

## তৰ্ক আৰু আলোচনা চক্ৰ বিভাগৰ সম্পাদিকাৰ প্ৰতিবেদন

বুলনিত বকো জয়হৰলাল নেহৰু মহাবিদ্যালয়ৰ 'তৰ্ক আৰু আলোচনা চক্ৰ' বিভাগৰ সম্পাদিকা পদত বিনা প্ৰতিদ্বন্দ্বিতাই কাৰ্যনিৰ্বাহ কৰিবলৈ সুযোগ দিয়া ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰী বন্ধু-বান্ধৱী সকললৈ মোৰ কৃতজ্ঞতাৰ শব্দই যাচিছে।

তৰ্ক, আলোচনা চক্ৰ তথা কুইজৰ পৰিসৰ বৰ বহল। জ্ঞান পিপাসুসকলৰ এক মনোবন্ম বিষয় হল তৰ্ক, আলোচনা চক্ৰ আৰু কুইজ। এই তিনিটা বিষয়ৰ ওপৰত দখল বাখিবলৈ হলে লাগে গভীৰ অধ্যয়ণ, সমগ্ৰ জগতখনৰ সম্যক জ্ঞান তথা প্ৰতিদ্বন্দ্বিতাৰ বা-বাতৰিবৰ ওপৰত বিশেষ দৃষ্টিপাত প্ৰয়োজন। আচলতে তৰ্ক, আলোচনা চক্ৰ আৰু কুইজ প্ৰতিযোগিতাৰ জৰিয়তে ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰীসকলৰ প্ৰতিভাৰ উমান পোৱা যায়। বেডিঙ, টেলিভিচন যাত্ৰাৰ কাকত আৰু আলোচনী আদিয়ে এইবোৰত বিশেষ প্ৰভাৱ পেলোৱা দেখা যায়। আজিকালি এইবোৰৰ প্ৰতিযোগিতা সকলোতে অনুষ্ঠিত

হোৱা দেখা যায়।

মহাবিদ্যালয় সপ্তাহতেই ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰীসকলে তৰ্ক, আলো-চনা চক্ৰ, কুইজ, অৰ্বুতি আৰু আকাশিক বক্তৃতা প্ৰতি-যোগিতা আদিত নিজ নিজ প্ৰতিভা দেখুৱাবলৈ সুযোগ পায়। এই বেলিও তাৰ ব্যতিক্ৰম হোৱা নাছিল। আন আন বছৰতকৈ এই বেলি আটাইকেইটি প্ৰতিযোগিতাত সৰ্বাধিক সংখ্যক ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰীয়ে অংশ গ্ৰহণ কৰিছিল।

মোৰ এই কাৰ্য-কালত নানা ধৰণৰ সহায়-সহযোগিতা, লগতে গঠনমূলক পৰামৰ্শ আগবঢ়াই মোৰ কাৰ্যকাল চলাই নিয়াত সহায় কৰাৰ বাবে ভাবপ্ৰাপ্ত অধ্যাপক মঃ মজিবব ৰহমান চাবলৈ মোৰ শ্ৰদ্ধা আৰু কৃতজ্ঞতা জ্ঞাপন কৰিছো, লগতে একতা সভাৰ সমূহ সদস্যবৃন্দলৈ মোৰ মৰম আৰু কৃতজ্ঞতা যাচিলোঁ।

সদৌ শেষত জয়হৰলাল নেহৰু মহাবিদ্যালয়ৰ উজ্জ্বল ভৱিষ্যৎ কামনা কৰিলোঁ।

জয়ন্তু জয়হৰলাল নেহৰু মহাবিদ্যালয়।

মিচ্. মৌৰা মহন্ত  
সম্পাদিকা

তৰ্ক আৰু আলোচনা চক্ৰ

## খেলা বিভাগৰ সম্পাদকৰ প্ৰতিবেদন

জয় জয়তে জৱাহৰলাল নেহৰু মহাবিদ্যালয়  
একতা সভাৰ ১৯৮৮-৮৯ চনৰ খেলা বিভাগৰ সম্পাদকৰ  
পদত অধিষ্ঠিত কৰা বাবে মহাবিদ্যালয়ৰ সমূহ  
ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰীকে মোৰ আন্তৰিক ধন্যবাদ জন'লে'।  
শিক্ষা আহৰণৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰীসকলৰ মানসিক আৰু  
শাৰীৰিক সুস্থতাৰ নিত্যসুস্থই প্ৰয়োজন। খেলা ধূলীই  
শাৰীৰিক উৎকৰ্ষ সাধন কৰিব পাৰে। এনে প্ৰয়োজনী-  
য়তাৰ কথা ভাবিয়েই বোধহয় শিক্ষানুষ্ঠানত খেল-ধেমালিক  
পাঠ্য-বহিৰ্ভূত বিষয় হিচাপে বখা হয়। খেল-ধেমালিক  
সা-সজুলি কম পৰিমাণে হলেও আমাৰ মহাবিদ্যালয়ত  
লক্ষ্য নহয়, কিন্তু ইবোৰৰ ব্যৱস্থাৰ খুব কমেই হয়।  
বছৰটোৰ নিৰ্দ্ধাৰিত সময়খিনি ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰীয়ে শ্ৰেণীৰ পাঠ-  
গ্ৰহণত ব্যস্ত থাকিব লাগে। খেল-ধেমালিকৰ অনুশীলনৰ  
বাবে প্ৰয়োজনীয় সহায় তেনেকৈ নাপায়। কেৱল  
বছৰটোৰ শেষত 'মহাবিদ্যালয় সপ্তাহ'টোত মুষ্টিমেয়  
ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰীয়ে খেলাৰ সা-সজুলিবোৰৰ লগত নতুনকৈ  
চিনাকি হয়। এনে ধৰণৰ পালমৰা ব্যৱস্থাৰ পৰা খেলা  
ধূলীৰ মান উন্নত কৰিব পৰা নাযায়।

পতানুগতিক ভাবে মোৰ কাৰ্যকাল ছোৱাভো

'মহাবিদ্যালয় সপ্তাহ' পালন কৰা হৈছিল। সীমিত  
সংখ্যক ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰীয়ে বিভিন্ন খেলাৰ অংশ গ্ৰহণ কৰি  
নিজৰ শ্ৰুতিভাৱ পৰিচয় দিবলৈ সক্ষম হৈছিল। আমি  
লক্ষ্য কৰিছো, অংশ গ্ৰহণকাৰী খেলুৱৈ ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰী সকলৰ  
ভালেমানে সুবিধা পালে আৰু নিৰ্দ্ধাৰিত ভাবে অনুশীলন  
কৰিলে দক্ষ খেলুৱৈ হব পাৰিব। তেওঁলোকলৈ আমাৰ  
শুভেচ্ছা থাকিল। 'মহাবিদ্যালয় সপ্তাহ'ৰ পিছত কোনো  
ধৰণৰ খেল-ধেমালিকৰ উল্লেখযোগ্য অনুষ্ঠান পাতিব পৰা  
নাই। নানা বেমেজালিৰ বাবে অভয়াপুৰীত অনুষ্ঠিত আশু  
মহাবিদ্যালয় ফুটবল প্ৰতিযোগিতাত অংশ গ্ৰহণ কৰিব  
পৰা মগল। তাৰ বাবে মই লজ্জিত।

সন্দোশেষত 'মহাবিদ্যালয় সপ্তাহ'ত খেল-ধেমালিক  
পৰিচালনা কৰাৰ ক্ষেত্ৰত দিহা পৰামৰ্শ দি সহায় কৰা  
বাবে ভাৰপ্ৰাপ্ত অধ্যাপক শ্ৰীযুত মদন চন্দ্ৰ কাকতি  
দেৱলৈ কৃতজ্ঞতা জনালে'। লগতে যিসকল অধ্যাপক-  
অধ্যাপিকা আৰু ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰীয়ে মোক নানা ধৰণে দিহা-  
পৰামৰ্শ আৰু সহায় আগবঢ়ালে তেখেত সকললৈও মোৰ  
কৃতজ্ঞতা জনালে'। \* \* \*

শ্ৰীলক্ষণ ৰাভা  
সম্পাদক, খেলা-বিভাগ।

## ছাত্ৰ জিৱণি কোঠাৰ সম্পাদকৰ প্ৰতিবেদন

বকো জৱাহৰলাল নেহৰু মহাবিদ্যালয়ৰ একতা সভাৰ ১৯৫৮-৫৯ চনৰ ছাত্ৰ জিৱণি-কোঠাৰ সম্পাদকৰ পদৰ বাবে বিনা-প্ৰতিদ্বন্দ্বিতাবে মোক নিৰ্বাচিত কৰা বাবে মহাবিদ্যালয়ৰ সমূহ ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰী বন্ধু বান্ধৱীক মোৰ আন্তৰিক ধন্যবাদ জ্ঞাপন কৰিলোঁ। ছাত্ৰ জিৱণি-কোঠাৰ সম্পাদক হিচাপে মই ভালোখিনি অসুবিধা ভোগ কৰিছিলোঁ ; বিশেষকৈ ছাত্ৰৰ সংখ্যা অনুপাতে আমাৰ মহাবিদ্যালয়ত পৰ্যাপ্ত পৰিমাণৰ সুবিধাৰে এটি আহল-বহল জিৱণি কোঠাৰ অভাব এতিয়াও পূৰণ হোৱা নাই। কৰ্তৃপক্ষক এই বিষয়ে মোৰ পূৰ্ববৰ্তী সম্পাদক সকলেও দৃষ্টি গোচৰ কৰি আহিছে। আমি বিশ্বাস বাখিছো মহাবিদ্যালয়ৰ কৰ্তৃপক্ষই এই বিষয়ত সতৰ্ক দৃষ্টি বাখিছে আৰু ভৱিষ্যতলৈ এই অভাব পূৰণ কৰিব পাবিব। সীমিত সা-সুবিধা খিনিকেই ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰী বন্ধু-বান্ধৱী সকলে সংস্বাৰহাৰ কৰিব বুলি আশা কৰিলোঁ।

বিগত বছৰবোৰৰ দৰেই এই বোলিও জানুৱাৰী মাহৰ ৪ তাৰিখৰ পৰা ১০ তাৰিখলৈ "মহাবিদ্যালয় সপ্তাহ" ঔলহ-মালহেৰে অনুষ্ঠিত কৰা হয়। কেৱম, বেডমিণ্টন আদি খেলাৰ

আয়োজন কৰা হৈছিল আৰু এই খেল সমূহত ভালে সংখ্যক ছাত্ৰই অংশ গ্ৰহণ কৰিছিল। কেৱম খেলত অংশ গ্ৰহণকাৰীসকলে কিছু পাৰদৰ্শিতা দেখুৱাব পাবিছিল যদিও বেডমিণ্টনত আমাৰ ছাত্ৰ-বন্ধুসকলৰ খেলৰ মানদণ্ড বৰ এটা শলাগিবলগীয়া নাছিল। আশা কৰোঁ ভৱিষ্যতলৈ অংশ গ্ৰহণকাৰীসকলে নিজকে প্ৰস্তুত কৰি সকলো প্ৰতিযোগিতাত অংশ গ্ৰহণ কৰিব।

সদৌ শেষত মোৰ কাৰ্যকাল ছোৱাত সকলো প্ৰকাৰে সহায় আগবঢ়োৱাৰ বাবে ভাৰপ্ৰাপ্ত অধ্যাপক শ্ৰীযুত মৃগেন্দ্ৰ কুমাৰ শৰ্ম্মাদেৱক মোৰ কৃতজ্ঞতা জ্ঞাপন কৰিলোঁ। লগতে জানি যি সকল অধ্যাপক-অধ্যাপিকা আৰু ছাত্ৰ বন্ধুৱে বিভিন্ন প্ৰকাৰে সহায় কৰিলে তেখেত সকলোলৈকেও মোৰ কৃতজ্ঞতা থাকিল।

শ্ৰীবাবুল ডেকা

সম্পাদক

ছাত্ৰ জিৱণি কোঠা।

## ছাত্ৰী জিৰণি-কোঠাৰ সম্পাদিকাৰ প্ৰতিবেদন

সমাজ এখনক সৰ্বাঙ্গ সুন্দৰ কৰি গঢ়ি তোলাত মানুহে বিভিন্ন ধৰণেৰে অবদান আগবঢ়াব পাৰে। ময়ো জৱাহৰলাল নেহৰু মহাবিদ্যালয়লৈ সেৱা আগবঢ়াব খুজিছিলোঁ। ছাত্ৰী জিৰণি কোঠাৰ সম্পাদিকা বূপে। মোৰ আশাৰ প্ৰতি সহাৰি দি ১৯৮৮-৮৯ চনৰ মহাবিদ্যালয় একতা সভালৈ ছাত্ৰী জিৰণি কোঠাৰ সম্পাদিকা বূপে মোক নিৰ্বাচিত কৰা বাবে সমূহ বন্ধু-বান্ধবীলৈ মোৰ আন্তৰিক ধন্যবাদ জনাইছোঁ।

ছাত্ৰী জিৰণি-কোঠাৰ সম্পাদিকাৰ দায়িত্ব পালন কৰিবলৈ গৈ মই ভালোখিনি অসুবিধাৰ সন্মুখীন হ'ব লগীয়াত পৰিছিলো। ছাত্ৰী সংখ্যা অনুপাতে আমাৰ মহাবিদ্যালয়ত প্ৰয়োজনীয় সা-সামগ্ৰীৰে সৈতে আহল-বহল জিৰণি কোঠাৰ আৱশ্যক। কিন্তু মোৰ কাৰ্যকালত এটি সৰু কোঠা, তাকৰীয়া আচৰাব তথা সীমিত সুবিধাৰ মাজেৰেই কামত আগবাঢ়িব লগাত পৰিছিলো। ভবিষ্যতলৈ এই অসুবিধাখিনি আতাৰিব বুলি আশা কৰিলো।

কাৰ্যভাৰ গ্ৰহণ কৰাৰ পিছতে জানুৱাৰীৰ ৪ তাৰিখৰ পৰা ১০ তাৰিখলৈ “মহাবিদ্যালয় সপ্তাহ” অনুষ্ঠিত হৈ যায়। সৌভাগ্যৰ কথা যে আন আন বছৰতকৈ এইবৈলি প্ৰতিযোগিতাসমূহত প্ৰতিযোগীৰ সংখ্যা কিছু পৰিমাণে বৃদ্ধি পাইছিল আৰু প্ৰতিযোগিতাসমূহৰ মানদণ্ডও কিছু উন্নত হৈছিল।

মোৰ কাৰ্য-কাল ছোৱাত বিভাগীয় তত্ত্বাৰ্থায়িকা শ্ৰীমতী বিনম্মা দেৱী বাইদেউ প্ৰমুখ্যে মাননীয় শিক্ষাগুৰু সকলৰ দিহা-পৰামৰ্শ আৰু বন্ধু বান্ধবীৰ সহায় সহযোগিতাৰ বাবে মোৰ কৃতজ্ঞতাৰ শৰাই আগবঢ়ালে।

সদৌ শেষত মোৰ ভুল-কুটিৰ বাবে ক্ষমা বিচাৰি মহাবিদ্যালয়ৰ উন্নতি কামনা কৰিলোঁ।

মিচ মধুমিতা দাস  
সম্পাদিকা,  
ছাত্ৰী জিৰণি-কোঠা।

## সমাজ-সেৱা বিভাগৰ সম্পাদকৰ প্ৰতিবেদন

প্ৰতিবেদনৰ পাতনিতে জগ্ৰাহবলাল নেহৰু মহাবিদ্যালয়ৰ ১৯৮৮-৮৯ চনৰ একতা সভাৰ কাৰ্য-নিৰ্বাহক পৰিষদৰ সমাজ সেৱা বিভাগৰ সম্পাদকৰূপে বিনা প্ৰতিদ্বন্দ্বিতাবে যোক নিৰ্বাচিত কৰা বাবে সমূহ ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰীলৈ মোৰ আন্তৰিক ধন্যবাদ যাচিলে।

সমাজ সেৱাৰ সম্পাদক হিচাপে শপত গ্ৰহণ অনুষ্ঠানত দিয়া প্ৰতিশ্ৰুতি অনুসৰি কাম কৰিব নোৱাৰি মই দুৰ্গন্ধত। প্ৰত্যেকজন নাগৰিকেই দেশ আৰু সমাজৰ প্ৰতি দায়বদ্ধ হোৱা উচিত। ভাৰতবৰ্ষৰ দৰে উন্নয়নশীল দেশ এখনৰ প্ৰগতিৰ পথত ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰী সকলে সীমিত ভাবে হলেও সমাজ সেৱাৰ জঁৰণতে ভালোখিনি অৰিহণা যোগাব পাৰে। সমাজ সেৱাৰ মনোভাব ছাত্ৰাৱস্থাৰ পৰাই গঢ়ি তুলিব লাগে। এই উদ্দেশ্যে আগত বাৰ্থয়েই শিক্ষানুষ্ঠান সমূহত সমাজ সেৱাকো পাঠ্য-বহিৰ্ভূত বিষয় হিচাপে বখা হয়। শিক্ষানুষ্ঠানৰ ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰীক সমাজ সেৱা কৰিবলৈ বাধ্য কৰিব পৰা নাযায়।

সমাজসেৱাৰ কাৰণে প্লেবণা আহিব লাগিব অন্তৰৰ পৰা। মোৰ কাৰ্যকালত সমাজসেৱাৰ কাৰ্য-ক্ৰম মহাবিদ্যালয়ৰ চৌহদৰ বাহিৰলৈ উলিয়াই নিব নোৱাৰিলে। মহাবিদ্যালয়ৰ চৌহদত সীমাবদ্ধ বখা সমাজ সেৱাৰ আৰ্চনতো আমি চকুত লগা ধৰণৰ কাম কৰিব নোৱাৰিলো। সমাজ সেৱাৰ প্ৰতি আমাৰ ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰী বন্ধু বান্ধবীসকলৰ বেছি ভাগবেই আগ্ৰহৰ অভাৱ আমি অতি দুখেৰে লক্ষ্য কৰিহেঁ। এয়া শূন্য লক্ষণ নহয়। আশা বাৰ্থছে। ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰীসকলে এই বিষয়ৰ প্ৰতি আগ্ৰহী হব।

সৰ্বো শেষত মোৰ কাৰ্যকালত সকলে দিগত দিহা-পবামৰ্শ দি সহায় কৰা বাবে মহাবিদ্যালয়ৰ অধ্যক্ষ শ্ৰীযুত যতীন্দ্ৰ চন্দ্ৰ নাথ দেৱ, সমাজ-সেৱা বিভাগৰ তত্ত্বাবধানক অধ্যাপক শ্ৰীযুত অৰণী কুমাৰ দাস দেৱলৈ আৰু লগতে সমূহ অধ্যাপক-অধ্যাপিকা আৰু ছাত্ৰ-ছাত্ৰী বন্ধু-বান্ধৱীলৈ মোৰ কৃতজ্ঞতা জনালো।

শ্ৰীসিদ্ধিনাথ শৰ্মা  
সম্পাদক,

সমাজ-সেৱা বিভাগ।

# THE JAWAHAR JYOTI



**E  
N  
G  
L  
I  
S  
H**

**S  
E  
C  
T  
I  
O  
N**

**ELEVENTH ISSUE**

**1988-89**

**Prof-in-Charge  
Basanta Kumar Dutta**

**Editor :  
Harsha Kalita**

This

Section Presents

|   |   |                |   |    |
|---|---|----------------|---|----|
| Shaw and Shakespeare                                      | : | M.K. Sarmah    | : | 1  |
| The unlucky Night   | : | J. K. Nath     | : | 7  |
| Are Apelike Men our Ancestors?                            | : | Joyshri Bhuyan | : | 11 |
| On the Results of the last 9th<br>lok-Sabha poll in India | : | U. C. Kar      | : | 15 |
| Present teaching and office<br>staff of the college       | : |                | : | 20 |

# Shaw And Shakespeare

M. K. Sarma,  
Lecturer in English.

Shaw and Shakespeare are the two most outstanding dramatists of England. Born in 1564, Shakespeare came to the theatre in the early nineties of the sixteenth century. He joined a company of London players and became first an actor and then, a playwright. The singular excellence of his plays made him famous as a dramatist. On the otherhand shaw was born in 1856 and he lived by his pen as a journalist and then, as dramatist. His is the longest career in the British theatre, and his plays hold a permanent place in the dramatic literature of England. It is said that Shaw sta-

nds next to Shakespeare among the British dramatists.

As dramatists both shaw and Shakespeare differ widely from each other. They are similar only in one respect. Their similarity lies in the fact that both of them made use of the heterogeneous dramatic material they found in their respective ages and by their genius welded it into a harmonious whole. Shakespeare found the playhouse in the hands of the crude dramatists. They courted attention by rough and melodramatic action or by vulgar and unpolished jests. A genius as he was, Shakespeare laid his hands on whatever was likely to



be of service to him and by the magic of his skill he transformed it into something new. It is to be noted that though Shak speare did so, he retained what formed the basic strength and theatrical value of the material he had chosen. In a manner precisely similar shaw turned his eyes for guidance to the dramatists who were his immediate predecessors. But there was nothing which he could learn from his predecessors in England. Of course with wilde he shared a brilliance in dialogue. Again from Ibsen, the Norwegian dramatist, he learnt how to manage the stage for plays with a contemporary setting and scene which admit discussion as well as action. It is worth-mentioning that Shaw brought about a union of the literary and theatrical qualities prevalent at that time and thus created a more harmonious type of drama.

Shaw's are the dramas of ideas. Unlike Shakespeare he made

use of his art to force his ideas upon the world. Shaw himself said, " I write plays with the deliberate object of converting the nation to my opinion on sexual and social matters." All his plays are about something that matters. His first play " Widowers ' Houses " deals with slum landlordism, jealousy and prostitution. In his play ' Man and Superman ' the long Third Act contains his creed as a creative evolutionist. His other play ' Pygmalion ' is an excellent drama of ideas. Such type of drama is based on antagonistic ideas alone. It is devoid of action, and the interest we take in it is purely intellectual. This shows that Shaw used the stage to ' convert ' a misguided people ". But in Shakespeare's plays we do not find any purpose or philosophy of him. In his plays we find the portrayal of human beings and the expression of the human soul in poetry '. A past master in the art of characteri-

sation, Shakespeare shows in his plays that his characters are real beings of flesh and blood, and they speak like real men and women. They are not his mouth-pieces to express his views on life as some of the characters of Shaw are. Like Shaw he is not concerned with any ideas or philosophy of life in his plays. So his plays are not the vehicles of his ideas or views on life. They are really the works of art.

A strong believer in the purpose of art, Shaw attacked the contemporary 'Art for Art's sake' theory. He claimed that 'Art for Art's sake' was nonsense and that all art to be really great must have faith and a purpose behind it. That was why he severely criticised Shakespeare for the latter's lack of purpose. Besides, 'A drama with a purpose' — that was what Ibsen appealed to Shaw. So to Shaw, Shakespeare was less great than Ibsen and he liked to

'hoist Ibsen by pulling Shakespeare down'. But it is really unjustified. Shakespeare's fame rests chiefly on 'richness of imagination and almost God like felicity of utterance'. So it is quite irrelevant to criticise him simply for failing to propound a coherent philosophy in his plays. It has been rightly observed that 'Shakespeare differs from Ibsen in kind as eggs differ from apples, and to criticise Shakespeare in terms of Ibsen is like trying to multiply three eggs by four apples it cannot be done'.

Shaw's plays are full of elaborate stage directions. In this respect Shaw differs from Shakespeare because in the plays of Shakespeare we find very short stage directions. By means of his elaborate stage directions, Shaw aimed at 'creating in the study, the atmosphere of the stage'. Again his plays are preceded by long prefaces. Shaw wrote the prefaces because he felt the necessity of explaining why he published his plays.

It is to be noted that Shaw's prefaces are not always better than his plays. But some of his prefaces are definitely of great merit. The preface to 'Heartbreak House' is, so to say, a fine revelation of the mind of a philosopher in time of war. Shaw was a great debater, and one of the reasons of his writing long prefaces was that it gave him an opportunity of arguing at length certain matters which interested him. Shakespeare's plays have not such prefaces as he had no morality to preach or views of his own to propagate like Shaw.

The most important thing that is to be noted is that Shaw was a born rebel and iconoclast. As a rebel and iconoclast, he wanted to destroy the old and accepted conventions in order to make room for new ideas. It is rightly observed by Nicoll that Shaw is a great destroyer of evil in the modern age, but out of his destructiveness he seeks to lead people towards a newer, fresher and more constructive thought. In short Shaw's

biggest fight was for conscience as against custom of the time. In almost all his plays Shaw satirises one thing or the other. In 'Arms and the Man' he strips war of its glamour. In 'Man of Destiny' and 'Caesar and Cleopatra' he attacks the old conception of the great heroes of history. In his other play 'Man and Superman' Shaw satirises the conventional romantic conception of love. In it he states clearly and illustrates his peculiar attitude to the relation between the sexes. We find how Ann driven by Life Force tricks Tanner, the revolutionary and free-thinker into marriage. In this respect too, Shaw differs from Shakespeare as the latter has no theory of his own to expound in his plays.

It is to be noted that Shaw's aim is serious, and his analysis is deep. But he cloaks the seriousness of purpose with wit and gaiety. We may call his plays comedies of purpose. To the English stage, he has brought a type of drama, entirely new. There is a charge

that Shaw's plays lack action and are, in effect, no more than dramatic dialogues. It is also said that conflict which is essential in drama seems to be absent from his plays. But if we go through the plays of Shaw, we shall find that though there is the absence of conflict in the physical sense, there is present the mental conflict. In a word Shaw's is 'the drama of thinking man', and discussion is the root of all his plays. On the other hand Shakespeare's plays are properly the expressions of passions, and they are not the descriptions of them. In fact passion in Shakespeare is of the same nature as the delineation of character.

Shakespeare's plays are extraordinarily full-blooded and also passionate. Apart from the wonderful creation of his characters, we find 'the superb richness of language and glow of imagery' in his plays. In comparison Shaw's plays are said to be 'thin and bloodless'. But Shaw's characters are intellectually very interesting. Harrison, a

critic, observes, "Shaw's Caesar is Bernard Shaw, and his contempt for Cleopatra's wiles is very amusing and his intellectual appreciation of his position and duties is quite admirable, but I do not find in Shaw's Caesar either the ruthlessness of the Roman or the will-power and dignity of the world-conqueror. I find more of the real Roman Emperor in Shakespeare than in Shaw".

Both Shaw and Shakespeare are undoubtedly the two great playwrights. It is not wholly correct to say that Shaw's characters are merely his mouthpieces. Some of his characters are quite independent of him, and they are his superb creations. They are, in fact, admirably presented in his plays. It is said that Shaw saw people with exceptional shrewdness and could exhibit their characteristics vividly. But the fact is that a great deal of Shaw's own kindness and common sense is given to some of his characters where it is utterly out of place. Shanks, a critic, considers that the

lesser characters of Shaw have more humanity than his principal characters. It is also said that the lesser comic characters of Shaw are human beings drawn very much in the spirit of Shakespeare or Dickens. It may be said that Shakespeare's play 'All's well that Ends well' though more confused and perplexing is a subtler, deeper and richer work than Shaw's play 'Man and Superman'. But in 'Man and Superman', as observed by A. C. Ward, Shaw reveals himself as a 'thinker, playwright and pure artist'. A. C. Ward also says, "In 'Man and Superman' the characters are persons of our flesh and blood, even in the Hell Scene". So besides being great dramatists, both Shaw and Shakespeare are the two great artists. The fact is that Shakespeare, a dramatist par excellence, is one kind of artist, and Shaw, an iconoclast

and social reformer, is another kind of artist. Rightly does Shanks, the critic, observe, '... and it is much more important to define and distinguish between two kinds than to enter into any argument as to which is the superior'.

A born poet and dramatist, Shakespeare is perfect in his art. All critics have testified to his generosity, tolerance and catholicity of temper. On the other hand Shaw was by nature an individualist and also a rebel. Throughout his life he waged a tireless crusade for social justice, righteousness and intellectual enlightenment of people. It is said that no one took greater pains than Shaw in order to make plays really interesting and appealing to the audience. Both Shaw and Shakespeare are really the two great dramatists, and they are 'not of an age' but for all time to come.

# The Unlucky Night

J. K. Nath,  
Lecturer in Geography.

Chandan's heart throbbed with fear and shame as he first entered the hostel compound as a boarder. From his friends he came to know that the Superintendent of the hostel was very strict and would not spare any unruly element. However as the days passed, Chandan, a first year H. S student, endeared himself to all other inmates of the hostel with his amiable nature and willingness to help others in need. Like him all other boarders came from poor families in different villages.

The hostel rules were strictly followed. Raghunath served as a night chowkidar of the hostel. His duty was to ring the bell every evening and guard the hostel at night. 'Iong, Tong, Tong',—that was how he rang the bell at 6 P.M. everyday. The boarders who were

out of the hostel did not fail to return as the bell rang. Because of his sincerity in service Raghunath was lovingly called 'Raghukai' by all the boarders of the hostel.

One evening the bell rang as usual. Chandan and his room-mates who were out for a walk came back to the hostel in time. Some boarders who played volley-ball in the afternoon and some others who had a cup of tea each in 'Purnima Cabin', the popular tea-stall of the locality, also returned to the hostel as soon as the bell rang. After half an hour Raghukai closed the gate and began walking on the veranda of the hostel with his staff in hand.

On their return the boarders washed their hands and feet. Then they took rest awhile and remained busy with their studies.

The Superintendent came on his usual visit to the hostel. Silence prevailed all around as the sound of his footsteps was heard. The monitor came out of his room and had a talk with the Superintendent. Raghukai saluted the Superintendent as the latter passed by him. Then the Superintendent left the hostel and Raghukai remained alone on the veranda. The boarders took their meals late that night and went to bed.

It was a chilly, winter night. Raghukai with his staff in hand, moved slowly from one end of the veranda to the other. The menials and the cooks had also gone to bed. Only an owl was hooting 'Tu-hoot, Tu-hoot' from a nearby tree. Raghukai who was pacing the veranda felt tired as he came from his home to the hostel walking about three miles at a stretch. He sat on his stool placed in the middle of the veranda. At a moment he remembered his wife, whom he had left with his five-year old daughter at home. But soon he felt

drowsy. Suddenly he was roused by the ringing of the factory bell. He stood up and began pacing the veranda again. The wall-clock of the hostel struck two. While walking Raghukai stopped in front of a closed window of Chandan's room. It was lighted till then. He peeped through the window pane and found to his surprise that Chandan was sitting on a chair in a vacant mind. Raghukai observed that Chandan, the smart and jolly boy, seemed to be in a depressed mood for the past few days. He failed to understand what had happened to him. Was it his poverty that often troubled his mind? He found that Chandan was the worthiest boy in the hostel. During the period of his long twelve years' service in the hostel he had not seen such a boy as Chandan who volunteered to do anything for the benefit of others. He knocked at the door and said in undertone, "Chandan Babu, you are still awake! It is nearly half past two now. So go to bed".

Chandan opened the door and said to Raghukai,

“Raghukai, I am going to bed now. Don't worry.”

Then he closed the door and fell asleep soon.

The hours seemed to move slowly but steadily. There was darkness all around with the shining stars in the sky above. Raghukai sat on his stool again and thought about Chandan. He remembered the time when Chandan was much helpful to him. It was Chandan who had donated blood to his ailing wife at the time of her operation. As a result his wife escaped her sure death. Being poor he could give nothing to Chandan in return, but only spoke out words of gratitude to him. Chandan was really a kind-hearted boy and always came forward to help others in distress. So he was loved by one and all in the hostel. As he thought of Chandan in that way, he felt drowsy.

Complete silence prevailed all around. Only the drizzling sounds

of dew-drops could be heard. All of a sudden the hinge of the gate creaked as it was opened. It roused Raghukai from his drowsiness and he saw a figure approaching in the darkness. Soon he shouted

‘Thief !- Thief !- Thief !- Thief !’

Some of the boarders woke up and with their night gowns on, came out of the rooms. They wanted to know what had happened. A moment later they saw that Raghukai had caught hold of a man and began to beat him with his stout stick. The man tried to say something, but could not. At last these words came out of his mouth.

I am not a thief ; I am not a thief. Don't beat me. I have come to ---

The man could not continue to say anything more as he became senseless.

Meanwhile Ranjit and some other boys ran to the spot. They saw to their surprise that it was Babul, the Rickshawala, whose rickshaw was often seen plying in the area. The senseless man was



carried to the veranda of the hostel.  
"Really he is not a good man,"  
said one of the boys.

"He must have a large family  
and he is unable to maintain it.  
So he has turned thief," another  
boy said.

"He has come here to steal  
our shirts, long pants, wrist wat-  
ches and everything," Ranjit said  
to the monitor and others with  
a kick at the senseless man.

Chandan who had slept late  
at night woke up and rushed to  
the scene. He saw to his bewild-  
erment that it was his father who  
was lying unconscious there. He  
fell over the man uttering,

'Father ! father !'

Ranjit and others became  
stunned and they looked at one  
another. They knew the man to  
be Babul, the Rickshawala, but  
they did not know that he was  
the father of Chandan. They emb-  
raced Chandan and uttered,

"Chandan, pardon us !  
pardon us !"

Raghukai felt helpless and shed  
tears in grief as he had made a  
great blunder. He folded his hands  
and said in a Choking voice :  
Please pardon me, Chandan Babu !  
pardon me ! I am wholly respon-  
sible for this ! I am guilty ! Oh !  
award me any punishment you  
like !

The Superintendent who was  
informed of the matter by the  
monitor came and according to  
his advice, the senseless father of  
Chandan was removed to hospital  
forthwith. The doctor attending on  
him declared him dead. Chandan  
who was still weeping fell over his  
dead father with a heart-rending cry,

'Father ! father !'

The unfortunate father of  
Chandan came to the hostel to in-  
form his only son Chandan of the  
sad and sudden death of his dear  
mother that night.

# Are Apelike Men Our Ancestors ?

Mrs. Joyshri Bhuyan,  
Lecturer in Anthropology.

Sometimes questions arise in our minds if we are really the descendants of an apelike creature that lived millions of years ago. Numerous miraculous stories are found regarding the origin of man. But it is a fact that man appeared in this earth not as a result of a special creation of God, but by a process of evolution. Man, like all living creatures has evolved progressively from simpler ancestors and ultimately from a unicellular creature. Survival is the main pre-occupation of all living creatures from the amoeba to man. According to the evolutionists there were prehistoric men and ape-like men that filled in the gap between man and animal.

Man has acquired his present physical characteristics from a more generalized primate form through different stages of evolution. In this regard we shall mention the important fossil evidence found in different parts of the world in different times. Most of the leading Anthropologists are of the opinion that the anthropoid apes (Gibbon, Gorrila, Chimpanzee, Orang-utan) are very closely related to man and that man and anthropoid apes lines originated from the common ancestral stock. Keith, the Anthropologist, believes that the chimpanzee shows the greatest number of points of resemblances to man. The chimpanzee is closely followed by the gorilla,

which is followed by the orang. Some authors find the common ancestors of man-chimpanzee, gorilla and gibbon in Dryopithecus and Sivapithecus stocks, but they are of the opinion that Dryopithecus leads only to the apes.

During 1930's G. Edward Lewis of Yale University noticed some fossil remains that looked remarkably manlike. These are called Ramapithecus. It was found in the Siwalik Hills of North west India. It is seen that in most respects Ramapithecus is ape-like with just a few hominid features superimposed. The ape-like features of Ramapithecus include its pointed canines, and front lower premolars. In contrast to these there are the man-like large molars and small incisors and canines. These, with the heavy buttressing of bone evident on the upper and lower jaws, show that Ramapithecus used crushing and grinding movements in eating small objects. Since man evolved from the apes, his very first ancestors would naturally be

almost exactly like the apes called the dryopithecines at that time, and the problem is to identify the first adaptations which led the early man on to the path which they are still following to-day. These first adaptations are thought to be those connected with small object feeding. Alone among the Dryopithecines Ramapithecus shows these features, and for this reason it is considered most likely candidate for the ancestor of man.

In the year 1925 the remains of Australopithecus have been discovered by prof. Raymond A. Dart in East Africa. The fossil remains of Australopithecus represent a more advanced stage in the domain of evolution than the other fossil anthropoids. The arms and legs bones are typically human in every detail. The pelvis, the shape of the ilium and thumb show many typical humanoid features. On the whole the Australopithecus may be described as an animal, with man-like body, a head more ape-like than man, and

massive jaws with the human dentition. Prof. Dart Brown and Clark say that these south African fossils must have been a collateral branch of the human stem. A group of scientists believes that the Australopithecus represents a stage in the process of human evolution and it disappeared before acquiring a true humanoid form.

The Anthropologists define man in more formal terms. To them all mankind are the members of the Homo sapiens ( wise man ) Homo sapiens or wise man, is the name usually given to all races with a human body and a brain capacity measuring from 1, 100C. C. upward and averaging between 1,350 and 1500c.c. This group includes all modern man. On the other hand Homo erectus is the name given by many scientists to all fossil races with a human body and a brain ranging between 700 C.C. and 1,100 C.C. Australopithecus had become extinct or had evolved into a form of man which we call Homo erectus, 'erect man'.

The fossil remains of Homo erectus were found in 1891 at Trinil in Java and they are named Pithecanthropus erectus. It was regarded as the long-sought transitional stage from ape to man. After studying the remains, Von Koenigswald disclosed that in various characters Pithecanthropus is more human than simian. It may not be our direct ancestor, but it certainly represents at least a collateral ancestor—"a great uncle, rather than a grand father." In the year 1921 Dr. Anderson and Dr. Zdansky discovered a few bone remains from the south west of Peking in China and they are named Sinanthropus pekinensis (Chinese man of Peking). After studying the bones, skulls and molar teeth it is found that Sinanthropus is more advanced than Pithecanthropus, and both the groups are regarded as Homo erectus.

The earliest examples of Homo sapiens are the Neanderthals. The first remains were found in the Neander valley in Germany in 1856. The Neanderthal people were closer