who is suffering from long confinement is generally charged for any homicide act or assisting such type act to others. It may be the fact he is not the main offender. But while in the act of crime he has somehow participated. At least investigating officer has submitted report or chargesheet in this manner. Now in this law or court procedure one need to be very active to get bail or any type of relief. The person who is intelligent enough or possess enough money he would take care of himself. Ootherwise his family members for any reason will look after his case and will be successful to get him released from custody. But who will take care of this psychiatry patient? Certainly he is not competent enough to perform this complicated job. The die hard family members will come forward specially the spouse, parents or children. But that is also not an easy task. Those who have any experience he would realise what a tremendous cobweb is formed in a criminal case consisting police, court, advocate etc.. Sometimes it seems impossible to come out from this complication specially as our judiciary process is heavily time consuming. Who have this patient to stand as a guard for this poor helpless psychiatry patient? Only the close family member is competent enough to show this empathy, solidarity, kinship; but they also have to face poverty the chief manager of all problems. Ultimately we will find that poverty stands in the way for any effective solution.

Now we can briefly discuss the trial process that is heavily cumbersome in our backward countries. If it has been submitted report from any corner that the accused is suffering from any mental disease then the trial judge will send the patient to a board of experts to ascertain

whether it is true that the patient is suffering from some psychiatry problem and if it is true then whether he is at this mental state competent enough to stand trial or not. Generally according to the directive of court a board of experts comprising psychiatrist, psychologist etc. is formed to examine the inmate to investigate this two problems. Even if the board recommends that he is a psychiatry patient and he is at this mental state not competent enough to stand trial, this is not the end of the story. Because according to the nature of crime judge may recommend that the accused can not be excused. He should be treated for cure and then we shall start his trial afresh. So in this way the accused as a psychiatry patient would received treatment under the guidance of the nearest state psychiatry hospital unit being incarcerated.

Again we have to remember that there is no infrastructure to treat any psychiatry patient in the correctional home. This psychiatry patients are totally at the mercy of the old convict writers. They are actually given the responsibility to look after the whole matter of this accused cum patient. The visiting doctors have no interest regarding this patient's care or service. So even in pen and papers the patients are attending psychiatrist and returning to this home with a prescription but of no use as it is impossible to honour this prescription or follow up for the patient as there is no infrastructure in correctional home to keep such patients. So if there are a considerable number of inmates suffering from chronic mental illness they will actually live a beastly life years together. Eventually his case, his trial would be missed for an indefinite period. The judge is overburdened with his own problems and he face a transferrable job and the investigation officer also has lost all interest. Again the persons of correctional home entitled to keep this inmates in safe custody have not also received any interest from any corner for the welfare of this poor creature. So this psychiatry patients suffer from incarceration for an indefinite period. As there is nobody to supervise the whole matter.

So we have seen if we have to rehabilitate a chronic mental patient taking out from custody or correctional home then one thing is very important that is the family support. If family is reluctant to get him bail out it is nearly impossible to have an answer. In the criminal justice system the role of judiciary is also important but above all it is family that would play the leading role for the welfare of this patient. Now in any case of this type of rehabilitation we have to make counselling with the close family members. They have to be convinced that in outside there is a supporting system from where they would get the requisite support regarding treatment, psychotherapy, occupational therapy etc. for the patient and this patient would not be a burden to the family members. Actually this family members are poor in every respect and they consider this patient as a burden. So they try to evade the responsibility. But if the family members take the initiative it is possible to rehabilitate this patient effectively.

Here we have to remember one thing that the concept of in-patient hospitalisation of this chronic psychiatric patients are impossible simply for their huge number. We are against all sorts of mental hospital like institutions. Because this institutions are the breeding ground for all sorts of corruption. So primarily we have to deinstitutionalise this patients. Again where they will go? Yes, they will come back to the community as a part of community. They are human being, they have some rights and we have to maintain their dignity. Family is the smallest unit of this community and this family specially the poor downtrodden family needs support to rehabilitate this kind of chronic mental patients. Supports in the form of expert knowledge and necessary materials like medicine, food, garments, help in any emergency situation (suicide, acutely disturbed mental state) etc.. It is fact that without this necessary support or help it is impossible to convince this family to take responsibility of this patients. So here we need some kind of active community programme, in the form of net working so that a 24 hours service to keep under observation like programme can be executed. In the next occasion we would sketch regarding our planning about this kind of community mental health programme. **PAS**

Back Numbers of PSYCHE AND SOCIETY

Vol. 10 No. 1	Rs. 40	May-2012
Subject	Writer	Pages
Alienation, Revolution and Madness	Dhirendranath Ganguly	3
Darwin	JBS Haldane	11
The Inter-relation of Man and Woman in the Writings of Rajsekhar	Basudeb Mukhopadhyay	15
Water Crisis and Human Rights	Sayan Bhattacharya	24
Poetry of a Committed Individual	Alo Bhattacharya	32
Tsunami Disaster & The Survivors of PTSD	Sanjoy Ghosh	39
Rationalism in Bengal : An Overview	Ramkrishna Bhattacharya	43
Letters from John Somerville to Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya		52
From the desk of the Mind-Painter	Goutam Banerjee	61
Vol. 10 No. 2	Rs. 40	December-2012
Subject	Writer	Pages
Twenty-five years study of schizophrenia in a Correctional Home : Logitudinal study	Basudev Mukherjee	3
What is meant by <i>Svabhava</i> : Chattopadhyaya and Needham	Ramkrishna Bhattacharya	16
What I Require From Life	J.B.S Haldane	20
European Feudal and Renaissance Literature	D.D. Kosambi	22
How the Soviets Fight Crime	Hiren Mukherjee	24
Sunil Janah (1918-2012)	Subhendu Sarkar	27
The Future of Mind of an Artist : Conjecture of Monobid	Dhirendranath Gangopadhyay	29
Eric Hobsbawm (1917-2012)	Subhendu Sarkar	35
The Late John Tytler, ESQ., of the Bengal Medical Service		38
From the desk of the Mind-Painter	Goutam Banerjee	52