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I dedicate this Course to my Harvard Medical School students whose enthusiastic participation makes it a successful teaching experience.

G. D.

Dear Students:

I have organized and directed annually since 1998, this Non-Clinical, Half-Time, Elective Seminar Course of four weeks duration, in September, November, February and April, for Year IV (Senior) Harvard Medical School students, on the subject matter of “Human Values As They Relate To Medicine”. Since the majority of those who took this Course responded very favorably to it, because as they said Medicine in this form of teaching is appraised Historically, from Philosophical (see p. 4), Ethical and Esthetic perspectives rather than exclusively from an Empirical - Scientific outlook, many of them urged me to post it online in the Harvard Intranet (“MyCourses” accessible by password only) for Harvard Medical students who do not have the time to take this Course when it is offered, and more recently in the Internet (accessible by its website, <http://hms.harvard.edu/humanvalues/>) for students of other Medical Schools as well, so that they could all benefit from this educational opportunity at their leisure.

Although the 80 pages long Syllabus of this Course is now available in both the Harvard Intranet and the Internet, which allows students from Harvard and other Medical Schools to read and to print its document, I strongly urge those who have the time and are genuinely interested in the Topics here discussed, to participate in small groups in candid debates between themselves and some of their Teachers acting as Moderators by employing the Socratic method - dialectic (see p. 68) which is based on dialogue, a process that would hopefully keep them intellectually stimulated as well as emotionally rewarded. Lastly, it will be most gratifying to the Organizer and Director of these Seminars to discover that some of the students who became involved in these interactive discussions, were motivated to the point that they will be launching similar teaching experiences with their own students in the years to come.

However very proud I feel of our Harvard Medical School students for wishing to share in a spirit of Collegiality rather than in a self-important manner with students of other Medical Schools this unique educational adventure, I am somewhat concerned by the possibility that the majority of Medical Courses will soon be offered online only. Yet, we must hope and trust that the Teacher - Pupil relationship which signifies a uniquely noble human bond, will not only survive intact but will be enhanced by the fourth “democratization of knowledge” brought about by the electronic word (the first three being the spoken, written and printed word) that the Internet offers, which could result in broadening, deepening and so enriching the students’ scholarly awareness.

With best wishes,

Cordially,
George Th. Diamandopoulos, M.D.,
CS704.0 Course Organizer and Director,
Department of Pathology, Harvard Medical School.

This Course is accessed through its website, <http://hms.harvard.edu/humanvalues/> (Requires Adobe Reader Software), by utilizing a Web browser like Safari (for Mac) or Internet Explorer, Netscape, Firefox (for PC), or by employing a search engine like Google or Yahoo.
“Our Human Values are by and large a reflection of Who we are.”

G. D.

PROLOGUE

Given that the Medical profession confronts daily *Life-and-Death* concerns and decisions affecting Humans, with the **concerns** frequently being based on incomplete or inaccurate information and the **decisions** often undertaken under pressure and within a limited time, the schooling of future physicians demands that they:

a) are thoroughly **trained** in the *Science of Medicine*, i.e., in the most important as well as the latest of the Basic Biomedical knowledge, and

b) are suitably **educated** in the *Art of Medicine*, i.e., on “**Human Values As They Relate To Medicine**”, particularly in instances in which Ethical Values are in conflict with each other, a situation that may lead to their collision and tragedy. It should be noted parenthetically at this early point in time of these Seminars, that the term **Human Values** (Lt. Valere - Worth) as currently employed, signifies purely Human Concepts, e.g., ideas - beliefs - convictions - perceptions, that are of Merit exclusively to Humans.

Because the selective pressures for admission to Medical School, and later on during the first two years of Preclinical Sciences in Medical School, encourage expertise in the Sciences rather than in the Humanities and the Liberal Arts, the only prospect available to remedy this most regrettable shortcoming, and so enhance a **Physician’s qualifications as a scientifically knowledgeable and an intellectually and culturally aware person**, is to offer Medical Students the chance to appraise Medicine from both **Medical Sciences and Human Values perspectives**. As the ancient philosopher Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) asserted so sensibly in his grand treatise *Politics*, Book 8,

“*It is clear that youths should be instructed in some useful things, but to be always seeking after the useful, does not become free and exalted souls.*”

Teaching sessions will be presented in **dialectic** rather than **didactic** manner. The Course Director has organized and will moderate the discussion of nine Seminars (see p. 7) during the first three weeks of the Course without imposing his perspective upon the students. He will then encourage each one of them to organize and moderate a Seminar to be chosen from among twenty-five **Thesis versus Antithesis** possibilities (see p. 10) during the fourth and last week, in order to give Students a “hands-on” teaching experience. Undoubtedly, the pedagogical outcome that may sprout out of an effort such as this, will not only depend upon the inspiration that the Teacher could provide, but would also be an articulation of the intellectual and emotional hopes, dreams and aspirations, along with the critical reflections and insights that the Students themselves freely and willingly bring to this mutually rewarding teaching adventure.

It must be emphasized that the **chief aim** of these Seminars is not to proselytize or convert anyone to what someone else believes in, but to arouse in each Student the longing to critically reflect upon Humanity’s Essential and Eternal Questions, and to try to answer them judiciously. As the foremost ancient philosopher Socrates (469-399 B.C.) affirmed so rightly in his *Apology*, which was recorded by his pupil Plato (428-348 B.C.),

“*An unexamined life is not worth living.*”
“The best physician is also a philosopher.”

This is the title of a short work by the Greco-Roman physician Galen of Pergamos (c. 130–200), who is considered second only in importance to the ancient Greek physician Hippocrates of Cos (c. 460-370 B.C.).

Why illuminate these Seminars with a Philosophical Perspective?

“Philosophy is to be studied, not for the sake of any definite answers to its questions, since no definite answer can, as a rule, be known to be true, but rather for the sake of the questions themselves; because these questions enlarge our conception of what is possible, enrich our intellectual imagination and diminish the dogmatic assurance which closes the mind against speculation; but above all because, through the greatness of the universe which philosophy contemplates, the mind is also rendered great, and becomes capable of that union with the universe which constitutes its highest good.”

“The Problems of Philosophy” (p. 161).

“ΕΝ ΟΙΔΑ, ΟΤΙ ΟΥΔΕΝ ΟΙΔΑ.”

“I know one thing, that I know nothing.”

By the ancient Greek philosopher Socrates (469-399 B.C.).
ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Quotations from the illustrious Works by the three celebrated Ancient Greek Tragedians Aeschylus, Sophocles (*), Euripides (**), which are found in the present Seminars, represent some of the truly great literary achievements of the human mind. They are the outcome of my extensive reading during the past many years of their English translations by the two outstanding Classicists, Philip Vellacott (Aeschylus; Euripides) and E. F. Watling (Sophocles), published by Penguin Classics, for Penguin Books. All other Quotations came chiefly from my reading of the world literature, occasionally from Bartlett’s Familial Quotations, and rarely by means of the Internet, e.g., Albert Einstein, Martin Luther King, Jr., using Search Engines Google and Yahoo.

I must point out that most of these notable Quotations exemplify the Western - Occidental Perspective, and extremely few reflect the Eastern - Oriental Outlook as articulated by Indian, Chinese and various other Asian Civilizations and Cultures. This is mainly because my having being born in Greece, acquainted me at an early age with the ancient Hellenic - Greek stance of knowing through experience based on objective sense perception and rational thinking based on logic, rather than of believing which is grounded on divine revelation or illumination and faith that could be a mystical inner experience which represent the East’s viewpoint. I must further stress that this Western Perspective was what laid the groundwork for the intellectual - political - artistic views of the Western Civilizations and of the Western type of Medicine that is presently taught and practiced in the West and more recently in many parts of the East as well.

I should also state clearly that those Thinkers whose voices predominate in these Seminars, do not belong exclusively to a particular period, i.e., Ancient, or a specific place, i.e., Greece, but instead they do pertain to all Ages and all Nations inasmuch as these Men represent some of the Intellectual Forefathers who reflect the Heritage of all Civilized Humans, hopefully ourselves included. Lastly, I must emphasize that the Quotations that are presently offered are chiefly to enrich rather than to embellish the texts, in hopes that they will inspire and challenge students to read the original literary works from which they were derived for the pure pleasure and delight of it.

Lastly, Man/Men with a capital M, followed by he/they, are terms that are used throughout these texts to denote human being(s) rather than male person(s), in order to avoid keep using the very awkward phraseology of “man or woman”, “he or she”.

G. D.

(*) “I portray men as they should be, but Euripides portrays them as they are.” Sophocles quoted by Aristotle in his Poetics, ch. 25, 1460b33-34.

(**) “Euripides is the most intensely tragic of all the poets.” Quoted by Aristotle in his Poetics, ch. 14, 1453a28-30.
“You are young, my son,
and as the years go by,
time will change and even reverse,
some of your opinions.
Refrain therefore awhile,
from setting yourself up,
as a judge of the highest matters.”

Plato (428-348 B.C.).
Laws, 888.

METAMORPHOSIS

“As an ugly little flower bulb
blossoms into a beautiful flower,
and an unsightly caterpillar
becomes a radiant butterfly,
so an inexperienced medical student
matures into an experienced physician,
who alleviates pain and suffering,
prolongs Life, postpones Death.”

G. D.
SEMINARS ON
“HUMAN VALUES AS THEY RELATE TO MEDICINE”

The following Nine Seminars will be moderated by the Course Director during the first three Weeks of the Course.

Directory

**Introductory Remarks.**  
Pages  1-10

**1st Seminar: “Life versus Death”.**  
Monday, 2:00-5:00pm.  
Pages, 11-14

**2nd Seminar: “Killing versus Murder”.**  
Wednesday, 2:00-5:00pm.  
Pages, 15-18

**3rd Seminar: “War versus Peace”.**  
Friday, 2:00-5:00pm.  
Pages, 19-24

**4th Seminar: “Love versus Hate”.**  
Monday, 2:00-5:00pm.  
Pages, 25-34

**5th Seminar: “Truth versus Lie”.**  
Wednesday, 2:00-5:00pm.  
Pages, 35-38

**6th Seminar: “Mythos versus Logos”.**  
Friday, 2:00-5:00pm.  
Pages, 39-44

**7th Seminar: “Theocracy versus Democracy”.**  
Monday, 2:00-5:00pm.  
Pages, 45-48

**8th Seminar: “Rational versus Instinctive”.**  
Wednesday, 2:00-5:00pm.  
Pages, 49-52

**9th Seminar: “Happiness versus Unhappiness”.**  
Friday, 2:00-5:00pm.  
Pages, 53-58

**Epilogue, Addenda I & II, Remaining Entries.**  
Pages, 59-80

These Seminars embody the Thesis *versus* Antithesis dialectic method.  
The term *versus* signifies *in contrast to* rather than *as opposed to.*
EACH STUDENT WILL DISCUSS IN CLASS ONE OF THE FOLLOWING BOOKS THE THEME OF WHICH RELATES CLOSELY TO A SEMINAR’S TOPIC

   Leo Tolstoy, The Death of Ivan Ilyich.
   The prolonged illness and dying of an unreflective man - a High Court Judge, facing his death alone, lonely, and abandoned by his family and friends, while only his young peasant servant shows human compassion, kindness and pity toward him.
   Leo Tolstoy, How Much Land Does a Man Need?
   Whereas a dead Man - a Corpse needs only “six feet from head to heel” of land for his grave, a living Man always greedy and grasping wants much more than what he has, as if he were to live for ever rather than that he will die one day soon.

   Plato, Apology.
   The trial, condemnation and infliction of death on the philosopher Socrates by his fellow citizens of ancient Athens on account of two false charges, i.e., of heresy and of corrupting young men, but in fact because he candidly pursued “the examined life”.
   Fyodor Dostoyevsky, Crime and Punishment.
   Raskolnikov, who is an intelligent destitute student imagines that he is such an extraordinary person that he is above conventional morality. He commits a heinous double crime from which he is eventually redeemed by a woman’s love for him.

   These two books are the most famous treatises on the Art of War. The first is the Eastern point of view of “victory by ingenious deception”. The second, is the Western perspective of “victory by disciplined, trained, organized, citizens’ militia”.
   Aeschylus, The Persians.
   This tragedy commemorates the dramatic victory of the Greek over the Persian naval forces in the sea battle of Salamis, i.e., the triumph of Democracy over Tyranny, while expressing sympathy for the “enemy’s” suffering and despair caused by the war.
   Euripides, The Women of Troy.
   This is another rare instance in world literature where a great Tragedian depicts most eloquently the anguish and sufferings of “enemy” civilian noncombatants, women and children, resulting from the horrors of war perpetrated for the sake of conquest.
   Aristophanes, Lysistrata.
   Lysistrata and the other women of ancient Athens and Sparta, disheartened by the cruelty and idiocy of their cities’ ongoing war, band together and start a sex-strike until their husbands agree to stop their warfare and so have a peaceful and loving life.

   Plato, Symposium.
   The Symposium is a dialectic discussion in ancient Athens by male friends while drinking (Gr. posis) together (Gr. syn) on the nature of human Love: first, the sensual or erotic type and then, the ideal or spiritual kind of Love of virtue, of beauty, of goodness.
   Sophocles, Antigone.
   This is a very bitter conflict between two fervently held principles: one, Respect of Secular Laws; the other, Love of Sacred Justice, each partly justifiable, each rigidly blind to the merits of the opposite, with their collision leading to tragedy and death.
William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*.
A contrast between the passionate Love of two young people, a mature girl of fourteen and a less mature boy, and the malicious Hate of their respective clans, which leads to the death of the two lovers and the eventual reconciliation of their families.

**5th Seminar: “Truth versus Lie”, Book Discussion.**
*Sophocles, King Oedipus.*
This play which was considered by Aristotle (*Poetics*) to be the highest point of Tragic Art, traces a Man’s search for the “truth about himself”, which leads him from arrogant confidence, to confusion, to fear, finally to despair as he becomes self-aware.

**6th Seminar: “Mythos versus Logos”, Book Discussions.**
*Charles Darwin, The Voyage of the Beagle.*
This is the absorbing account of Darwin’s five-year voyage around the glob on the H.M.S. Beagle, while he was amassing biological and geological observations, the insights of which led to his Theory of Evolution - one of the greatest human discoveries.
*Ernst Mayr, What Evolution Is.*
Mayr, who was the foremost Evolutionary Biologists of the 20th century, shows clearly that Evolution is no longer just a Theory, but it is a scientific explanation based on strong factual evidence, although admittedly some details still remain controversial.
*Mother Teresa, Come Be My Light.*
This book is a collection of letters sent by a saintly Catholic nun to her spiritual confessors, which reveal faith-hope-love coexisting with doubt-emptiness-despair, the latter causing profound suffering in the believer for feeling forsaken by God and Christ.

**7th Seminar: “Theocracy versus Democracy”, Book Discussion.**
*Niccolo Machiavelli, The Prince.*
Italian City-States that inspired the Renaissance and High Culture endorsed the ruthless attaining, retaining and exercising political power while abandoning the strong ethical values that had been sanctioned by Ancient Classical and Christian Morality.

**8th Seminar: “Rational versus Instinctive”, Book Discussions.**
*Euripides, The Bacchae.*
This tragedy considered to be Euripides’ best work, illustrates that although Man must subscribe to the rational - *Apollonian* part of his nature, he must not ignore his instinctive - *irrational* - *Dionysian* part, because he will then be horribly destroyed.
*Euripides, Medea.*
This tragedy, also by Euripides, demonstrates clearly that instinctive - irrational passions of a betrayed wife who inflicts vengeance on her unfaithful husband by killing her children and his new wife, inexorably leads to frightful annihilation of all involved.

**9th Seminar: “Happiness versus Unhappiness”, Book Discussions.**
This book has had a profound influence for many centuries on Western moral philosophy, by clarifying the relationship between Goodness and Happiness from theoretical and practical perspectives, and how morality relates to human nature.
*Leo Tolstoy, Family Happiness.*
A young woman married to an older man comes to realize that “the only certain happiness in life is to live for others”, i.e., to love her family, a theme that defies the life of Ivan Ilyich whose existence was meaningless because he had lived solely for himself.
During the remaining forth week of the Course, Seminars will be organized and moderated by the Students on Topics to be chosen from among the following twenty-five Thesis versus Antithesis possibilities.

1) “Humility versus Arrogance”
2) “Kindness versus Meanness”
3) “Virtue versus Vice”
4) “Compassion versus Cruelty”
5) “Forgiveness versus Revenge”
6) “Noble versus Base”
7) “Hope versus Despair”
8) “Morality versus Legality”
9) “Impartiality versus Prejudice”
10) “Conviction versus Convenience”
11) “Cooperation versus Confrontation”
12) “Need versus Greed”
13) “Secular versus Spiritual”
14) “Reason versus Faith”
15) “Discovery versus Revelation”
16) “Science versus Religion”
17) “Thinking versus Feeling”
18) “Objective versus Subjective”
19) “Pragmatic versus Dogmatic”
20) “Nature versus Nurture”
21) “Chance versus Choice”
22) “Volition versus Determinism”
23) “Reality versus Appearance”
24) “Causation versus Correlation”
25) “Tradition versus Modernity”
1st Seminar: “Life versus Death”.
Monday, 2:00-5:00pm.
Readings: Leo Tolstoy, The Death of Ivan Ilyich.
Leo Tolstoy, How Much Land Does a Man Need?

Since, as stated on page 3 of this Syllabus, “the Medical profession confronts daily Life-and-Death issues and decisions affecting Humans”, it is most appropriate that the 1st Seminar in this Course explores the topic of “Life versus Death”. Yet, it must be emphasized that whereas the raising of intelligent questions in this and in subsequent Seminars is a unique feature characteristic of many Humans, all answers must be proposed skeptically with humility rather than dogmatically with conceit.

What is Life?
From the perspective of Biology - Chemistry - Physics (rather than of Metaphysics which transcends the physical or natural reality), Life is DNA replicating into more DNA, or in the case of some viruses, RNA replicating into more RNA, e.g., poliovirus, or RNA being reverse-transcribed into DNA which in turn is transcribed into RNA, e.g., retroviruses (AMV, HIV).

From the perspective of Humans, Life is the means by which inanimate matter has evolved into animate matter - body - brain, the latter manifested as mind, i.e., brainpower - intelligence - awareness - consciousness - cognition - thinking - reasoning - contemplating - judging - understanding - knowing - remembering - feeling - believing. Is animate matter - body - brain versus mind, one - monism or two - dualism (Descartes) independent entities?

What is the Fundamental Characteristic of Biological Life?
It is replication, usually with but rarely without (e.g., phage), metabolism.
This is true for Humans, Animals, Plants, Microbes (bacteria, fungi, viruses).
With regard to Humanity, it is the survival of the Human Species.
With regard to Individual Humans, it is procreation, i.e., to bear Children who will perpetuate the family lineage and so establish the family tree.
Are Viruses that can replicate only inside living animal, plant or bacterial cells, and can also be crystallized, e.g., TMV, human poliovirus and rhinovirus, alive?
Are Prions, i.e., the misfolded infectious proteins that can replicate, “alive”? Are “computer viruses” that can copy themselves and can destroy data, “alive”? Can dissimilar items share a certain attribute, e.g., being “alive” by analogy only?

What is the Aim or Goal of Human Life, i.e., “How” must Man live?
It is to Live Fully in terms of stipulations that differ from person to person, e.g.,
- to get to “know oneself and others” as Socrates and Plato advocated, so that Humans can avoid being in conflict with themselves and with others.
- to get to “understand the physical laws and biological principles” as Aristotle attested, because being aware of the truth is better than living with falsehoods.
- to seek and find for ourselves, and to help others seek and find for themselves, contentment, fulfillment and happiness (see p. 53) in Life.

What is the Meaning or Purpose of Human Life, i.e., “Why” does Man live?
(This question is based on the presumption that there might be Meaning or Purpose).
For a person who believes in “One God” (Monotheist) and His Divine Meaning or Purpose in the World, it is to worship, honor and venerate Him and to always strive to obey - fulfill His Moral Laws as articulated in the Sacred Books of Great Religions like Judaism and Christianity (the Bible), Islam (the Koran) and Others.
Whereas belief in God’s existence can explain the Entire World and the Hereafter, for a person who doubts (Skeptic), does not know about (Agnostic), believes in the nonexistence (Atheist) of God, he may be unable to justify “Why” Man lives, Hence, for a person who thinks that Life is the evolutionary outcome of “Chance and Necessity”, i.e., an unguided process of random genetic variation and natural selection, rather than one who believes that it is the result of “Intelligent Design”, i.e., that the variety and irreducible complexity of Living Organisms can only be illuminated by the existence of an All-knowing Divine Designer - Creator, could he then conclude that there is no Ultimate Meaning or Purpose of Human Life?
If yes, can a Skeptic, an Agnostic, an Atheist, finding himself in this distressing dilemma, devise a Sense of Meaning or Purpose for himself, both by pursuing a Reflective and a Creatively Productive Personal Life, and also by seeking to help establish together with Kindred Spirits the Brotherhood among all Men?

What are Physicians’ Principal Objectives for their Patients?
To preserve health; to prevent, treat, cure illness; to alleviate anguish, distress, pain, suffering; to prolong quality Life; to postpone Death; to comfort and help patients face their Illness courageously, and .... “To Do No Harm” (Hippocrates).

Does Prolonging Human Life often lead to unanticipated harmful Consequences?
If yes, is keeping alive in Assisted Living Communities or in Nursing Homes, elderly people with neurodegenerative diseases or with incurable illnesses, a decision to be taken by the physicians responsible, or should they refrain from partaking in these kinds of judgment, since in the absence of a “living will” the Spouse, Children, Siblings are the only ones with the moral authority to decide?

What is Human Death?

“When I am, Death is not; When Death is, I am not.”
Epicurus (341-270 B.C.).

Difficult to define other than to say that it is the Cessation of Life. Although in a human being - an individual (indivisible) who is cardiorespiratory dead or brain dead i.e., is a living cadaver, the brain is not accompanied by mind, his viable organs, tissues, cells can survive - “live on” by being transplanted into suitable patients needing them.

What might be the Consequence of Human Death?
From a Religious Perspective, the Body can die, but the Soul is Immortal.
From a Secular Perspective, the Death of the Body is the Ultimate Extinction.
If Death is not a New Beginning, but it is the End of it All, must we fear this?
Can we know about the “Beyond Death” by way of Faith or through Reason?
Is Faith in a “Life after Death” self-deception, or is it supreme wisdom?
Should it matter to Humans if there is, or there is no, Life after Death?

Can Humans face Death with Calmness, Dignity, Serenity, Equanimity, even Humor?
Can we do this alone, or do we need the Compassion of Fellow Humans?
What is Human Compassion? Is it kindness, tenderness, pity? What else is it?
Can a Religious Belief or a Philosophical Perspective give Support - Comfort to a dying person, or does the “Fear of Death” invariably rule supreme?
Does the imminence of Death confer Intellectual Clarity, or Despair and Gloom?
Is it true that “The brave dies only once, the coward dies a thousand deaths.” Yes? No?
Life versus Death

Homer (c. 700 B.C.), the greatest of all Poets, gave a peerless comment about Life versus Death in his Epic Poem Odyssey, Book 11, Lines 548-553 and 555-558. Translated by Robert Fagles, Viking Press.

Odysseus, while visiting the Ghosts of the Heroes of the Trojan war in Hades - Hell, meets with Achilles’ Ghost:

“But you, Achilles,
there’s not a man in the world more blest than you --
there never has been, never will be one.
Time was, when you were alive, we Argives
honored you as a god, and now down here, I see,
you lord it over the dead in all your power.
So grieve no more at dying, great Achilles.”

Achilles, responds as follows:

“No winning words about death to me, shining Odysseus!
By god, I’d rather slave on earth for another man --
some dirt-poor tenant farmer who scraps to keep alive --
than rule down here over all the breathless dead.”

The oral Storyteller Aesop (c. 620-560 B.C.) who was/is much loved in ancient and modern times, by both the young and the old alike, informs us very simply but most beautifully in his Fable “The Old Man and Death” that while Life may not be sweet, Death is very bitter.

“A Poor Old Man traveling a long distance with a heavy bundle of firewood on his back grows very tired.
He throws his bundle on the ground and calls upon Death to deliver him from his miserable Life.

Death appears promptly.
‘What do you want from me Old Man?’
The Old Man, now Face to Face with Death, tells Him.
‘Please help me lift my heavy bundle on my back,
and I will be on my way again.’”

Likewise, the Tragedian Euripides (c. 484-407 B.C.), has Princess Iphigenia in his moving Tragedy Iphigenia in Aulis, contemplate about Life versus Death, as she accepts the inevitability of her pending death by sacrifice to the goddess Artemis.

“To see this sunlight is for us all our dearest love!
Below is nothing; and to wish for death, madness,
Better a life of wretchedness than a noble death.”

“And if Artemis has laid a claim on my body,
Who am I, a mortal, to oppose a god?”
In *The Women of Troy*, which is another great tragedy by **Euripides**, Hecabe - the grieving Queen of Troy who is now captive of the Greek army, argues with her also captive daughter-in-law Andromache, the pros and cons of Life versus Death,

Andromache:  
“It is over now. Yes, it was terrible; and yet, being **dead**, she [Polyxena] is more fortunate than I who **live**.”

Hecabe:  
“**Death** and **Life** are not the same.  
Death is Extinction; but in **Life** there is still **Hope**.”

Andromache:  
“To be **dead** is the same as never to have been born,  
And better far than living on in wretchedness.  
The dead feel nothing; evil then can cause no pain.  
But one who falls from happiness to unhappiness,  
Wanders bewildered in a strange and hostile world.”

It was the great Moral Philosopher **Socrates** (469-399 B.C.) who even though “he knew that he knew nothing”, he nevertheless offered the most logical answer to the puzzling question of personal immortality and its befitting rewards, as related by his beloved pupil and Fellow Philosopher **Plato** (428-348 B.C.) in his *Apology* (of Socrates).

“**Death** is one of two things.  
Either it is annihilation,  
and the dead have no  
consciousness of anything,  
or, as we are told, it is a change --  
a migration of the soul  
from this place to another.

Now if there is no consciousness  
but only a dreamless sleep,  
death must be a marvelous gain.

If on the other hand death is a removal  
from here to some other place,  
and if what we are told is true  
that all the dead are there,  
what greater blessing could there be than this  
.... to join .... heroes of the old days ....  
who met their death through an unfair trial.”

The Elizabethan Poet **William Shakespeare** (1564-1616) offered in his magnificent play *King Richard the Second* [1595-1596], *Act III, Sc. ii*, a most somber commentary about our only true possession, i.e., our death, in contrast to our ephemeral possessions.

“And nothing can we call our own but **death**.”

Lastly, people of different temperaments may perceive human life differently.

“**Life** is a **tragedy** for those who **feel**,  
but a **comedy** to those who **think**.”

Horace Walpole (1717-1797).
2nd Seminar: “Killing versus Murder”.
Wednesday, 2:00-5:00pm.
Readings: Plato, Apology.
Fyodor Dostoyevsky, Crime and Punishment.

Killing of animals for their flesh and organs in primitive and modern societies occurs chiefly for the purpose of securing food and preventing starvation. The killing of animals in ancient times had also taken place as sacrifices to the Gods. The killing and devouring of fellow humans - Cannibalism, of enemy people for ritualistic reasons e.g., the Aztecs in Central America, and of friendly people for food when facing death from extreme starvation, e.g., the Donner Party, has happened. The killing of family members at God’s command has taken place in ancient societies, e.g., Abraham and his readiness to sacrifice his son Isaac; Agamemnon and his willingness to sacrifice his daughter Iphigenia, both of whom were saved in the nick of time from certain death by the intervention of a benevolent God. The silencing by death of the annoying, disapproving voices of citizens, e.g., Socrates, Gandhi, King, by their Societies has occurred often.

Is killing of humans by humans always murder, therefore a crime?

“Crime in a just cause’ is .... an insanity breeding in evil hearts.”
Euripides (c. 484-407 B.C.). Orestes.

At War: Between soldiers of warring nations? Of civilians of an enemy nation? Of civilians of the same nation, e.g., “ethnic cleansing”, “genocide”? Does it make any difference if killings are: vicious or much less so, at close range or at a distance? Is killing of humans justified in self-defense, in a war fought for national independence but not in a war fought for conquests? Can one nation’s “terrorists” be another nation’s “freedom fighters”? Isn’t that he who has nothing to live for may have something to die for? Are suicide bombings, preemptive strikes, targeted assassinations, moral?

At Peace: Accidental or premeditated? Are there ever extenuating circumstances? Can a victim turn into a cruel victimizer? Does society have the right to impose capital punishment (see p. 16) or long imprisonment (see p. 17) on humans? Does the cruelty of the penalty, e.g., stoning, hanging, beheading, shooting, electrocution, lethal injection, reveal something about the degree of civilization of a society (see p. 17, Churchill quote)? Shouldn’t physicians, even under duress, refuse to assist in an execution? Isn’t “honor killing” a vile, despicable act practiced by superstitious, backward peoples?

In Medical Settings: Should physicians be guided by the advice of Hippocrates - “The Father of Medicine”, who firmly affirmed in his “Oath” (see p. 48) that a Physician is “to help or at least to do no harm” as exemplified by the physician’s profound respect for and protection of all human life, i.e., “never to prescribe a deadly drug to anyone even if asked, nor to give such advice” (physician-assisted suicide is unacceptable), “neither to give a woman a pessary to procure abortion” (unequivocal protection of the unborn human fetus). Although since 1980, 1.3 million legal abortions have been reported yearly in USA, could some consider this as killing while others as murder? If the destruction of a living human embryo for its “stem cells” were not killing, could it still be unethical?

What should be the punishment for killing or murdering a fellow human being?

a) Loathing, Hatred, Revenge, Retaliation, Death, or
b) Understanding, Compassion, Mercy, Forgiveness (see p. 18)?

What punishment serves Justice best? Is there “Equal Justice under Law”, or is this a ploy, a trick, perpetrated by the Strong to blatantly deceive the Weak and Vulnerable?

c) Is “thirst for Justice”, “thirst for Revenge”? (see p. 17, Nietzsche quote).
REASONS FOR OR AGAINST CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Capital Punishment is the judicial infliction of Death on Criminals. It was first sanctioned in early antiquity - “Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed” (Genesis 9:6). It was attained by stoning (Ancient Jews); hemlock poisoning (Ancient Greeks); strangling (Ancient Chinese); drowning, crucifixion (Ancient Romans); burning alive at the stake (Medieval Europe); hanging, beheading (England); guillotine (France); hanging, electrocution, lethal injection (USA). The Empress Elizabeth first decreed the abolition of Capital Punishment in Czarist Russia. By early 20th Century the death penalty had been abolished in a number of European Nation, and by late 20th Century in all European Nations belonging to the European Union. Although 66% of the people in the US polled nationally support the Death Penalty, it was abolished in 12 of the States. Yet, it remains lawful in the other 38, occurring regularly even excessively, with Texas accounting for 400 (37%) of 1,092 executions in all USA from 1976 to 2007.

**Capital Punishment - Death Sentence - Death Penalty is justified because:**
- a) it prevents the criminal from repeating his crime.
- b) it deters crime by discouraging would be criminals.
- c) for poor countries, swift execution of a criminal will cost much less than the costs of prolonged imprisonment, which can be brutal and dehumanizing.
- d) a criminal may be too far gone to be rehabilitated, especially in “prison air”.
- e) from the point of societal retribution, criminals deserve to be punished, and their punishment should be commensurate to their crime. Code of Laws by the Babylonian King Hammurabi (c. 1792-1750 B.C.), e.g., “an eye for an eye”, which sanctioned Equal instead of Unequal Injustice, e.g., “two eyes for an eye”.
- f) feelings of vengeance and revenge may be cathartic for a victim’s relatives.
- g) as a rule, a person is condemned to death because of irrefutable evidence.
- h) contrary to ideology, racism plays no role in deciding on a death sentence.

**Capital Punishment - Death Sentence - Death Penalty is not justified because:**
- a) the effect of deterrence can be better accomplished with life imprisonment.
- b) deterrence by the possibility of death, under normal circumstances with executions is not possible.
- c) for rich countries like the USA, the costs incurred from appeals and legal counseling of the person to be executed are much greater than expenses from prolonged imprisonment, which can be merciful and humanizing.
- d) a criminal might become rehabilitated and make something of his/her life.
- e) the death sentence of a criminal like a mass murderer, is definitely inadequate as retribution for the death of many people who are usually innocent victims.
- f) feelings of vengeance and revenge should never justify a death sentence.
- g) a man may be condemned to death because of inadequate or biased evidence.
- h) poverty and race are connected to the imposition of a death sentence.

[Many of these judicial perceptions were retrieved after extensive Internet Searches].

**Conclusion:** The above apparently logical arguments for or against Capital Punishment seem sensible both singly and collectively. Yet, since Judges and Jurists may make tragic dire mistakes in their Verdicts on human guilt or innocence, and also because a Death Sentence followed by its implementation cannot be rectified, Capital Punishment is below human dignity in a Civilized Society and should at long last be abolished.
THE BALLAD OF READING GAOL [1898].

“I never saw a man who looked
With such a wistful eye
Upon that little tent of blue
Which prisoners call the sky. ....
When a voice behind me whispered low,
‘That fellow’s got to swing’.
Yet each man kills the thing he loves,
By each let this be heard,
Some do it with a bitter look,
Some with a flattering word.
The coward does it with a kiss,
The brave man with a sword!
It is sweet to dance to violins
When Love and Life are fair:
To dance to flutes, to dance to lutes
is delicate and rare:
But it is not sweet with nimble feet
To dance upon the air! ....
Something was dead in each of us,
and what was dead was Hope,
I know not whether laws be right,
Or whether laws be wrong;
All that we know who lie in gaol
Is that the wall is strong;
And that each day is like a year,
A year whose days are long. ....
The vilest deeds like poison weeds
Bloom well in prison air:
It is only what is good in man
That wastes and withers there.”

Oscar Wilde (1854-1900).

Whereas 200,000 almost all men were prisoners in 1974 in USA, more than 2,000,000 men and women, 50% of whom were Blacks, were incarcerated in 2004. Likewise, while the USA represents 5% of the world’s population, it accounts for 25% of its prison population (New York Times). As Winston Churchill had observed, “Treatment of crime and criminals is one of the most unfailing tests of the civilization of any country.”

“Distrust all in whom the impulse to punish is powerful.”

Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche (1844-1900).
Thus Spake Zarathustra [1883-1891].

“Prisons are to crime what greenhouses are to plants.”

Austin, Texas, Attorney Harry M. Whittington (1927- ).
A TRUE STORY - Justice Tempered with Mercy and Forgiveness.

“To err is human, to forgive divine.”
Alexander Pope (1688-1744).
An Essay on Criticism [1711] II, l. 525.

According to my maternal grandmother Olympia, this incident occurred many years ago in a mountain village in Northern Greece, where people who live there abide by strict moral and social conventions, customs, rules and regulations.

“There were two young boys who had been the best of friends since early childhood. Years later when they were both grown-up men in their early twenties, for reasons that no one of the villagers could ever figured out, they had gotten into a fierce violent argument which caused one of them to kill the other - his best friend unintentionally, by striking him very hard once, on the chest over the heart, with his clenched right fist. Twelve of their villagers acting as Jurors, and taking into account the tragic circumstances that lead to this murder, decided that the ‘killer’ should be punished with twenty years of imprisonment. During this long time of the man’s incarceration, his two sisters who were unable to bear the shame of their brother’s crime, and also because they realized that no good man would ever marry a murderer’s sister, left their parents’ home and their village and moved to a big city thus disappearing into desirable anonymity. A few years later, first the Father and then the Mother of the murderer died ‘of a broken heart’ as the villagers said, although in reality it was because they were crushed by knowing that every man, woman, and even child in the village thought of them as being the ‘murderer’s parents’.

After twenty years of imprisonment, the man having ‘served his time for his crime’ won back his freedom. Since he knew no place other than his village, and also because everything had changed in the world so much during his long absence, he decided to go back home, in hopes that he will not be rejected, and perhaps even accepted by his fellow villagers. But his return did not turn out to be what he had hoped for. Although he was not abused by anyone, ‘no one would shake the hand that killed a man’. The long years in prison however had made him another kind of a person, by his coming to realize that ‘no man has the right to kill another man under any circumstance’. And so he decided to visit the Mother of the friend whom he had killed - the Father had died already, and beg for her forgiveness. He asked the village Priest to find out if his friend’s Mother will allow him to visit her. When she said yes, he paid her a visit with the Priest accompanying him. Although he had expected to find her waiting for him alone, he saw that many of the villagers had also come to witness this gesture of forgiveness like the Chorus of an Ancient Greek Tragedy. When finally he faced the Mother while she stood in the large living room of the house, with many of the villagers crowding behind her all in silence and anticipation, he fell to his knees in front of her, kissed her right hand, and asked her for forgiveness. As he had hoped, the Mother of the man he had killed, placed both her hands on his head, and forgave him. She also gave him her blessings, to find at last happiness in life, ‘for he had suffered much’ “.

The happy ending of this story, was that the man now at liberty and forgiven, was free to ask for the hand and be given in marriage the sister of the man he had killed, for she was the girl to whom he had been betrothed before the tragic event, and who had faithfully and devotedly waited for him during these twenty years. My Grandmother also said with much conviction, that although she had no knowledge of what had transpired later on, she anticipated that their firstborn son was named after the killed friend - now the man’s brother-in-law in spirit, so that finally the name of the dead man would be remembered and so live on in their hearts in love and affection.

G. D.
3rd Seminar: “War versus Peace”.
Friday, 2:00-5:00pm.
Readings: Sun Tzu, The Art of War.
   Niccolo Machiavelli, The Art of War.
   Aeschylus, The Persians.
   Euripides, The Women of Troy.
   Aristophanes, Lysistrata.

Physicians volunteer or are drafted into the Armed Forces by nations at war, in order to preserve the health of those who will do the fighting, but mainly to treat those who are injured during the fight. Because of the laudatory ethical principles that have characterized the medical profession throughout human history, Physicians of all civilized nations are expected to offer enemy soldiers the same medical care as what they give to those of their own nations. Undoubtedly, under distressful or calamitous circumstances this ethical approach to treating injured people irrespective of national origin has not always occurred as exemplary and commendably as it should have been. Physicians must however never allow negative, hateful, detestable, abhorrent personal feelings, to influence their professional expectations of themselves. At war and during peace, the stipulations that stem from honoring the “Hippocratic Oath” (see p. 48) should always reign supreme. But a more fundamental responsibility, obligation, or duty that Physicians are required to exercise in a free society is not only to patch-up the bodies of wounded combatants in time of war, but to try also as Citizens to influence national policies so that war can be prevented or at worst be limited in space and time.

In War’s opposing sides, cruelty breeds cruelty, hate breeds hate, depravity breeds depravity, atrocities bring about worse atrocities, and so Man becomes a most vicious beast, for he has much more intelligence and shrewdness than any of the savage animals. Although wars are as a rule planned and declared by older men, usually for religious or secular mythologies, or because of feelings of revenge - reprisal, it is young men and women too who fight in them and are slaughtered. As the historian Herodotus (c. 485-425 B.C.) wrote in his The Histories, “In peace, children bury their parents; while war violates the order of nature and causes parents to bury their children.”. Of the lucky ones who survive this living Hell, this abysmal appalling Barbarism, many get injured, mangled, maimed, or crippled, both bodily and emotionally, with little chance for their eventual complete recovery. In addition, these war-caused calamities and sufferings which can also hurt civilian noncombatants, women (see p. 21, Hecabe) and children, are never emphasized, in fact they are often suppressed, because in war the death of Truth or the reign of the Half Truth or of the Naked Lie usually come to pass before the deaths of combatants occur. For Man has always tried to justify his inhumanity to Man, especially because the “evil enemies” (see pp. 23-24) that he is asked to exterminate are complete strangers to himself, never having done him any harm or caused him any wrong.

Why do we humans go to War? Is it because a vindictive God commands us to do so, or do we have it in our nature, in the genes that we have inherited without our consent from our progenitors during the past many millennia, to wage war against everyone, always, with some short periods of repose which we call Peace, and that is only whenever it is expedient? Since War is associated with Death while Peace with Life, does the fact that humans, just like wild animals, choose to fight and die, rather than to compromise and live in peace, suggest that there is a killing instinct, a “death wish” (Freud), in each one of us from the day we are born, namely to kill and be killed?
Or, is war the result of preserving our boundaries, our turf, or in more contemporary cynical terms, is war the outcome of conflicting economic interests among Men and Nations which is another way of saying that war is the result of human greed, rapacity, even theft, i.e., of not knowing when “enough is enough”? Or, is war as the eminent ancient Greek historian Thucydides (c. 460-400 B.C.) asserted, the outcome of “lust for power arising from ambition .. followed by the violence of parties once engaged in contention”?

Whereas US President Woodrow Wilson declared, “This will be the war to end all wars”, World War II that followed it two decades later caused a total estimated human loss of life of seventy-two million people. In addition, many war victories are actually of the “Pyrrhic” type when the victor is destroyed as much as his defeated enemy is, or an indecisive success in a limited war may soon lead to guerilla wars or to a war without an end as the “war on terror” appears to have become? But isn’t war against an aggressor, or of liberation, or to defend a moral principle, ever justified even just, provided of course that its conduct is with any luck not excessively cruel (see p. 21, Sherman quote), and the struggle is to preserve or regain one’s national and personal freedom and independence (see p. 21, Churchill quote), rather than for other expedient rationalizations like the re-conquest of lands that allegedly were their patrimony - birthright - legacy, granted them by a “divine proclamation”?

As a result of these considerations, the very hostile declaration that “All is fair in love and war.” can not be the ideal to follow, since this kind of relationship concerning two people emotionally involved with each other represents a battle for control between the strong - usually the man and the weak - usually the woman, when the only outcome that would ultimately matter is who will be the vanquisher and who the vanquished, even though no such victory is worth the heartache that it will certainly bring about. Similarly, in relations between two nations where national (self) interest rules supreme, views based on delusions of grandeur that the conflict is a struggle between “Good and Evil” may lead to the kind of outcome that is associated with terrible costs on life and property. In addition, in the event that one of the opponent nations is much weaker, the situation will usually lead to its inescapable surrender which will cause it to be full of anger, bitterness, resentment and spite that could in the long run turn out to be much worse than open warfare. As a result of these considerations, one is led to the sensible conclusion that it is preferable to accept honorable compromises and see to it that a noble end is achieved by whatever ethical means that can be honestly employed, which would lead to peace, rather than to the detestable, despicable, repugnant war.

Is Peace just the absence of war, or it is something more as St. Francis of Assisi (see p. 22) spoke about or the philosopher Spinoza (see p. 22) wrote about? Isn’t it true as William Shakespeare suggested in his Play “Pericles” that there can be no real peace among Men unless there is peace in Man, i.e., he is at peace with himself. And he is at peace with himself only when he finally accepts that he is who he is, does not pretend to be someone else, although he ceaselessly strives to become a better person, so that he can be in greater harmony and rapport with his fellow humans who will thus become disposed more favorably toward him. This does not mean that for the sake of not being at war with others, he should be so “fluid” as to take the shape of every “receptacle” that comes by, but rather that he should not be too rigid in his views and beliefs, so that he may retain the chance to improve on account of the influence on him by others who may possess more wisdom, or greater kindness of heart and generosity of spirit. This view is valid not only between individual persons but among nations as well.
War versus Peace

“The way of war is a way of deception.” …. “Ultimate excellence lies not in winning every battle, but in defeating the enemy without ever fighting.”

Sun-Tzu (probably 4th century B.C., or earlier).
The Art of War (Ping-fa).

“To kill one person is murder. To kill thousands is foreign policy.”

Moh-Tze (468-376 B.C.).

“Those whom God wishes to destroy, he first makes mad.”

Euripides (c. 484-407 B.C.).
Fragment.

Hecabe, the grieving Queen and widow of King Priam of Troy, now a captive of the Greek army laments her losses:

“I mourn for my dead world, my burning town,
My sons, my husband, gone, all gone!
What pride of race, what strength once swelled our royal sails!
Now shrunk to nothing, sunk in mean oblivion!”

Cassandra, King Priam’s and Queen Hecabe’s Daughter, who is also a captive of the Greek army, speaks of war:

“Indeed to avoid war is a wise man’s duty; yet
If war comes, then a hero’s death confers as much
Fame on his city as a coward’s brings infamy.”

Euripides (c. 484-407 B.C.).
The Women of Troy.

“We are mad, not only individually, but nationally. We check manslaughter and isolate murderers; but what of war and the much vaunted crime of slaughtering whole peoples?”

Lucius Seneca (c. 4 B.C. - A.D. 65).
Epistles, 95, 30.

“War is hell.” “War is cruelty.” “War is at best barbarism.”

General William T. Sherman (1820-1891).
From Letters and Addresses.

In Victory: Magnanimity. In Peace: Good Will.”

Winston Spencer Churchill (1874-1965).
The Gathering Storm [1948].
“Lord, make me an instrument of Your Peace.
Where there is hatred let me sow love;
where there is injury, pardon;
where there is doubt, faith;
where there is despair, hope;
where there is darkness, light;
and where there is sadness, joy.”

Attributed to St. Francis of Assisi (c. 1181-1226).
(Translated by Leo Sherley-Price).

“Peace in not an absence of war,
it is a virtue, a state of mind,
a disposition for benevolence,
confidence, justice.”


Would the rational Man ever overcome the irrational Man in each one of us, so that finally Peace can triumph over War for the Good of all Mankind?

“For I dipped into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the Vision of the world, and all the wonders that would be ....
Till the war drum throbbed no longer and the battle flags were furled
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.”

Alfred, Lord Tennyson (1809-1892). Locksley Hall [1842].

“We, the people of the United Nations,
determined to save succeeding generations
from the scourge of war,
which twice in our lifetime...
has brought untold sorrow to mankind,
and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights,
in the dignity and worth of the human person,
in the equal rights of men and women
and of nations large and small.”

Charter of the United Nations [1945].

“All human beings,
are born free and equal,
in dignity and rights.”

Universal Declaration of Human Rights [1948].

“Human rights must always be balanced by human responsibilities.”

Anonymous
Message from Sniper Soldier X

“First, let me introduce myself. My name is X. But this is not my real name. X stands for something Unknown, or Invisible like the X-rays. I use the name X because I want to remain Unknown - Invisible, to those who know me, and like me, and perhaps even love me, and to those who don’t know me, but would hate me, if they knew me.

I am a twenty-five year old man, strong, healthy, full of life and vigor. I joined the Army because a war was going on, although neither I nor most of my friends and relatives understood what it was all about. As a soldier, I could serve my Country, and make some money too. Then I would be able to pursue my University Studies as the rich guys do, without financial problems, interruptions, and postponements. Ever since I was a little boy, I wanted to become a Medical Doctor, a Physician as he is properly called, or a Doc as my folks used to say. I aspired to be a Healer, to cure sick people, and see them be healthy again. This desire inflated my Ego, and made me feel very important when I fantasized that others would need me, look up to me, and respect me.

When I started my stint in the military, I found that it suited me fine. I always gave most eagerly my very best to whatever I was asked to do. At times however I was expected to act like a man whom neither I, nor a good decent person would have admired or respected me for. My superiors often praised me for having done a superb job, no matter what the undertaking I was asked to do happened to be. I am extremely self-disciplined, precise, orderly, neat, and very tidy. Some of my Fellow Soldiers would often annoy me by telling me that I was behaving more like a machine, a robot, than a real person. My answer was always the same. ‘It is not for me to ask Why, but to do what is expected of me, and do it as well as I possibly could’.

One day, my Sergeant told me that the Colonel who was in charge of our Army Unit wanted to talk to me privately, in his office. I am embarrassed to confess that I was very frightened by all this. When the Sergeant saw how alarmed I was, he told me that ‘I had nothing to fear, but on the contrary, I was going to receive some good news that would make me feel very proud of myself’.

And so I visited the Colonel, in his office, at the Headquarters. He was very tall, very athletic, and very manly but not someone I would call handsome. He looked severe, a little rough, and somewhat crude. When he spoke to me he was certainly a man of very few words. He told me that ‘Since I had often demonstrated during the various training exercises that I was a very good marksman, and also because I was a calm rather than an easily excitable person, my Army Superiors had selected me to be trained as a Sniper’.
When I heard the word Sniper, I felt sort of sick, like throwing up. I had been told many frightful stories about the Snipers in our Unit, some of whom, it was said, got to enjoy this kind of sneaky killing. This was certainly the last thing that I would have ever wanted to be. The Colonel having sensed what was going through my head, told me that 'I should think it over, take my time, there was certainly no rush about it, and then to let him know, in a day or two, what I had decided'.

As I was leaving his office, I could see that a small number of Soldiers, most of whom were known among the rest of us as being members of 'The Sniper Team', were waiting for me. They surrounded me, embraced me in a very friendly manner, and congratulated me for my having joined their 'Elite Group'. I tried to tell them, repeatedly, that I had not decided as yet, but they paid no attention to what I was striving to say so desperately.

Next day, my Sergeant asked me to take a walk with him. He told me that in the Army 'an order is an order, no matter in what friendly or coarse language it is given'. He then informed me that 'my training was to start next morning, at five o’clock sharp, without any ifs, ands or buts'. And so, I started my military training as a future Sniper Soldier. I must confess that this experience turned out to be a lot of fun. Although I was one of the new arrivals to the Snipers’ group, they could see that I was the best marksman amongst them all.

Soon enough, my apprenticeship came to an end, and I was posted within a special Snipers’ Unit, to support our Soldiers, in their many dangerous and even death-threatening tasks. My first ‘kill’ was that of an enemy Sniper, as I was told he was. I could see him very clearly through my rifle’s telescopic lens. He was very young, certainly much younger than what I was then. The bullet hit him smack in the head and blew out his brains. I couldn’t believe that it was I who had done this dreadful thing. The bullet that killed this young man killed the good man in me too.

I have had a few more ‘kills’ during the past several months. I always got them in their heads with the same ghastly results, although I no longer get sick in my stomach after the ‘kill’ is over. In fact, I silently celebrate every time that I achieve an accurate hit. But in all fairness to myself, I can truthfully say that I never enjoy doing this abominable act, which feels more like murder to me. I have always wanted to be a Medical Doctor, a Physician, a Healer, yet all that I have become is a heartless, pitiless, remorseless Killer, of young men like me, labeled by some higher-up as ‘evil enemies’. I am much appalled by what has become of me, so quickly, so easily. This is why I decided to speak out now, hoping that you and others, can learn the harsh Truth about Sniper Soldiers like me and others.”

As imagined by G. D.
4th Seminar: “Love versus Hate”.
Monday, 2:00-5:00pm.
Readings: Plato, Symposium.
          Sophocles, Antigone.
          William Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet.

What is Human Love?

When a physician is asked the simple question of “How do you like your Medical Profession?” the answer is usually the same - “I love it”. Hence, it would be of interest for people in general to try to determine what the term “Love” is all about, and for future physicians to attempt to clarify what they mean by saying “I love my Medical Profession”.

The most important kinds of Human Love that can exist singly or jointly are: first, Erotic Heterosexual Love (probably genetically determined) which is the most essential one since it is responsible for propagation and hence for the survival of our human species; second, Parental Love that is just as crucial since it creates the tender nurturing and protective environment for the survival of the helpless newborn infant; third, Romantic Love, which offers an idyllic or poetic dimension to Human Love that makes it stand above and beyond the first two that exist mainly for the sake of human biological survival; fourth, Familial Love of parents for each other and their children, and of the children for their parents and their siblings; fifth, Platonic Love or True Friendship which is a strong emotional feeling of attraction between two people of the same or of different gender but which lacks any erotic or sexual element; sixth, Erotic Homosexual Love (probably also genetically determined) between people of the same gender, e.g., Gay Men or Lesbian Women; seventh, Divine Love - Christian “Agape” (see p. 28) that is a selfless, noble feeling toward fellow Human beings even one’s own enemies that is a reflection of God’s Goodness and Love for Humans and of Humans’ Love for God; eighth, Secular - Humanistic Love which is similar to Divine Love but one based on “belief” in Humanity rather than in Deity; lastly, “Passionate Love of Jesus”, as described by Mother Teresa in her book “Come Be My Light”. There are also various other less important kinds of human love, as for example of the country of our birth - patriotism, of our profession, of the arts, of nature, of animals, and some other types that may have wicked implications when pursued greedily, as in the case of love of pleasures, of wealth, of fame, of glory, of political power, of ourselves - Narcissism.

Beautiful poetry (see p. 27), poetic prose (see p. 28), fictional literature, and scientific treatises, have been sung, spoken and written about the different kinds of Human Love. The main conclusion that one may draw from all this information is that Romantic Love is an emotional, passionate, sensual feeling, most often beyond rational control, at times self-destructive, and even tragic (see Shakespeare’s Romeo and Juliet, and “A True Story” p. 30). It is preferable therefore at this juncture to abandon pursuing the nature of Human Love in general and of “Eros” or passionate Love in particular, but to focus instead on the question of why physicians love their profession so deeply?

It appears that this is mainly the result of two circumstances. First, although Medicine is an inexact Science, the Science of Medicine has its roots in the most currently basic Biomedical Sciences that are both extremely interesting in themselves, and also carry important implications to the prevention, therapy and cure of human diseases. Second, the Art of Medicine which is an equally significant component of Medicine, particularly with regard to Clinical Medicine, offers practicing physicians the chance to
work in an environment of kindness, sympathy, empathy, caring and compassion, that are feelings which gratify and delight our human need to be of help to others, especially since these others are patients who are vulnerable because they are ill, and desperately need our medical assistance, care, support and guidance. Yet, the main drawback of the fact that physicians love their medical profession so totally, is that it may quite often consume their normal personal life to the extent that no time or energy is left for other aspects of human existence, such as spending enough quality time with one’s own family, maintaining an exciting multifaceted social life with good friends, and having intellectual and emotional experiences outside Medicine such as reading great books, attending memorable plays, listening to majestic music, facts that force one to conclude that moderation should rule human activities no matter how strongly they are desired.

What is Human Hate?

Although far fewer comments (see pp. 27, 29) have been made about the hideous, loathsome, repugnant, vile feeling of Human Hate in comparison to what has been said about Human Love, Hate exists and flourishes in our contemporary world, not only because the Strong seize much more of the communal wealth than what might be legitimately theirs, but also and principally because the impoverished - destitute Weak are treated by the Strong with much arrogance, conceit and contempt, and are humiliated as if they were hungry animals rather than fellow human beings who must receive a share of what justly belongs to them too.

As we have previously tried to answer the question of why physicians love their medical profession so strongly and deeply, we could now try to answer why physicians may at times have negative feelings, and in rare instances may even sense hate, toward their profession. The main drawbacks that accompany a medical career, which could cause such gloomy outlook, are relatively few and mostly insignificant. As mentioned already, since Medicine is a “way of life” rather than “just a job”, it can often devour all other aspects of an individual’s personal life. In addition, since most Physicians are compensated quite generously, they may experience envy, jealousy and resentment from relatives and friends, many of who are poorly or inadequately paid. However, once the issue of “money earned” is examined more objectively, it becomes apparent that the incomes secured by physicians are as a rule not extravagant when one takes into account the many years of medical education and training, the great responsibility that Physicians shoulder in making life and death decisions, the long hours of hard and at times dangerous work that they perform almost routinely, and the human pain and suffering to which they are exposed all the time.

In cases in which physicians experience negative feelings toward their patients, they should determine their causes and then try to neutralize them as much as possible, otherwise they will lose their professional medical effectiveness. In instances in which physicians experience negative feelings and even hatred from their patients, they can explain this unwelcome behavior by the fact that sick people especially those who have been bedridden for a long time, can feel unhappy and even miserable because of their illness, rather than by anything that their Doctors did or did not do. Of course, the best way for physicians to nullify this hostile attitude is to show kindness and compassion while avoiding any covert or overt signs of arrogance, egotism, or pretentiousness. In the event that these negative feelings still persist, the physicians should forgive them and forget them, and continue doing their work, their duty, as well as they possibly can, since the most important objective in their professional life is to help patients in need.
Love versus Hate

“Greatness wins hate. Unenvied is unenviable.”

Aeschylus (525-456 B.C.).
Agamemnon.

“Love, unconquerable.”

“My way is to share my love, not share my hate.”

Sophocles (495-406 B.C.).
Antigone.

Phaedra: “When they say that one is in love, what do they mean by love?”

Nurse: “Oh, my child! it is the sweetest of all things, - yet full of pain.”
.... “The whole world was born from Love.”

Euripides (c. 484-407 B.C.).
Hippolytus.

“For no matter what dull clay we seemed to be before, we are every one of us a poet when we are in love.”

Plato (c. 428-348 B.C.).
Symposium [196, c] Translated by Michael Joyce.

“Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, pray for them who despitefully use you, and persecute you.”

St. Matthew the Evangelist (1st Century A.D.).
The Gospel According to St. Matthew, 5:44.

“For stony limits cannot hold love out, and what love can do, that dares love attempt.”

William Shakespeare (1564-1616).
Romeo and Juliet, [II.2.67-68, II.3.62-64].

“The greatest evil is the lack of love and charity, the terrible indifference toward one’s neighbour who lives at the roadside assaulted by exploitation, corruption, poverty and disease.”

Mother Teresa (1910-1997).
Come Be My Light.
Divine Love - Christian “Agape”

13 “1What if I could speak all languages of humans and of angels? If I did not love others, I would be nothing more than a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal.

2What if I could prophesy and understand all secrets and all knowledge? And what if I had faith that moved mountains? I would be nothing, unless I loved others.

3What if I gave away all that I owned and let myself be burned alive? I would gain nothing, unless I loved others.

4Love is kind and patient, never jealous, boastful, proud or rude.

5Love isn’t selfish or quick tempered. It doesn’t keep a record of wrongs that others do.

6Love rejoices in the truth, but not in evil.

7Love is always supportive, loyal, hopeful, and trusting.

8Love never fails!

13For now there are faith, hope, and love. But of these three, the greatest is love.”

Love versus Hate, as spoken by the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.
(See also, Martin Luther King, Jr., The Autobiography - I Have A Dream, pp. 31-33)

“Love is the only force capable
of transforming an enemy into a friend.”

“Man must evolve for all human conflict
a method which rejects revenge,
aggression and retaliation.
The foundation of such a method is love.”

“Hatred paralyzes life; love releases it.
Hatred confuses life; love harmonizes it.
Hatred darkens life; love illuminates it.”

“Returning violence for violence multiplies violence,
adding deeper darkness to a night already devoid of stars.”

“Darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that.
Hate cannot drive out hate; only love can do that.”

“That old law about ‘an eye for an eye’ leaves everyone blind.”

“We have flown the air like birds
and swum the sea like fishes,
but have yet to learn the simple act
of walking the earth like brothers.”

“The ultimate measure of a man, (*)
is not where he stands in moments
of comfort and convenience,
but where he stands at times
of challenge and controversy.”

[The above Quotations by the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. (1929-1968),
were derived from the Internet, using Search Engines Google and Yahoo].

“Hate is too great a burden to bear.”

Reverend Martin Luther King, Sr. (1899-1984).

“Well! There is no clear sign to tell the quality of a man; (*)
Nature and place turn vice and virtue upside down.
I have seen a noble father breed a worthless son,
and good sons come of evil parents; a starved soul housed
in a rich man’s palace, a great heart dressed in rags.”

Euripides (c. 484-407 B.C.).
Electra.
A TRUE STORY - Thanatos (Death) embraces Eros (Love)

I was a quiet boy when I was little. I did not much like playing sports with other boys because they always enjoyed being “rough”, and I did not care to be getting hurt. My greatest pleasure was to sit quietly and listen to what the “grownups” were saying. My Grandmother Olympia was the best source of “True Stories” (see p. 18). Another one was our dear maid Eleni, a young woman in her early twenties, born and raised in a mountain village on the island of Crete, who could neither read nor write but could tell all kinds of stories about her life while she was growing up there. Most of Eleni’s stories were very moving and very sad, which made her cry very copiously whenever she told them to me. The following is one of them that I still remember very clearly.

“There was a boy and a girl who had become very close friends since when they were in grade school; a shocking development given the fact that the village mores and customs could not tolerated this kind of ‘wicked’ behavior, especially among children in sex-segregated schools. Although when they grew older they became aware of the hopelessness of their circumstances - the girl’s father was a rich land owner; the boy’s father was a poor laborer, they nevertheless could not help but fall in love with each other in a very passionate way, thus becoming the envy and jealousy of the villagers, most of whom had gotten married out of necessity or expediency.

A few days after they had both finished high school, the young man who was still living at home with his parents, for he was unemployed, visited the girl’s family and formally asked her Father for ‘her hand in marriage’. The village rumor had it that the girl’s Father got very angry for having been insulted and dishonored by this destitute but conceited young man, that he actually kicked him out of his house while threatening him with bodily harm and even death. He further forbade his daughter to ever again lay her eyes on him, while he hastily arranged to have her get married to one of his nephews who was much older than her, but had become quite rich.

The young man sent a message with the help of a kindly elderly aunt to the young woman he loved, telling her that their only hope was for them to elope and get married by a Priest at a neighboring village, an outcome that was practiced fairly common in Crete. Alas, she refused to accept his sensible solution because as she told his elderly aunt ‘defying her Father’s wishes would have disgraced and dishonored both their families’. Instead, she suggested that given that they were not allowed to get married and live happily together, they should die together by drinking poison that she had purchased already for this purpose. This desperate suggestion was accepted by the young man, and the two hopeless lovers, both in their late teens, committed suicide by drinking the poison in a final embrace of love, affection and devotion.”

This was a very sad Love Story, as told to me by Eleni with much accompanying sobbing, which I vividly remember although more than half a century has gone by. And so, every time I visited my birthplace Greece, I met with dear Eleni and took her out to dinner whenever I could. She had gotten married to an older man from her village whom she did not love and who turned out to be so abusive that she decided to divorcing him, a development that occurred very rarely during those times. She became a Communist in hopes of finding ‘justice in this unjust world’, but her conclusion was that they were all ‘thieves and crooks’ and so she gave them all up. Her unfulfilled wish was ‘to have died when she was very young while embracing the man she really loved’, like those two young lovers of the story she had told me long ago. But this had not come to pass, and will certainly not happen now so late in her life. Because she had gradually become very religious, she now sincerely believed that ‘after she died, her soul will finally find her true Love in Haven, and the two of them will dwell together in everlasting bliss’.

G. D.
Memorable words spoken by the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.,
springing from the Biblical - Prophetic - Religious Tradition,
and in response to Expectations based on the U.S.
Declaration of Independence, Constitution,
and Emancipation Proclamation.

“I Have A Dream”

“Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand today,
signed the Emancipation Proclamation. This momentous decree came as a great beacon light
of hope to millions of Negro slaves, who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice. It
came as a joyous daybreak to end the long night of their captivity. But one hundred years later,
the Negro still is not free. One hundred years later, the life of the Negro is still sadly crippled by
the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination. One hundred years later, the Negro
lives on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity. One
hundred years later, the Negro is still languishing in the corners of American society and finds
himself an exile in his own land.

And so we’ve come here today to dramatize a shameful condition. In a sense, we’ve come
to our nation’s capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent
words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a
promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men,
yes, black men as well as white men, would be guaranteed the inalienable rights of “Life, Liberty
and the pursuit of Happiness.” It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory
note insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation,
America has given the Negro people a bad check, a check which has come back marked
“insufficient funds.” But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to
believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation. So we’ve
come to cash this check, a check that will give us upon demand the riches of freedom and the
security of justice.

We have also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the fierce urgency of now.
This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of
gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of Democracy. Now is the time to rise
from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice. Now is the
time to lift our nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood.
Now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God’s children.

It would be fatal for the nation to overlook the urgency of the moment. This sweltering
summer of the Negro’s legitimate discontent will not pass until there is an invigorating autumn
of freedom and equality. Nineteen sixty-three is not an end but a beginning. Those who hope that
the Negro needed to blow off steam and will now be content will have a rude awakening if the
nation returns to business as usual. There will be neither rest nor tranquility in America until
the Negro is granted his citizenship rights. The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the
foundations of our nation until the bright day of justice emerges. But there is something that I
must say to my people, who stand on the warm threshold which leads into the palace of justice:
in the process of gaining our rightful place, we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not
seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence. Again and again, we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force.

The marvelous new militancy which has engulfed the Negro community must not lead us to a distrust of all white people, for many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny. They have come to realize that their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom. We cannot walk alone. And as we walk, we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back.

There are those who are asking the devotees of civil rights, “When will you be satisfied?” We can never be satisfied as long as the Negro is the victim of unspeakable horrors of police brutality. We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities. We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro’s basic mobility is from a smaller ghetto to a larger one. We can never be satisfied as long as our children are stripped of their selfhood and robbed of their dignity by signs stating “For Whites Only.” We can never be satisfied as long as a Negro in Mississippi cannot vote and a Negro in New York believes he has nothing for which to vote. No, no, we are not satisfied and we will not be satisfied until justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.

I am not unmindful that some of you have come here out of great trials and tribulations. Some of you have come fresh from narrow jail cells. Some of you have come from areas where your quest for freedom left you battered by the storms of persecution and staggered by the winds of police brutality. You have been the veterans of creative suffering. Continue to work with the faith that unearned suffering is redemptive. Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to South Carolina, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to the slums and ghettos of our northern cities, knowing that somehow this situation can and will be changed. Let us not wallow in the valley of despair. I say to you today, my friends: so even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream.

I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed -- we hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal. I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together at a table of brotherhood. I have a dream that one day even the state of Mississippi, a state sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice. I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.

I have a dream today! I have a dream that one day, down in Alabama, with its vicious racists, with its governor having his lips dripping with the words of interposition and nullification; one day right there in Alabama little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers. I have a dream today! I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain and the crooked places will be made straight and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it together. This is our hope. This is the faith with which I will go back to the South with. With this faith we will be able to hew out of the mountain
of despair a stone of hope. With this faith we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood. With this faith we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day.

This will be the day, this will be the day when all of God’s children will be able to sing with new meaning: “My country, ‘tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing. Land where my fathers died, land of the pilgrim’s pride, from every mountaintop, let freedom ring!” And if America is to be a great nation, this must become true. And so let freedom ring from the prodigious hilltops of New Hampshire. Let freedom ring from the mighty mountains of New York. Let freedom ring from the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania. Let freedom ring from the snow-capped Rockies of Colorado. Let freedom ring from the curvaceous peaks of California. But not only that. Let freedom ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia. Let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee. Let freedom ring from every hill and every molehill of Mississippi, from every mountaintop, let freedom ring!

And when this happens, when we allow freedom ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God’s children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual, “Free at last, free at last. Thank God Almighty, we are free at last.”

The Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. (1929-1968), delivered this speech on the steps at the Lincoln Memorial, in Washington D.C., in August 28, 1963.


“*What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?”*

A statement in the form of a question attributed to Quintus Septimius Tertullianus or Tertullian (c. 160-220), the first important Roman Christian theologian who tried to articulated the basic distinction between Reason - Ancient Athens, and Faith - Ancient Jerusalem.

HMS student B.A., found this quotation via the Internet when he was preparing his Class Seminar “*Reason versus Faith*” while he was taking this Course in February 2006.
Extraordinary Words Written by an Ancient Physician and a Modern Biologist, springing from the Empirical - Scientific Tradition

“Men ought to know that
from nothing else but the brain,
come joys, delights, laughter, and sports,
sorrows, grieves, despondency, and lamentations.”

Hippocrates (460-370 B.C.).

Note: It was believed in antiquity that Pythagoras (c. 582-500 B.C.) of Samos was the first who proposed that the thought process was located in the brain and not the heart.

“ ‘You’, your joys and your sorrows,
your memories and your ambitions,
your sense of personal identity and free will,
are in fact no more than the behavior
of a vast assembly of nerve cells
and their associated molecules.
As Lewis Carroll’s Alice might have phrased it:
‘You are nothing but a pack of Neurons’.”

Francis Crick (1916-2004).
The Astonishing Hypothesis [1994].
5th Seminar: “Truth versus Lie”.
Wednesday, 2:00-5:00pm.
Reading: Sophocles, King Oedipus.

“While both [Plato and truth] are dear, piety requires us to honor truth above our friends.”
Aristotle (384-322 B.C.), Nicomachean Ethics, Book I, Chapter 6.

“There is no truth, only perception.”
Gustave Flaubert (1821-1880).

“Art is a lie that leads to truth.”
Pablo Picasso (1881-1973).

From a General Perspective:

What is the nature of truth? While Divine or God-revealed Truth is absolute, namely one and only, and therefore eternal, scientific or man-discovered truth about some natural phenomenon or process is verifiable and often revisable, while ordinary truth is the outcome of competing versions of perceived reality. Was St. John the Evangelist correct when he said in his Gospel that only Divine “Truth makes Man free.”? Could it be that scientific truth makes Man a captive - a slave to always be seeking to find truth but never finding it fully? Is divine truth fiction and scientific truth fact, or are they both valiant expressions of the human need to know, as achieved by different paths, approaches and methodologies, which quite often are mutually exclusive? While in Religion, truth is obtained by divine revelation based on faith - hope (see p. 41), in Science, despite the fact that inspiration, intuition, insight play a decisive role, factual truth is acquired through human sense perception resulting from appraisal of objective reality and by precise logical thinking with “immense patience in observation, and great boldness in framing hypotheses.” (Bertrand Russell, The History of Western Philosophy), until something accurate, beautiful and often beneficial to Humans is born out of this effort.

Is Man’s search for the truth about himself, mainly by self scrutiny such as King Oedipus’ fair quest for who he really was, the result of his passionate, courageous tenacity, while the pursuit for scientific truth is the final outcome of dispassionate, detached, objective evaluation of facts by rational human beings employing observation and logic as their only decisive tools, or is the search for any kind of truth affected by the biases, prejudices and inclinations of whoever does the searching, as well as by the broad intellectual and historical environment or climate in which the search is done? Can our longing for seeking and acquiring scientific truth irrespective of its societal harmful ramification be justified or excused on the basis of assertions like “In science truth is the only end.” (William Whewell, 1794-1866), and “To seek the truth for truth’s sake.” (Franz Boas, 1858-1942), or is this a profoundly shameful and obscene avoidance of our responsibility as moral human beings? Could the lie survive because humans with vested interests in it embrace the lie as the truth and reject the truth as a lie? If that were the case, how can we be sure that the truth we have accepted is genuine rather than a resemblance of it, namely a lie? Blaise Pascal (1623-1662) may have been right when he stated that “We know the truth, not only by the reason, but also by the heart.” which means that we can intuitively feel that something is true while something else is a lie. Lastly, when enough people of good will defend and safeguard the truth, especially by “speaking truth to power” - 1955 Quakers’ Manifesto; (see p. 37, Shakespeare quote) it will be vindicated in due time coming forth as the final victor for the welfare of all Humans.
From a Medical Perspective:

“How dreadful knowledge of the truth can be, when there is no help in truth.”
Sophocles, King Oedipus.

Illness can assault children, adults, elderly; it can be somatic, psychosomatic, psychic; it can be acute, subacute, chronic; it can be mild, severe, fatal. Since there are so many different states of illness that can exist singly or in combination with each other, should a physician tell a patient, the whole truth, a half truth (which is no better than a lie), a plain lie; occasionally, always, never, or can the Physician decide on the basis of his/her intelligence and compassion, namely on what is best for the individual patient’s welfare, under the particular circumstances? Is this “verbal relativism” to be abhorred, or is it the ultimate wisdom to be actively pursued? Can a lie be condoned in an extreme situation, e.g., to save one’s life or the life of a loved one, but also in a medical setting in order to avoid discouragement, depression, and even suicide of the ill patient, or are we the enemies of truth whenever and for whatever reason we knowingly lie? If we must tell the truth, can we do it boldly but gently, even to patients who do not wish to hear it, e.g., they are in “psychological denial” because they are afraid that it may crush them? But if as some purists say, no matter how bitter and painful truth may be, it is still the most precious and beautiful of human goods, then falsehood or the lie no matter how well intentioned or scheming it is, it must be the lowest and ugliest of all human evils. Is withholding bad news from a patient who wishes to know, but with whom the physician has made no explicit agreement or vouched no binding contract that the truth will always be told, be equivalent to lying, or can this deceitful behavior be justified or rationalized on the basis of exercising inordinate but sensible human kindness and compassion?

Can lying to a patient ever be condoned and even encouraged? For myself who writes these comments the answer is an overcautious yes, but only under very special circumstances. Physicians should not allow themselves to tell young children whose understanding of the medical situation is very limited because of their youthful age, of the extreme seriousness of their illness, e.g., cancer. A child’s parents however should be told the whole truth with much sympathy and empathy, knowing fully well that this tragic knowledge will cause them much anguish and deep grief at the future loss of someone so very young and so dear to them both. The parents, not the physicians, are ultimately the ones who have the moral and legal authority to decide for their minor children. A lie can also be condoned but perhaps not encouraged if the patient is very old, suffers from some type of senile dementia, e.g., Alzheimer’s Disease, or is dying of a disease which can only be inadequately controlled by palliative therapy. In this case also, the patient’s spouse and children must be informed, although it is clear that the death of an elderly patient will not cause as much distress and pain to them as the death of a young child would do. Lastly, it must be clearly stated that suggestions such as the ones presently offered, can only act as guidelines to all professional people involved with a patient’s medical care, and must always take second place to the wishes and decisions of the adult patient himself or herself and the patient’s close relatives whose pain at the loss of a loved member of their family even though he or she may be very old. Physicians on the other hand, must not become too emotionally involved with their patients’ tragic predicament, since they are the ones who are ultimately responsible for making the tough but correct decisions.
Truth versus Lie

"‘Drunkards and children tell the truth’
-- drunkards anyway."

Ancient Greek Proverb mentioned by Plato
(c. 428-348 B.C.) in his Symposium [217, e].
Translated by Michael Joyce.

“O cruel hour, that brings a bitter truth to light!”

Euripides (c. 484-407 B.C.).
The Bacchae.

“A lie is like a snowball; the longer it is rolled, the larger it gets.”

Martin Luther (1483-1546) Quotation.

“They do abuse the king that flatter him: ....
Whereas reproof, obedient and in order,
fits kings, as they are men, for they may err.”

William Shakespeare (1564-1616).
Pericles [1608-1609].

“He who permits himself to tell a lie once,
finds it much easier to do it a second and a third time,
till at length it becomes habitual;
he tells lies without attending to it,
and truths without the world believing him.
This falsehood of the tongue leads to that of the heart,
and in time deprives all its good dispositions.”

Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826).
Letter to Peter Carr [August 19, 1785].

“We are not afraid to follow truth wherever it may lead,
nor to tolerate any error so long as reason is left free to combat it.”

Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826).
Letter to William Roscoe [December 27, 1820].

“That a lie which is half a truth is ever the blackest of lies,
That a lie which is all a lie may be met and fought with outright,
But a lie which is part a truth is a harder matter to fight.”

Alfred, Lord Tennyson (1809-1892).
The Grandmother [1864], st. 8.

“‘Tis strange -- but true; for truth is always strange; stranger than fiction.”

George N. G., Lord Byron (1788-1824).
Don Juan, Canto XIV [1823], st. 101.
“‘Beauty is truth, truth is beauty.’
-- that is all ye know on earth, and all you need to know.”

John Keats (1795-1821).
Ode on a Grecian Urn, st. 4.

“Take the saving lie from the average man,
and you take his happiness away.”

Henrik Ibsen (1828-1906).
Hedda Gabler, A Play.

“The ultimate good desired is best reached by free trade in ideas -
the best test of truth is the power of the thought
to get itself accepted in the competition of the market.”

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. (1841-1935).
Abrams v. United States, 250 U.S. 616, 630 [1919].

“Convictions are more dangerous enemies of truth than lies.”

Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche (1844-1900).
Human, All Too Human: A Book for Free Spirits.

“Science tells the truth about the world;
art makes its own worlds.”

Oscar Wild (1854-1900).
A conversation with Herbert Spencer (1820-1903).

“They that asks no questions, isn’t told a lie.”

Rudyard Kipling (1865-1936).
A Smuggler’s Song, st. 6.

“The truth is found when men are free to pursue it.”

Franklin Delano Roosevelt (1882-1945).
Address at Temple University [February 22, 1936].

“The opposite of a true statement
is a false statement,
but the opposite of a profound truth
is usually another profound truth.”

Neils Bohr (1885-1962).
Principle of Complementarity.

“You can recognize truth,
by its beauty and simplicity.”

Richard Feynman (1918-1988).
The Character of Physical Law.
6th Seminar: “Mythos versus Logos”.
Friday, 2:00-5:00pm.
Ernst Mayr, What Evolution Is.
Mother Teresa, Come Be My Light.

When we study human history of the past three to four millennia, the one most important conclusion that we can safely arrive at, is that Mythos or mythical - fictitious beliefs were gradually but inevitably replaced by Logos or logical thinking. We discover for example that the Priesthood and Intelligentsia of the most civilized nations of antiquity, i.e., Egypt, Mesopotamia, Persia, India, China, Japan, Mesoamerica, and also Hellas - Greece especially during the Epic or Homeric Times, believed without doubt or hesitation that beneficial and harmful natural phenomena that influenced the daily lives of humans were caused by omnipotent, kind, or vindictive Gods who were beyond human control. This notion of Man’s helplessness in his relation to the Gods or God, suggested in turn that these Divine Forces had to be thanked for the favors and pacified and placated for the disfavors bestowed upon humans, with the appropriate sacrifices, atonement and penance. In contrast to these notions, the early ancient Greek “Natural - Physical Philosophers” like Thales, Pythagoras, Heraclitus, Anaxagoras, Empedocles, Leucippus, Democritus and others who lived between the 6th and 4th Centuries B.C., many of them in Hellenic Ionia, imagined and taught that “Natural Phenomena have Natural Causes.” and “Gods are the Human Personifications of these Natural Occurrences.”

This uniquely Hellenic - Greek view of Man in his relation to Nature, which was unprecedented in its arrogance and even hubris, was linked to another and much more conceited and egotistical conviction, namely that the Human Mind or “Nous”, solely on its own ability, aptitude and competence could understand Nature through experience based on objective - impartial sensory perception and rational thinking based on logical analysis, rather than by means of religious faith - belief - dogma inspired by divine revelation. These “Pre-Socratic Philosophers” further held the view that when experience and logic acted in unison, they could organize diverse facts into concepts and thoughts that would lead to broad generalizations called theories and hypotheses (see p. 35, Bertrand Russell quote) which help us to comprehend the Natural - Ordinary World. In this manner, the restraints imposed upon Humanity by Superstition and the Fear of the Unknown that had been given the semblance of the Supernatural by those who wanted to protect and perpetuate their religious authority and political power which was translated into privileges, were at long last shattered with the result that ignorance and misunderstanding was gradually replaced by illumination of understanding.

In a manner similar to that of the “Natural - Physical Philosophers”, the ancient Coan Physician Hippocrates (c. 460-370 B.C.), “The Father of Medicine”, was the first who clearly stated on the basis of his pithy intuition and experience rooted on evidence, that Diseases are Natural Phenomena rendered by Natural Causes, and so the Physician’s first priority is to attempt to understand the true Nature of Human Illness, i.e., what we presently call “Etiology and Pathogenesis of Disease”, by means of critical observation and logical thinking. Once this kind of knowledge could be achieved, Hippocrates and his pupils held, it would then be feasible to pursue either a preventive approach, or a curative or palliative path to the therapy of Human Diseases, which would be based on natural rather than supernatural interpretations of etiologies or causes.
This new **Cause - Effect** relationship principle advocated by Hippocrates, which is responsible for his stellar reputation as being the first “Physician-Scientist”, was balanced by another equally important outlook, namely that of the “Art of Medicine”, which is exemplified as kindness and compassion toward the patient, and concern about the fears, anxieties, apprehensions, distress he or she experiences during illness and while contemplating death. This humane approach is also beautifully articulated by the “Hippocratic Oath” (see p. 48), which is based on the “absolute respect of human life” and on “helping without harming”, both of which are the ethical concepts characteristic of the **Doctor - Patient Relationship** that survived up to the very present, although quite often in a diluted or tarnished form.

Whereas the peerless philosopher of antiquity Socrates had asserted that “I know that I know nothing”, (a state later defined by Thomas Huxley as “Agnostic”, see p. 42), both he and his brilliant pupil Plato realized to their chagrin that whereas love for knowledge about Nature was very laudatory, the technical means available to Humans in their times were so limited that this kind of valiant effort, however aggressively pursued, could turn out to be nothing more than an exercise in futility. Both Socrates and Plato saw on the other hand the urgency and need in finding ways to resolve how Man should conduct himself and interact with his Fellow Men in an **Ethical - Moral** manner, so that his own life, as well as the lives of others, could be happy, peaceful, and inventively productive. Their conclusions were simple and direct, namely that “a Good and Virtuous Man is a Happy Man,” and that an “Elenchic, i.e., Critically Reflective life, is superior to a life of Political Power, Pleasures, Possessions, Fame, Glory, Celebrity.” (see p. 53).

Although Plato’s independently-minded and very intelligent pupil Aristotle who was a native of Stagira in Hellenic Macedonia agreed with this view, he nevertheless challenged his beloved Teacher by asserting that although interest in **Human Values**, i.e., Morality must be an ongoing and ever enduring preoccupation of all Human beings (he endowed us in fact with the most profound disquisition on Ethics in the form of a book presently known as Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*), efforts to understand **Nature’s Laws and their Exceptions**, even when the resources are extremely limited, should also be relentlessly pursued. This is the reason why Aristotle has rightly been considered during the past more than two millennia to be one of the foremost “Moral Philosophers” like Socrates and Plato, but also as one of the greatest “Natural - Physical Philosophers”, in fact as being the “Father of Science, of Biology, of Logic”. Aristotle in other words held the profound view, that genuine understanding of the physical and biological worlds could be accomplished by means of a truly dispassionate, continuously cumulative correction of available empirical knowledge under the guidance of logical thinking. As a result of this viewpoint, contemporary Science pursues Biology - Chemistry - Physics (see p. 11), instead of Metaphysics, the latter being the subject matter of Religion and Philosophy.

Lastly, although **Mythos**, i.e., mythical or faith-based explanations as articulated by **Religious beliefs** (see p. 41, *The Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle*), was gradually replaced by its alternative **Logos**, i.e., **Logical - Rational thinking** as elucidated by the empirical approach of **Science** (see p. 41, top paragraph) was inevitable, this new awareness that liberated Humanity from ignorance, superstition and inflexible obstinate traditions was shown to be a cruel *Faustian bargain*, which made reflective people realize that we are definitely alone as individuals and as members of the human race in a vast, chaotic, violent, indifferent, and conceivably pointless and meaningless Universe (see p. 42), where oblivion - nothingness awaits us all (see p. 63, Orhan Pamuk quote).
IN THE BEGINNING WAS THE WORD.
AND THE WORD WAS WITH GOD.
AND GOD WAS THE WORD.

St. John the Evangelist (1st Century A.D.).

Whereas in ancient Greek philosophy (c. 600 - 300 B.C.) the term “Logos” (Gr.) or “Word” signified Reason, i.e., the Governing or Ordering Principle in the Universe, in early Christian Biblical times twenty centuries ago, St. John the Evangelist employed it as doctrinal Faith in the Divine Absolute - the Source of Everything - the Creator, i.e., God Himself and hence Christ - God Incarnate, a God who also manifested human attributes like Will, Anger, Love, Mercy, Forgiveness which had been perceived either factually or metaphorically - symbolically. Yet, the prevailing contemporary meaning of Logos is that it represents logical - objective concepts in agreement with sense perceptions, in contrast to Mythos that denotes mythical - subjective doctrinal beliefs.

“We have no use for theological subtleties. The beliefs we have inherited, as old as time, can not be overthrown by any argument, not by the most inventive ingenuity.”

Euripides (c. 484-407 B.C.).
The Bacchae.

“Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.”

The Holy Bible: The Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews 11:1.

“You, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?” (which in the Aramaic language means), “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?”

The Holy Bible, Psalm 22:1 and Matthew 27:46.

“If there be no God--there can be no soul.
--If there is no soul then Jesus--You also are not true.
--Haven, what emptiness.”

Mother Teresa (1910-1997) during a crisis of her Faith.
Come Be My Light.

“For those who believe in God, no explanation is necessary. For those who do not, no explanation is possible.”

John LaFarge, quoted by Thomas Cahill in his Book Desire of the Everlasting Hills, about miraculous medical cures.
AN AGNOSTIC SECULAR EMPIRICIST SURVEYS THE WORLD
To Observe -> To Theorize -> To Reason -> To Understand -> To Explain -> To Know
(FROM DEMOCITUS, TO EMBEDOCLES, TO DARWIN, TO THE PRESENT AND BEYOND)

Among the Ancient Greek “Natural - Physical Philosophers” (see p. 39), first Anaxagoras (c. 500-428 B.C.), then Leucippus along with his better-known pupil Democritus (c. 460-400 B.C.) held the unique view that Matter had existed for all Eternity, being composed of A-toms (Non-divisible [particles]) and Void (Kenon). Empedocles (c. 495-435 B.C.) at the same time proposed that Nature is regulated or governed by Chance and Necessity rather than by Design and Purpose, processes that generated diverse and progressively complex Physical Forms that gradually evolved into the PHYSICAL UNIVERSE or COSMOS (see p. 43).

While Empedocles was perhaps the first to suggest that Animals and Humans evolved from antecedent forms, it was Darwin (1809-1882) who offered in 1859 explicit - convincing evidence, subsequently verified by Molecular Biology, that Life’s recent organized complexity arose over time from primeval simplicity by Chance, i.e., Random genetic variation, e.g., mutation, recombination, and Necessity, i.e., Non-Random natural cumulative selection - elimination, processes that generated diverse and progressively complex Biological Forms, the fittest of which survived and the least fit perished, an outcome that gradually evolved into the current BIOLOGICAL WORLD including MAN (see p. 44).

Aristarchus (c. 310-230 B.C.) first postulated, Copernicus (1473-1543), Kepler (1571-1630) and Galileo (1564-1642) then established, that the Sun rather than the Earth is the indisputable center of our solar system, modern Astronomy next demonstrated convincingly that the Sun is a medium-size star among the estimated 100 Billion Stars that make up our Galaxy, which is one among an infinite number of other Galaxies like the neighboring Andromeda Galaxy which is probably twice as massive as our own, being located two million light years away, and finally current Cosmology suggested that only about 5% of the Universe is composed of ordinary atomic matter, around 20% of dark matter, and the remaining 75% of dark energy which is said to be accelerating the expansion of the Universe. Biology on the other hand has verified Darwin’s Theory of Biological Evolution which advocated that Man has emerged from lower forms of life as shown initially by the Fossils’ Record, and more recently in combination with the evidence based on Mendelian Inheritance (the two termed “The Modern Evolutionary Synthesis”) as demonstrating overwhelmingly at long last through DNA sequencing technologies (see p. 51, first quotation) that all animal species are related to each other but have developed different characteristics because of transformations through time.

Although these significant discoveries compel us to conclude that we Humans do not possess the Cosmic importance that we had previously arrogated quite naively and extremely egocentrically to ourselves, we must nevertheless feel very proud of our Species when we consider that it takes our Human Brain with its 100 Billion Neurons and their 100 or more Trillion Synapses, to perceive by means of our Brainpower, i.e., our Mind (see p. 11) the Vastness, Complexity, Beauty and Mystery of the visible and invisible or “dark” Universe. Yet, since our Brain has its anatomical and physiological limitations, i.e., our mental powers are finite - restricted, it follows that our mental picture about complex matters such as these, should be offered to the scrutiny of our Fellow Humans with humility and modesty rather than pride, arrogance and conceit.
The Universe or Cosmos as perceived by Albert Einstein

"The most incomprehensible thing about the universe is that it is comprehensible."

"Two things inspire me to awe - the starry heavens above and the moral universe within."

"It is a magnificent feeling to recognize the unity of complex phenomena which appear to be things quite apart from the direct visible truth."

"A human being is part of a whole, called by us the 'Universe', a part limited in time and space. He experiences himself, his thoughts and feelings, as something separated from the rest - a kind of optical delusion of his consciousness. This delusion is a kind of prison for us, restricting us to our personal desires and to affections for a few persons nearest us. Our task must be to free ourselves from this prison by widening our circles of compassion to embrace all living creatures and the whole of nature in its beauty."

"What I see in Nature is a magnificent structure that we can comprehend only very imperfectly, and that must fill a thinking person with a feeling of 'humility'. This is a genuinely religious feeling that has nothing to do with mysticism."

"The finest emotion of which we are capable is the mystic emotion. Herewith lies the germ of all art and all true science. Anyone to whom this feeling is alien, who is no longer capable of wonderment and lives in a state of fear is a dead man. To know that what is impenetrable for us really exists and manifests itself as the highest wisdom and the most radiant beauty, whose gross forms alone are intelligible to our poor faculties - this knowledge, this feeling ... that is the core of the true religious sentiment. In this sense, and in this sense alone, I rank myself among profoundly religious men."

Above quotations by Albert Einstein (1879-1955), were derived from the Internet using Search Engines Google and Yahoo.

“All religions, arts and sciences are branches of the same tree. All these aspirations are directed toward ennobling man’s life, lifting it from the sphere of mere physical existence and leading the individual toward freedom."

Albert Einstein (1879-1955), Out of my Later Years. Convictions and Beliefs, 4. Moral Decay [1937].
MAN, as perceived by an Ancient Tragedian

"Many are the wonders of the world,
but none is more wonderful than MAN.
He rides the ocean,
and takes his way through the deeps,
through wind-swept valleys of perilous seas,
that surge and sway.
He is master of ageless Earth,
bending her to his own will,
by the sweat of his brow,
as year succeeds to year,
with toil unending of mule and plow.
He is lord of all things living;
birds of the air, beasts of the field,
all creatures of sea and land he takes,
cunning to capture and ensnare,
with sleight of hand.
He hunts the savage beast
from the upland rocks,
taming the mountain monarch in his lair,
teaching the wild horse and the roaming ox,
his yoke to bear upon their necks.
He learnt the use of language,
and the wind-swift motion of thought.
He established the laws of living together in cities,
building himself shelter against the rain,
and wintry weather.
There is nothing beyond his power.
His subtlety met all chance.
He conquered all danger.
For every ill he has found its remedy,
save only DEATH."

Sophocles (496-406 B.C.), Antigone, Chorus.
Combined translation by:

Versus

MAN, as perceived by a Modern Biologist

“Nothing in biology makes sense,
except in the light of evolution.”

Theodosius Dobzhansky (1900-1975).
7th Seminar: “Theocracy versus Democracy”.
Monday, 2:00-5:00pm.
Reading: Machiavelli, The Prince.

General Considerations:

Theocracy or “God-mandated Rule” as the words “Theos” - God, and “Cratos” - Rule indicate, is an immodest, insolent and shameless claim by Men of great arrogance and exceptional strength of resolve, who seize power in a community or a nation in the name or as spokesmen of a Religious or a Secular (e.g., Communism, Fascism, Nazism) “God”, and then proceed to order, command, control and rule their fellow humans by enforcing their desires and decisions on them, at times with much cruelty and often with the threat of, or with actual, death. This type of “Rule by One” or “Monarchy”, and the man who rules in it called Monarch, Emperor, King, Despot, Tyrant was and still is the oldest and most common form of government by which groups of people that had formed Societies have been ruled from antiquity to the very present. Although this hierarchical way of rule was at times relatively benevolent, in the majority of instances it was and still is very brutal and repressive, since experience reveals that Man is easily corruptible - “Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.” (Lord Acton).

Repeated attempts made throughout the ages to regulate, reduce and restrain, this one-man type of exercise of political power, by replacing the one-man rule with the “Rule by Few” or “Oligarchy” who offer themselves as exemplifying some form of nobility, e.g., of family pedigree, of intelligence, of wealth, features that allow them to call themselves “Aristocracy” or “Rule by the Best”, have repeatedly failed since a small Group of Rulers much like a Single Ruler, being egotistical, self-centered, self-indulging and self-serving, never consent to voluntarily share the power they wield with others, although they often do become aware that such power has its limitations. This is the main reason why Rulers in ancient and modern times, have jealously kept all power in their own hands, while holding back the common people in ignorance and want, in order to deprive them of their prerogative to think for themselves and so determine in freedom and liberty their individual and collective future and destiny.

In contrast to “Rule by One” or “Rule by Few”, “Democracy” or “People’s Rule” was born in ancient Athens when first the law-giver Solon (c. 630-560 B.C.) reformed the constitution and the judicial courts and constructed the machinery by means of which the conduct of public affairs was in the hands of the People - the Demos, and then the statesman Cleisthenes (c. 570-507 B.C.) finally established it firmly by the principle of equal rights for all citizens who actively participated in government. It was Lincoln (1809-1865) who in his Gettysburg Address (1863) defined Democracy most fittingly as a “Government of the people, by the people, for the people.” Although Democracy has many deficiencies (see p. 47, Anarchias, quoted by Plutarch) and imperfections, it has survived up to the very present after much conflict and opposition, in a large part of the world, and in as many forms as there are different cultures, chiefly because it is still the best form of government developed by humans, or as Winston Churchill said “It is the least bad of all the systems of government produced out of human experience.”

Accordingly, Secular - Liberal Democracy exemplifies a ceaseless Contest of the persuasive force of virtue of the common People against the coercive power and wicked
conduct of the King - Despot. Nevertheless, human freedom must be rigorously limited by self-rule and self-restraint, so that the individual willingly serves the group, i.e., the State, for we have been warned by Plato and by our own experience that even in a Democracy when someone is inspired by excessive ambition in wanting to obtain and hold on to political power, especially absolute power, he will inevitably abuse such power and is therefore unfit to exercise it sensibly and judiciously, and so should be kept away from it as much as possible. Yet, history has demonstrated as well that in a Democracy where “the People are King” (Euripides), the Individual Human Mind being left free and independent of capriciously imposed controls, will lead to progress and advancement while eluding stagnation and decline. Although this outcome may bring on a rugged adventuresome individualism of an uninhibited riotous manner that could result in situations in which unfairness and injustice rule supreme, e.g., when the constitutional rights and civil liberties of social minorities and the weak are suppressed and stifled, the possibility of such unwelcome developments should not hinder or arrest the replacement of Despotism by Democracy, especially when achieved from within.

Medical - Professional Considerations:

Physicians have a number of “constituencies” that they must attend to Democratically and never Monarchically or Kingly. Whereas the first and foremost is their Patients, the second is their Fellow Physicians, and the third is their Medical Students. What are Physicians’ duties toward their Patients, their Fellow Physicians, their Students to whom they are privileged to teach the “Science and Art of Medicine”? Lastly, what are their expectations of themselves as Physicians and as Human Beings? The peerless answers to these questions were given by Hippocrates close to twenty-five Centuries ago in his majestic “Oath” (see p. 48).

Physicians’ Duties Toward their Patients:
“I will prescribe a regimen for the good of my patients according to my ability and my judgment and abstain from offending them or harming them. Never to prescribe a deadly drug to anyone even if I am asked, nor give such advice. Neither will I give a woman a pessary to procure abortion. But I will preserve the purity of my life and my art. In every house where I come I will enter only for the good of my patients, keeping myself far from all intentional injustice and harm, and especially from the aphrodisiac contacts with the bodies of women or of men, whether they be free or slaves. Whatever I see or hear in the exercise of my profession or outside my profession in my communioh with men, which ought not to be divulged, never to reveal it but to keep it as a secret.”

Physicians’ Duties Toward their Fellow Physicians:
“To consider him who taught me this art the equal of my parents; to live in common with him and if necessary to share my goods with him.”

Physicians’ Duties Toward their Medical Students:
“To look upon his children as my own brothers, to teach them this art if they so desire without fee or written contract; to impart to my sons and the sons of him who taught me and the disciples who have enrolled themselves and have agreed to the rules of the profession, but to these alone, the precepts and the instructions.”

Physicians’ Expectations of Themselves as Physicians:
“If I keep this oath faithfully and not violate it, may I enjoy my life and my art, respected by all men and for all times. But if I transgress it or forswear it may the reverse be my lot.”
HUMAN LAWS VERSUS HUMAN JUSTICE IN A DEMOCRACY

Anacharsis was a Scythian who lived at about 600 B.C. He was the son of Gnurus, the king of a nomadic tribe of the Euxine shores, and of a Greek woman.

Although Scythians spoke an Indo-Persian language, Anacharsis was instructed in the Greek language by his mother, because of which he prevailed upon his father to entrust him with a visit to Athens at about 589 B.C. While there, he became acquainted with the Athenian Lawgiver Solon - the “Father of Democracy”, from whom he acquired a knowledge of the wisdom and learning of Greece, and by whose influence he was introduced to the principal persons and philosophers in Athens. He was the first foreigner who received the privilege of Greek citizenship, and it is said that he was initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries. Both Solon and Anacharsis had been judged in antiquity as being two of the “Seven Sages”.

After Anacharsis had resided in Athens for several years, he traveled through different countries in quest of knowledge, and returned home filled with the desire of instructing his countrymen in the laws and religion of the Greeks. The historian Herodotus (c. 485 - c. 425 B.C.) states that his brother Saulius killed him while he was performing a sacrifice to the Greek goddess Cybele, for worshipping Strange Foreign Deities.

According to Plutarch (A.D. 46-120) “Lives, Life of Solon”, Anacharsis laughed at Solon for imagining that “the dishonesty and covetousness of his fellow Greeks could be restrained by Laws, which were like spiders’ webs that, it is true, would catch small flies - the weak and the poor, but be easily broken by the bigger ones - the mighty and the rich, allowing them to escape while at the same time destroying the webs - the Laws.”. His simple and forcible mode of expressing himself gave birth to the proverbial “Scythian Eloquence”.

Similar comments made centuries later:

“Laws and police regulations can be compared to a spider’s web that lets the big mosquitoes through and catches the small one.”

Julius Wilhelm Zinngref (1591-1635).
Aphorismata, Book II.

“Laws are like cobwebs, which may catch small flies, but let wasps and hornets break through.”

Jonathan Swift (1667-1745).
A Critical Essay upon the Faculties of the Mind [1707].

(Historical facts about Anacharsis were derived from various Encyclopedias, and the two Quotations about Laws were found in Bartlett’s Familiar Quotations.)

The Four Freedoms in a Democracy are:
“Of Speech and Religion, From Want and Fear.”

Franklin Delano Roosevelt (1882-1945).
PHYSICIAN’S “OATH” BY HIPPOCRATES (c. 460-370 B.C.).

(Complete Text)

“I swear by Apollo the physician, and Asclpios, and Hygieia, and Panacea, and I call to witness all the gods and all the goddesses, to keep this oath and agreement according to my ability and my judgment. To consider him who taught me this art the equal of my parents; to live in common with him and if necessary to share my goods with him; to look upon his children as my own brothers, to teach them this art if they so desire without fee or written contract; to impart to my sons and the sons of him who taught me and the disciples who have enrolled themselves and have agreed to the rules of the profession, but to these alone, the precepts and the instructions. I will prescibe a regimen for the good of my patients according to my ability and my judgment and abstain from offending them or harming them. Never to prescribe a deadly drug to anyone even if I am asked, nor give such advice. Neither will I give a woman a pessary to procure abortion. But I will preserve the purity of my life and my art. I will not perform an orchietomy on any man even if he asks me, yet leave this task to the person who occupies himself with this type of work. In every house where I come I will enter only for the good of my patients, keeping myself far from all intentional injustice and harm, and especially from the aphrodisiac contacts with the bodies of women or of men, whether they be free or slaves. Whatever I see or hear in the exercise of my profession or outside my profession in my communion with men, which ought not to be divulged, never to reveal it but to keep it as a secret. If I keep this oath faithfully and not violate it, may I enjoy my life and my art, respected by all men and for all times. But if I transgress it or forswear it may the reverse be my lot.”

It is obvious that the true essence of the Physician’s “Oath” as articulated by Hippocrates is “to help or at least to do no harm to human beings”, a view exemplified by the physician’s profound respect for and protection of all Human Life from its earliest to its latest stages, which is a principle that rises above practical “cost-benefit” analyses.

Many present-day physicians, and many more would-be physicians who will be practicing Medicine in the twenty-first century and beyond, may remark that what Hippocrates declared twenty-five centuries ago is too old-fashioned and therefore most irrelevant for today’s world. Although it is fair to say that human attitudes do change with time, and what was acceptable in the past may no longer be acceptable at present, there are some uniquely human attributes - characteristics that cannot change, i.e., our high intelligence, our moral vision, our esthetic appreciation and the supreme rule of our laws, which are what distinguish us Humans from all (other) Animals. Otherwise Aristotle’s declaration that:

“ἈΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ ΕΣΤΙ ΛΟΓΙΚΟΝ ΗΘΙΚΟΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΟΝ ΖΩΝ”,
i.e., “MAN IS A LOGICAL ETHICAL POLITICAL ANIMAL”,
will be replaced by the scientifically accurate but frightfully restricted assertion that:
“MAN IS THE OUTWARD MANIFESTATION OF HIS DNA”.

Despite the fact that from the perspective of Biology - Chemistry - Physics, Life is nucleic acid replicating into more nucleic acid (see p. 11), from the perspective of Humans there is certainly much more to “Life .... to MAN” (see p. 11), and as Sophocles affirmed so beautifully and so clearly (see p. 44) in his magnificent tragedy Antigone.
8th Seminar: “Rational versus Instinctive”.
Wednesday, 2:00-5:00pm.
Readings: Euripides, The Bacchae.
        Euripides, Medea.

As stated already (see p. 39), “Natural - Physical Philosophers” of Antiquity like Thales, Pythagoras, Heraclitus, Anaxagoras, Empedocles, Leucippus, Democritus and others, pursued Knowledge about the Physical World to the extent that many of their ideas which were conceived with clarity and lucidity became the foundations of much of what we now call Modern Science, e.g., the atomic theory of matter delineated by Democritus which is the basis of the comparable current atomic theory. Similarly, “Moral Philosophers” of Antiquity like Socrates, Plato, Aristotle laid the foundations of Ethics, which both legitimized and enriched Christian Morality for close to twenty Centuries. These and other “Intellectual Giants”, as well as Artists and even Common People of Antiquity, laid also the foundations of an Esthetic perspective of human life, because they delighted in Beauty in its many and varied forms as perceived by human senses, in a manner that escapes contemporary Man’s grasp, however hard he tries.

They perceived the Universe as being orderly. They called it Cosmos, which in Greek means beautiful, hence the word “cosmetic” for something that beautifies. They created artistic masterpieces, e.g., Temples, Sculptures, and even Household Utensils for their everyday needs, which still look exquisitely beautiful, thus confirming the sensible and wise view that an Esthetic perspective is as important as the Rational and Ethical outlooks, and that these three human autonomous activities are not mutually exclusive but can easily coexist in harmony. The great Athenian statesman Pericles, as reported by Thucydides (c. 460 - 400 B.C.) in his “History”, proclaimed in his celebrated Funeral Oration which he gave during the first year (431-430 B.C.) of the Peloponnesian War between ancient Athens and Sparta, that “We [Athenians] are lovers of beauty without extravagance, and lovers of wisdom without loss of manly vigor.”

Yet, although ancient philosophers had an esthetic appreciation of the Cosmos, and modern scientists have noted the intrinsic simplicity, beauty and elegance of many of the Laws of Nature (see p. 38, Feynman quote), it must be emphasized that all such “Human Values” can not be taken into account in explaining the true Essence of the Physical World which should be the exclusive domain of objective Scientific inquiry.

Whereas there is still much ugliness, cacophony and disharmony in the modern world that needs to be soon addressed, contemporary Man could feel proud of his Esthetic Achievements, in the Practical Arts - Architecture, Engineering, Technology, and in the Fine Arts - Literature, i.e., poetry, drama, prose fiction, and Music, Painting, Sculpture, which he created for his well-being (the Practical Arts) and for his emotional uplifting (the Fine Arts) especially as communicated through the Performing Arts.

Although both ancient and modern philosophers realized that the Practice of Rational Thinking, the Exercise of Morality, and the Esthetic Appreciation of Beauty, are features that distinguish Intelligent Humans from Animals, and that they are dependent to a great extent upon Man’s resolve, they also became aware that there are Forces beyond his control no matter how hard he tries to check them. While it appeared reasonable to accept Man’s sorry predicament that he cannot well understand, harness and constrain many of the Natural Forces, e.g., an Earthquake and its aftereffects, it was always more discouraging and disheartening to Man to realize that he was/is unable to
restrain aspects of his own character, such as hate, malice, envy, greed, and worse of all his frequent follies, which singly and collectively worked to his disadvantage. While men in ancient times ascribed these difficulties to Gods or God (“Preordained Fate” they called it), and we presently blame it on our Genes (“Genetic Determinism” we call it) and our overall Environment, the ancient Tragic Dramatists Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides gave the finest answers to our perplexity as to who is to blame - namely Man himself. It was Homer however, the greatest poet of all times, who gave the peerless response when the Olympian Father-God Zeus - (Lt. Jupiter) tells the other Gods at their Assembly, Odyssey, Book 1, Lines 37-40. Translated by Robert Fagles, Viking Press.

“Ah how shameless -- the way these mortals blame the gods.
From us alone, they say, come all the miseries, yes,
but they themselves, with their own reckless ways,
compound their pains beyond their proper share.”

And so finally, we come to realize that the human tragedy is that irrespective of how moral Man may be, he battles with Forces which govern decisively his life that are beyond his control - which Sophocles rightly called in his grand tragedy King Oedipus “the encounters of Man with more than Man”. Yet, he also becomes aware of the harsh truth that he himself is solely responsible for his actions that are free, i.e., are not made under coercion or duress, hence he is to be blamed for his sufferings. It is entirely up to him therefore to exercise his free will - his power to choose to right his wrongs, in order to prove to himself and to others that he is truly Homo Sapient, i.e., “Intelligent Earthling”, who can think rationally, behave morally, admire beauty in its many forms, and just as important can love, laugh, cry, hope. Nevertheless, he must never forget that the rational - Apollonian component of his nature should coexist in harmony with the instinctive - irrational - Dionysian part, with the latter expressed in moderation, as the great Euripides illustrated so well in his two Tragedies The Bacchae and Medea.

Despite the fact that in Ancient times their most significant thinkers showed respect toward Religions, which were characterized by a strong Moral component, this worthy attitude has more recently been replaced by disrespect, intolerance and even strife. While this outcome is to a degree the result of Science’s discoveries with regard to the non-central place of the Earth in the Physical Universe, and to the Origin of Humans from lower forms of Life (see p. 51, first quotation), it is also the product of Humanity’s ignorance, wishful thinking and self-deception, which time and again breed much superstition, prejudice, bigotry, dogmatism, fanaticism, and quite often brutal violence.

In conclusion, it will be wise and prudent of all of us to acknowledge that despite the fact that scientific knowledge is the only kind of understanding that reflects as closely as possible the physical or material reality, there are philosophical, ethical and aesthetic Human Values that are outside the concern and competence of Science. Even an Agnostic Secular Empiricist (see p. 42) must admit that most people yearn to believe in a personal God, because this Faith consoles and comforts them with dual hope that is beyond reason, i.e., that they will survive death by entering eternal life - a life external to time as spiritual beings as immortal souls, and that in this ethereal world, this Paradise, they will be rewarded for their good deeds during their earthly life while their enemies will be punished for their wicked actions. Lastly, it must be stated clearly that while scientific knowledge and religious beliefs may be irreconcilable for the few, they can coexist in harmony rather than disharmony by the many for their own good.
Human versus Animal

The genomes of humans and chimpanzees are 98.5-98.8% identical when each one of the three billion DNA units are compared, which suggested that we shared a common ancestor 5 to 6 (probably 5.4) million years ago. The genomes of men and women differ by 1-2%, which is the same as the difference between a man and a male chimpanzee or between a woman and a female chimpanzee.


“Reason struggled to subdue passion.”

Euripides (c. 484-407 B.C.).
Hippolytus.

“Man is neither angel nor beast; and the misfortune is that he who would act the angel acts the beast.”

Blaise Pascal (1623-1662).
Penses [1670] no. 358.

“It is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied; better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied.”

John Stuart Mill (1806-1873).
Utilitarianism [1863] ch. 2.

“By words man interchanges thoughts, by the forms of art he interchanges feelings, and this with all men, not only of the present time, but also of the past and the future.”

Leo Tolstoy (1828-1910).
What Is Art? [1898].

“Our civilization is still in a middle stage, scarcely beast, in that it is no longer wholly guided by instinct; scarcely human, in that it is not yet wholly guided by reason.”

Theodore Dreiser (1871-1945).
Sister Carrie [1900].

“Too much of the animal disfigures the civilized human being, too much culture makes a sick animal.”

Carl Gustave Jung (1875-1961).
The Psychology of the Unconscious [1943].

“The abstract has no emotional content.”

Cecil Balmond (1943- ), Arup Architect-Engineer.
If

“If you can keep your head
when all about you men are losing theirs
and blaming it on you,
If you can trust yourself when all men doubt you
but make allowances for their doubting, too.
If you can wait but not be tired of waiting,
or being lied about, don’t deal in lies,
Or being hated, don’t give way to hating,
and yet don’t look too good nor talk too wise,
If you can dream but not make dreams your master,
if you can think and not make thoughts your aim,
If you can meet with triumph and disaster,
and treat those two impostors just the same,
If you can bear to hear the truth you’ve spoken
twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools,
Or watch the things you gave your life to broken,
and stoop and build them up with worn-out tools,
If you can make one heap of all your winnings
and risk it on one turn of pitch and toss,
and lose and start again at your beginnings
and never breathe a word about your loss,
If you can force your heart and nerve and sinew
to serve your turn long after they are gone,
and to hold on when there is nothing in you
but the will that says to them “hold on,”
If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
or walk with kings nor lose the common touch,
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you,
if all men count with you but none too much,
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
with 60 seconds worth of distance run,
Yours is the Earth and everything that’s in it,
and which is more, you’ll be a man, my son.”

Rudyard Kipling (1865-1936).
Rudyard Kipling Complete Verse.

“How dull it is to pause, to make an end,
to rust unburnish’d, not to shine in use!
as tho’ to breathe were life!” ....

“To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.”

Alfred Lord Tennyson (1809-1892).
Ulysses [1842], lines 22-24; line 70.
9th Seminar: “Happiness versus Unhappiness”.
Friday, 2:00-5:00pm.
Leo Tolstoy, Family Happiness.

What Decides Human Happiness or Unhappiness (see pp. 54-55)?
   a) Predestination, i.e., Divine Control - Fate - Karma - Kismet - Moira?
   b) Predetermination, i.e., Heredity - Genetics, Environment?
   c) Unpredictability, i.e., Chance - Luck - Fortune (opposite of Misfortune)?
   d) Free Will, i.e., Free Choice, as the basis of Human Moral Responsibility?

Is Happiness found mainly outside of Man?
   a) In pleasures, enjoyments, satisfactions, indulgences, gratifications?
   b) In prosperity, wealth, riches, money, material acquisitions - possessions?
   c) In fame, glory, honors, prestige, celebrity, notoriety?
   d) In attaining and exercising power, especially political power?

Is Happiness found mainly within Man?
The foremost ancient moral philosophers Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and subsequently
the Stoic Philosophers and the Christian Theologians, affirmed that Man is Happy:
   1) When he lives by right actions that result from his Innate Virtues (Aretes), i.e.,
      a) Justice (most essential one according to Plato - Republic), fairness, impartiality.
      b) Goodness, kindness, tolerance, charity, generosity, magnanimity.
      c) Wisdom, self-knowledge (“know thyself” - a Delphic axiom), understanding.
      d) Moderation, prudent aspirations (“nothing in excess” - another Delphic axiom).
      e) Courage, fortitude, bravery, daring, personal integrity.
      f) Serenity, humility, equanimity, peace of mind.
      g) Love (most essential one for Christians) of Man for God and of Man for Man.
   2) When he pursues,
      a) A Contemplative, i.e., critically reflective life (see p. 56).
      b) A Creatively Productive life “in accordance with excellence”.
      Is it to be found in the Odyssey - the Journey, or in the Ithaka (see p. 57) - the
      Destination? If in the Odyssey, is seeking it without finding it, sufficient?
   3) When his life is exemplified by an optimal blend of these excellent attributes?

Or, is Man Happy, when he safeguards his personal freedom and independence and so
preserves his individuality and originality as the historian Thucydides (460-400 B.C.)
stated, “The secret of happiness is freedom, and the secret of freedom a brave heart.” Or, when
he truthfully loves as the German poet Johann W. von Goethe (1749-1832) declared,
“Only the soul that loves is happy.” and the Russian author Leo Tolstoy (1828-1910)
remarked, “The only certain happiness in life is to live for others.”

Is our Pursuit of Happiness one of our “Unalienable rights endowed by the Creator.” as
affirmed in the U.S. Declaration of Independence [July 4, 1776]? Does our right to pursue
happiness assure us that we shall attain it, especially since we may not know what it is?

Is Happiness or Unhappiness a simple matter of how Life is perceived subjectively by a
certain person, and not something that is happening objectively to that person?

Is, at times, Unhappiness - Misery - Misfortune the result of calamitous and deplorable
events beyond a person’s control (see p. 58) that can neither be avoided nor evaded?
Happiness versus Unhappiness

“Call him fortunate, whom the end of life,
finds harbored in tranquility.”

“We lean on sticks -
in strength not men but children. ....
In weakness youth and age are one:
The sap sleeps in the unripe bone,
as in the withered. ....
In the gray and brittle years,
old men must walk,
three-footed, weak as babes,
and stray like dreams,
lost in the light of day.”

Aeschylus (525-456 B.C.).
Agamemnon.

“No man may hope to spend his life
untouched by pain and favored to the end.
Some grievances are with us now; others again
Time and the Gods will send.”

Aeschylus (525-456 B.C.).
The Choephoroi.

“There is no time of life, so happy as the days
of innocence, before you know what joy or sorrow are.”

Sophocles (495-406 B.C.).
Ajax.

“Chance rules our lives,
and the future is all unknown.
Best live as best we may, from day to day.”

Show me the man whose happiness was anything
more than illusion followed by disillusion.”

None can be called happy,
until that day when he carries
his happiness down to the grave in peace.”

Sophocles (495-406 B.C.).
King Oedipus.
“No man has ever lived out of the reach,  
of misadventure’s grasping hand.”  

Sophocles (495-406 B.C.).  
Oedipus at Colonus.

“The strongest mind, can not but break,  
under misfortune’s blows.”

“What is the life of man?  
A thing not fixed for good or evil,  
fashioned for praise or blame.  
Chance raises a man to the heights,  
chance casts him down,  
and none can foretell,  
what will be from what is.”

“Of happiness the crown and chiefest part  
is wisdom, and to hold the Gods in awe.  
This is the law that, seeing the stricken heart  
of pride brought down, we learn when we are old.”

Sophocles (495-406 B.C.).  
Antigone.

“You may meet people in every variety  
of fortune and condition;  
but happiness in human life is hard to find.”

“How our lives are tossed about this way and that  
with the shifting gales of fortune and misfortune!”

“For in the end good men receive the reward  
they deserve; but evil natures beget evil fortune;  
and to them happiness can never come.”

Euripides (c. 484-407 B.C.).  
Ion.

“The man who finds his own wealth and security  
a cause of pleasure, is a fool. Those forces which  
control our fortunes are as unpredictable  
as capering idiots. Happiness does not exist.”

“Good fortune means nothing.  
Call no man happy till the day he dies.”

Euripides (c. 484-407 B.C.).  
The Women of Troy.
A very important and exceedingly consequential distinction between:

Western - Occidental - European - Ancient Greek-Roman, “Contemplation”

“The Aristotelian contemplator is a man who has already acquired knowledge; and what he is contemplating is precisely this knowledge already present in his mind. Contemplation is something like a review or survey of existing knowledge; the contemplator is engaged in the orderly inspection of truths, which he already possesses; his task consists in bringing them forward from the recesses of his mind, and arranging them fittingly in the full light of consciousness. .... In this way, contemplation is a quasi-aesthetic appreciation of knowledge and truth. .... A life of unbroken contemplation is something divine: no man can hope to live it for more than a portion of his time, and many men cannot aspire to it at all.” (*)

versus


“Oriental meditation, if I understand it aright, consists essentially in relaxing one’s intellectual muscles and letting the mind roam at random over the vastness of eternity. Such an exercise is designed, in part at least, to gain new insight or knowledge; and to that extent it differs from the Aristotelian exercise. Moreover, it involves a voluntary surrender of intellectual control, whereas Aristotle clearly thinks of contemplation as a consciously directed activity.”


(*) Although it is true that the great majority of adult people are unconcerned about Contemplation - Critical Reflection, namely a ceaseless dialogue with oneself about Humanity’s Essential and Eternal Questions, we should strive to remedy this form of deficiency by encouraging young people like our Students to pursue with much resolve the examined life which is the only kind of human life that is worth living (Socrates, Apology).
“As you set out for Ithaka
hope your road is a long one,
full of adventure, full of discovery.
Laistrygonians, Cyclops,
angry Poseidon -- don’t be afraid of them:
you’ll never find things like that on your way
as long as you keep your thoughts raised high,
as long as a rare excitement
stirs your spirit and your body.
Laistrygonians, Cyclops,
wild Poseidon -- you won’t encounter them
unless you bring them along inside your soul,
unless your soul sets them up in front of you.

Hope your road is a long one.
May there be many summer mornings when,
with what pleasure, what joy,
you enter harbors you’re seeing for the first time;
may you stop at Phoenician trading stations
to buy fine things,
mother of pearl and coral, amber and ebony,
sensual perfume of every kind --
as many sensual perfumes as you can;
and may you visit many Egyptian cities
to learn and go on learning from their scholars.

Keep Ithaka always in your mind.
Arriving there is what you’re destined for.
But don’t hurry the journey at all.
Better if it lasts for years,
so you’re old by the time you reach the island,
wealthy with all you’ve gained on the way,
not expecting Ithaka to make you rich.
Ithaka gave you the marvelous journey.
Without her you wouldn’t have set out.
She has nothing left to give you.

And if you find her poor, Ithaka won’t have fooled you.
Wise as you will have become, so full of experience,
you’ll have understood by then what these Ithakas mean.”

C. P. Cavafy (1863-1933).
Collected Poems.
Translated from Modern Greek by E. Keeley & P. Sherrard.
Edited by George Savidis.
IF THIS IS A MAN, IF THIS IS A WOMAN

“You who live safe,
In your warm houses,
You who find, returning in the evening,
Hot food and friendly faces:
Consider if this is a man,
Who works in the mud,
Who does not know peace,
Who fights for a scrap of bread,
Who dies because of a yes or a no.
Consider if this is a woman,
Without hair and without name,
With no more strength to remember,
Her eyes empty and her womb cold,
Like a frog in winter.
Mediate that this came about:
I commend these words to you.
Carve them in your hearts,
At home, in the street,
Going to bed, rising;
Repeat them to your children,
Or may your house fall apart,
May illness impede you,
May your children turn their faces from you.”

Translated from the Italian by Stuart Woolf.

We must never forget, that there were Fellow Human Beings, who did not have the chance to experience their Odyssey, their Ithaka, however modest and humble those could have been. Sadly enough, never to forget can be for some never to forgive.

“I can’t forget, but I will forgive.”
Nelson Mandela (1918-).

In Contrast to Auschwitz:

“I am not an Athenian or a Greek,
but a ΚΟΣΜΟΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ - a Cosmopolitan - a World Citizen.”

Socrates (469-399 B.C.), as reported by Plutarch (A.D. 46-120).

“My country is the World, my countrymen are all Mankind.”

William Lloyd Garrison (1805-1879), Motto of The Liberator [1831].
(Garrison’s Statue and the above striking Quotation can be found in Boston’s Commonwealth Avenue Mole, a little before Exeter Street).

“Nationalism is the last refuge of the scoundrel.”

Samuel Johnson (1709-1784), Apopthegm.
“We think too much and feel too little.”

EPILOGUE

This is the END of an intellectual Odyssey or Adventure that we embarked upon together, in our courageous efforts to elucidate by means of self-reflection and Dialectic interactions “Human Values As They Relate To Medicine”.

If we were to appraise with much modesty and humility the outcome of our scholarly labors as illustrated by these Seminars, to some extent objectively but certainly to a much greater extent subjectively, we could state without hesitation or evasion that we were able to articulate our thoughts quite clearly and successfully, but we failed to express our feelings as explicitly as we would have wished, a condition that has often resulted in provocation rather than in persuasion. This outcome has resulted first, from the rational approach as pursued by the Ancient Greek Philosophers who advocated Reason over Faith that we have employed in our efforts which is suited for issues of Thinking rather than for matters of Believing or Feeling, and second, from the biased notion by many that the Hatred and Bigotry of the contemporary world is to a large extent caused by religious convictions, whereas it has been proven on the contrary that Love and Peace have always been the core Values of the teachings of all great Religions which have played a central role in social reform and a more equitable human life.

This is why we must now state clearly and unequivocally, that we are acutely aware that in the province of Human Values and the kind of acceptable or unacceptable Human Behavior that results from them, the power of Rational Argument is often not as potent or as effective as Religious Faith and the broadly approved Cultural Norms that the German Philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) had called the “objective spirit”, which by advocating love, mercy, charity, kindness and compassion (the former), or what is appalling, shameful, utterly intolerable and hence forbidden (the latter), encourage ethical, decent, behavior (the former), or restrain bad, evil, wicket conduct (the latter), which in synergistic interaction usually but not always overcome prejudice and encourage justice that results in comforting and aiding the many afflicted. This outcome was amply demonstrated by the struggle for Civil Rights in the U.S.A., which was wisely guided by the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. who truly believed in Nonviolence and the Love and Brotherhood among all Men (see pp. 31-33), a valiant contest that is accurately and beautifully documented in two books: “The Autobiography” by Martin Luther King, Jr., and “A Stone of Hope” by David L. Chappell.

Although this is the END of our present Seminars, it can hopefully be a new BEGINNING, which will inspire each one of you who partook in these intellectual encounters, to continue your explorations by yourselves and with Kindred Spirits in trying to understand the True Nature and Innate Dignity of Man, by answering as well as you possibly can some of Humanity’s Essential and Eternal Questions, since as the foremost ancient philosopher Socrates (see p. 3) stated so concisely and candidly:

“An unexamined life is not worth living.”

Good luck to you in your efforts, but just as important, do enjoy doing what you are doing, for as Euripides said so very wisely in his magnificent tragedy The Bacchae:

“He who best enjoys each passing day is truly blest.”
“Great things can not be achieved without great effort; only a fool would dream of it.”

Euripides (c. 484-407 B.C.).
Orestes.

But there is always another side to a Life’s story.

“....
You’ve never walked in that man’s shoes
Or saw things through his eyes
Or stood and watched with helpless hands
While the heart inside you dies ....”

Hank Williams (1923-1953).
Men With Broken Hearts [1951].
Physicians, like Soldiers fighting for Freedom and Independence, must be inspired by Honor and Duty

“No Retreat, No Surrender.”

Spartan King Leonidas (540-480 B.C.) to his Soldiers.

“Go tell the Spartans, you who pass by, that here, obedient to their Laws, we lie.”

Simonides (c. 556-468 B.C.).
Fragment 92.

Epitaph for the Spartan King Leonidas and his small army of three hundred men, all of whom died fighting to hold the narrow pass at Thermopylae (see p. 62), against the immense army of Medes - Persians invading Greece in the year 480 B.C.

“.... It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us -- that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion -- that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain -- that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom -- and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.”

Abraham Lincoln (1809-1865).
Address at Gettysburg.
[November 19, 1863].
THERMOPYLAE

“Honor to those who in the life they lead define and guard a Thermopylae. Never betraying what is right, consistent and just in all they do but showing pity also, and compassion; generous when they’re rich, and when they are poor, still generous in small ways, still helping as much as they can; always speaking the truth, yet without hating those who lie.

And even more honor is due to them when they foresee (as many do foresee) that Ephialtis will turn up in the end, that the Medes will break through after all.”

C. P. Cavafy (1863-1933).
Collected Poems.
Translated from Modern Greek by E. Keeley & P. Sherrard.
Edited by George Savidis.
DEATH IS ALWAYS THE ULTIMATE VICTOR - VANQUISHER

“For all things are born
to change and pass away and perish,
that others in their turn may come to be.”

Marcus Aurelius (121-180).
Meditations, Book 12, Segment 21.
Translated from Latin by M. Staniforth.
Penguin Classics.

CANDLES

“Days to come stand in front of us
like a row of burning candles --
golden, warm, and vivid candles.
Days past fall behind us,
a gloomy line of burnt-out candles;
the nearest are still smoking,
cold, melted, and bent.
I do not want to look at them: their shape saddens me,
and it saddens me to remember their original light.
I look ahead at my burning candles.
I don’t want to turn, don’t want to see, terrified,
how quickly that dark line gets longer,
how quickly one more dead candle joins another.”

C. P. Cavafy (1863-1933).
Collected Poems.
Translated from Modern Greek
by E. Keeley & P. Sherrard.
Edited by George Savidis.

“Before my birth there was infinite time,
and after my death, inexhaustible time.
I never thought of it before:
I’d been living luminously
between two eternities of darkness.”

Orhan Pamuk (1952-).
My Name Is Red, page 3.
Translated from Turkish
by Erdag M. Goknar.
“Things won are done; joy’s soul lies in the doing.”

William Shakespeare (1564-1616).
*Troilus and Cressida* [1601-1603],
*Act I, scene ii, line 310.*

“The melancholia of everything completed!”

Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche (1844-1900).
*Beyond God and Evil* [1885-1886], IX, 277.
Translated by Helen Zimmern.
ADDENDUM I

PREREQUISITES FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING

The first prerequisite for excellence in teaching, is that the teacher possesses true knowledge. The teacher will receive the unswerving respect, and admiration of intelligent and demanding students, when he or she is perceived as being at the cutting edge, of a particular kind of human endeavor. Namely, the teacher must be knowledgeable, of the objective facts and of their interconnections, that is to say, of how the facts relate to each other, and to the broader human knowledge. Moreover, the good teacher must be capable, of distilling the essence of the facts from the fictions, so that they can be revealed in their esthetic simplicity, and also, of determining their relative weight, in order for their importance to be ascertained. Intelligent and demanding students, will have additional admiration for their teacher, if he or she is not reluctant to admit ignorance, while at the same time is actively engaged, in pushing back the endless frontiers of human knowledge, by defining the important issues, and raising the answerable questions. Likewise, students will have a special affection, for the teacher who has an historical perspective, namely one who knows how the facts were acquired, and can bring to life the human adventure, the sweat and the tears, of men and women who overcame the failures, the disappointments, and the negative intellectual currents, until they reached their final destination, which we call discovery.

Although possession of true knowledge by the teacher, is very necessary for excellence in teaching, it is by no means a sufficient condition. To accomplish indisputable excellence, a second prerequisite is required, namely, that the teacher must have the capacity to transmit knowledge to the students, with a high degree of effectiveness. The main elements of effectiveness are: enthusiasm combined with skepticism. - Enthusiasm is contagious, it stimulates in the students a loving and
positive attitude toward new and exciting knowledge.
- Skepticism, on the other hand, encourages the disciplined and disinterested mind, to stay cool, to doubt, to raise questions, and to look at human knowledge in terms of an enigmatic past and an unpredictable future.

The third prerequisite for excellence in teaching, is the capacity of the good teacher, to communicate to the students that teaching is fun. This can be accomplished by showing a sense of humor, which is entertaining while it is instructive, and by pointing out that the reward in teaching, lies in the act itself, namely that a creatively productive human contact was made. The good teacher will encourage the Students moreover, to anticipate that the best in their lives is yet to come, that they can travel toward distant and wide horizons, strictly of their own free choosing, where unanticipated "surprise", the greatest of human joys, awaits them.

The fourth prerequisite relates to the teacher's inner moral compass - moral conviction, or viewed more broadly, ethical vision. The main elements are: kindness, civility, humility and decency, personal integrity, intellectual honesty, and lack of any pretentiousness, while refraining from embarrassing or humiliating others. These human qualities, teach not by words, but by the force of the personal example, and represent the majesty of the human spirit. They generate the kind of warmth and genuine concern, that bring the students closer to their teacher, while, at the same time, protect them from a "moth and flame" relationship. They help also to erase in students any distorted sense of self importance, while inspiring in them self trust and self confidence.

The fifth and perhaps final prerequisite, does not relate to the teacher. It is an expression of the attitude of the students, toward their learning experience. No student will achieve excellence, no matter how original and penetrating a mind he or she possesses, without hard work and hard thinking, without commitment and self discipline, without patience, persistence, and perseverance. No student will reach great understanding
of the world at large,
without intellectual curiosity,
without passionate devotion and dedication.
No student will ever succeed,
in changing the world for the better,
without stubborn idealism,
without human passion, as well as compassion.
Of course, no student, no young person,
should contemplate reaching for the stars,
unless he or she is well aware,
of the cost of the venture,
when undertaking the adventure.

But as time goes by, and the student and the teacher
become better aware of their true relationship,
they will both come to realize the simple truth,
that there are no major differences between them,
other than their respective - particular age.
In the final analysis, each one of us,
is both a teacher and a student, a giver and a receiver.
This plain fact is what makes teaching,
such a rewarding experience.
Namely, accepting the opportunity
that we are offered as teachers,
to inspire in our students
a Love for Wisdom or “Philosophy”,
which, like a spark of fire,
can be kindled by them into a flame,
that will be transmitted .... to their students,
and by those .... to theirs,
so that finally, we may hope,
perhaps against all doubts and skepticism,
that something of our very own self,
will live on, at least for a little while,
as a tiny part of the indestructible human spirit.
Then, and only then, we can console ourselves,
and accept with some equanimity and serenity,
that we have not lived, entirely in vain,
in a seemingly pointless and meaningless world.

G. D.

This Essay is illustrated by the biographical
sketch of Dr. John F. Enders (see pp. 69-74).
A CLARIFICATION

To the foregoing Thesis of the PREREQUISITES FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING, there is an Antithesis, e.g.,

“The authority of those who profess to teach, is often a positive hindrance to those who desire to learn; they cease to employ their own judgment, and take what they perceive to be the verdict of their chosen Master as settling the question.”

Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 B.C.).

which is the opposite or contradiction of the Thesis.

It will be then up to the intelligent person, to reconcile or compromise between this Thesis and its Antithesis, by Logical Analysis of their Pros and Cons, and arrive at a Synthesis of what is most reasonable, which will be a new Thesis, that will in turn have its Antithesis, .... and so on, and so forth.

At times however, a Thesis, e.g., “.... in the image of God made he man” (Genesis 9:6, King James Version [1611]). versus its Antithesis, e.g., “Gods are the Human personifications of Natural Phenomena” (see p. 39) and may not be reconcilable by Logical Analysis of their Pros and Cons into a Synthesis which will be a new Thesis, because either one or both of the opposing views is/are based on Faith - Belief that is subjective, rather than on Reason than could be objective.

This “Thesis versus Antithesis” approach of discussing and reasoning by means of dialogue as a method of intellectual investigation that seeks to expose false beliefs and elicit the truth, was invented by Zeno of Elea - one of the disciples of Parmenides. It was systematically practiced and further developed by the ancient Greek philosopher Socrates on account of which it is generally known as the Socratic method or dialectic. It was gradually perfected by the German Philosopher Georg W. F. Hegel (1770-1831), which is the reason why it is often identified by his name as the Hegelian dialectic. Yet, it must be emphasized that the principal defect of the dialectic is its strict reliance on logical reasoning at the expense of genuine facts, provided of course that such facts exist and that they can be verified as being accurate by empirical scrutiny.
ADDENDUM II

DR. JOHN F. ENDERS, THE IDEAL TEACHER

“A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops.”

Henry Brooks Adams (1838-1918).
The Education of Henry Adams [1907].

It is sad but inevitable that the younger generation of the Harvard Medical School Faculty, but much more so of the Students, know very little about the Men and Women who were/are responsible for the stellar reputation of this Professional School. The fault lies not so much with them, but with the older generation of the Faculty who although many of them worked - labored very closely with some of these most illustrious, Physicians, Physician-Scientists, Scientists, and therefore came to know them intimately, both as Academicians and also as Fellow Human Beings, have not troubled themselves to transmit this knowledge to others. One such Scientist was Dr. John F. Enders, who enlightened many young men and women who had apprenticed with him during his long professional career at Harvard, not only on “how to pursue biomedical research”, but also and just as important on “how to pursue the good life”. If a rare reader of this biographical sketch feels that it sounds more like a “Hagiography” by an adoring former pupil, so be it. The fact is that Dr. Enders was a truly Saintly (Gr. Hagios) Man.

Dr. John F. Enders (Photograph taken in 1965)
**John Franklin Enders, Ph.D.**, was a member of the Department of Bacteriology and Immunology, at Harvard Medical School from 1930 until 1967, when he became University Professor Emeritus, finally retiring in 1977 at the age of eighty. He died September 8, 1985, at the age of eighty-eight.

Dr. Enders was a truly Great Scientist, having made many important discoveries, three for which he is best remembered:  
i) he succeeded in growing poliomyelitis virus in non-nervous tissue cells *in vitro*, which led to the development of the Salk and the Sabin vaccines against paralytic poliomyelitis, and for which he shared the Nobel Prize with his two young Research Associates, Dr. Frederick C. Robbins and Dr. Thomas H. Weller. 
ii) he was the first to isolate the measles virus, which allowed for the development of the measles vaccine. 
iii) he was the first to demonstrated that a virus which is oncogenic in experimental animals can transform human cells *in vitro.*

Another, and just as important contribution of Dr. Enders, who was affectionately and warmly addressed as “Chief” by the English-speaking or as “Chef” by the French-speaking Research Fellows in his Research Laboratory, was that he trained close to one hundred Physician - Scientists from all over the world, with the majority having come from North America, in the *Art and Science* of Virological - Biomedical Research. One of them was Dr. Gajdusek who received the Nobel Prize, for his work on Kuru - a fatal Neurodegenerative disease, while most of the others achieved prominent academic positions in prestigious Medical Schools including that of Harvard.

These greatly successful Scientific accomplishments, had profound Human - Clinical implications, that resulted in the almost complete eradication of both Poliomyelitis and Measles from the entire World, were the outcome of Dr. Enders having possessed:  
- active but disciplined imagination,  
- crystalline judgment,  
- intellectual honesty and integrity, qualities that allowed him to seek knowledge, reflectively and with disinterested objectivity. Yet, the brilliance of his creative mind, was always balanced by a passion of his heart, in the form of dedication and devotion to his work, and by the realization of the importance of patience, persistence, and perseverance, in his pursuit of scientific excellence.
But those of us who had the chance to observe him closely, are mindful of the fact that his being a Great Scientist, was only a small part of what he was as a Man. So, I will try to tell you now, as briefly and as clearly as I possibly can, what Dr. Enders - the Man, has meant to me, for I came to know him quite well during my four years (1963-67) as his Postdoctoral Research Fellow, and particularly during the subsequent years, especially after his retirement in 1977, when I often visited him at his home, to be warmed by his fellowship, to be enlightened by his wisdom.

Let me start by saying that Dr. Enders was a Great Human Being, a distinctly unique person:
-- first, for who he was,
-- second, for what he did for others,
-- third, for what he expected in return, and
-- lastly, for what he has meant to me, personally.

First, and foremost, Dr. Enders was an extremely kind, an incredibly gentle and a profoundly charming man, at peace with himself, and not at war with others. This was because his mind, his heart, and his body, lived in complete harmony with each other. Namely, he thought, he felt, he spoke, and he acted, in a consistent manner, which was the result of the balance between: a brilliant intellect and a strong ethical instinct, that were always expressed most actively, as clarity of vision and integrity of character.

Second, and just as important, Dr. Enders believed, that the door to personal happiness opens outwardly, and he proved this conviction by offering you, - courtesy and civility,
- compassion and concern,
- understanding and tolerance. He taught you, in other words, by the moral force of his personal example, that what you give to others, unselfishly and without an ulterior motive, is the only thing that you truly possess. Material possessions, on the other hand, he would say should be of little value to a sensible person, because, as Shakespeare had stated long ago "Nothing you can call your own but Death."
He was also very much aware, 
that he had neither the wisdom nor the insight, 
to know what will make another person happy. 
So, he gave you his advice, 
without demanding obedience, 
he gave you a prescription, 
without offering you a remedy or a cure, 
which meant that he did not attempt to make you, 
a prisoner of his own expectations of you. 
On the contrary, you had to dream your dreams, 
define you longings, and find the will and stamina, 
to accomplish their fulfillment and their realization. 
He would warn you nonetheless, 
by quoting from the dramatist Euripides, that 
"To do the wrong deed for the right end, always leads to disaster."

Other times, however, 
when he was more analytical about Human Values, 
he would admit with sadness and distress, that quite often, 
the conflict in human affairs is not between good *versus* evil, 
but between two goods of equal but opposing forces, 
like the conflict beautifully depicted in the tragedy *Antigone* 
by the dramatist Sophocles, between King Creon, 
who stubbornly and doggedly believed in the 
Supremacy of and Respect for the Secular Laws, 
no matter how rigid, harsh, or cruel they might be, and 
his niece Antigone, who just as tenaciously and adamantly 
believed in the Love of Sacred Justice, 
which for some is a reflection of Divine Love, 
namely compassion, charity, mercy, forgiveness. 
So, choosing between two conflicting Goods, he would say, 
where there is no prospect for compromise and reconciliation 
between the opposing individuals or groups, 
will always lead to human tragedy and disaster.

Dr. Enders was always available 
in case you needed him, in case you had lost 
your bearings or had lost your nerve. 
He would let you know gently but firmly, 
without patronizing you, 
and without any condescension, 
while looking at you 
with his penetrating blue eyes, 
- that to admit the possibility of defeat, 
is, to some extent, to be defeated, 
- that to feel that the future may no longer be yours, 
is to live in an irrelevant past, 
and then, he will paraphrase Winston Churchill who said, 
"Your darkest hour may be your finest hour."
But the most important advice that he would offer you, when he found you contemplating quitting in your pursuits of scientific truth, was that only serious Illness or Death should make one avoid or evade doing his ultimate duty (see p. 61), i.e., giving up defending his Thermopylae (see p. 62). No one, or nothing, must be allowed to make you surrender, because as Einstein had said, "The important thing in Science is not to stop questioning."

And this made you want, to turn another page in the book of your life, to start another chapter, to go on, to continue, and not to give up, because as Tennyson, one of his favorite English Poets said in his Ulysses: "How dull it is to pause, to make an end, to rust unburnish’d, not to shine in use! as tho’ to breathe were life!” .... "To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

Third, Dr. Enders was the kind of a person who, when you had won your battles, and you wanted to thank him for his help and support, he would tell you with genuine humility, that you owed him .... nothing. The victory, however small or large, was yours and yours alone. His own reward was knowing, that you had realized at least one of you dreams, one of your hopes, one of your aspirations. But there was much, much more, work to be done, no time therefore to rest, no time for self praise.

And then he would share with you, a feeling that was always very close to his heart, namely, that the ultimate victory of the reflective person, is not to win wealth, power, prizes, praise, but to win peace with oneself, by taming the enemies within, namely selfishness, envy, hatred, cruelty, greed, so that each one of us, could live nobly and virtuously, as a true human being should aspire to live. Otherwise, he would add, as St. Matthew the Evangelist had said long ago, "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul.”
Lastly, for someone like myself, who had the privilege and the honor to come to know Dr. Enders, somewhat intimately, although not too intimately, for he was a very private person, I can say without any hesitation, that I will always remember him, for the grace of his spirit, and the warmth of his heart.

But, as the song laments rather sorrowfully, "He is gone, and the world moves on." Yet, the glow of his light, which will always remain in the hearts of those of us who knew him and loved him, can be passed on to others, like yourselves who read these somewhat inadequate words, so that a little part of this truly noble man, this supremely civilized and honorable man, can live on, in each one of us, as a beautiful inspiration, as a radiant vision.

In closing, and trusting that I will not appear presumptuous or irreverent
to great Teachers of the recent or the remote past,
I want to say about Dr. Enders who was my beloved and much adored Teacher, Mentor, Friend,
what the philosopher Plato said in his Dialogue Phaedo twenty-five centuries ago about Socrates, who was his beloved and much adored Teacher, Mentor, Friend: "He was the bravest, wisest and most just Man, of all those whom I ever knew in my time."

G. D.
“To be a philosopher is not merely to have subtle thoughts, nor even to found a school, but so to love wisdom as to live accordingly to its dictates, a life of simplicity, independence, magnanimity, and trust.”

Henry David Thoreau (1817-1862). Walden [1854], 1, Economy.

“ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑ ΒΙΟΥ ΚΥΒΕΡΝΗΣ.”

“PHILOSOPHY LIFE’S GUIDE.”

ΦΒΚ, An American Undergraduate Honorary Society.
A Message by “The Father of Medicine”

"Life is short. (*)
The Art long.
Opportunity instant.
Experience perilous.
Judgment difficult."

Hippocrates (c. 460-370 B.C.).
[First] Aphorism.

Two fundamentally different points of view:
The Western - Individualistic, “Life is short.” (*)
The Eastern - Collective, “Life is long, it continues, it never ends.”
CLOSING COMMENTS

A Cosmic Perspective

In order for Life to exist, the environment in which it originates and survives has to fulfill exacting physical (temperature), chemical (oxygen, nitrogen) and biological constraints, e.g., planet Earth supports Life successfully because it orbits the blazing Sun at an optimal distance from it, sustains a suitable atmosphere, contains organic - carbon compounds and surface liquid water, prerequisites not present on planets Mercury and Venus or Mars and Jupiter, as a result of which Life can not exist on them.

If these very essential conditions for Life’s origin and survival were not found on planet Earth, then Biological Life --> Human Life --> Mind --> Values, i.e., Philosophical - Ethical - Esthetic which are purely Human Concepts that are of great Merit exclusively to Humans could not have occurred, and if this state of affairs were representative of the whole Universe, then as the ancient Greek philosopher Empedocles (c. 495-435 B.C.) stated more than twenty-five centuries ago, Chance and Necessity rather than Design and Purpose rule supreme.

Since these conclusions are based on experience and logical thinking rather than inspired by divine revelation and religious faith, the reality of the former is verifiable and often revisable while that of the latter is absolute and thus eternal, which suggests that most likely the valiant human effort to reconcile the two is an exercise in futility, and hence the formulation of suitable questions (*) instead of the discovering of final answers should be the enduring activity to be favored by inquisitive rational Humans.

G. D.

(*) See comment by British philosopher Bertrand Russell on p. 4.
“No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; .... any man’s death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.”

John Donne (1572-1631). Devotions upon Emergent Occasions [1624].
“What is God?  
Everything.”

Pindar (c. 518-438 B.C.).  
*Fragment, 140d.*
THE END

ГЕОРГИОС ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΔΙΑΜΑΝΤΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ Ο ΚΡΗΣ ΕΠΟΙΕΙ.