

## SELF-REFERENCE, REALITY PRINCIPLES, MARXISM, AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS IN THE POSTMODERN ERA

ANDRÁS BALÁZS

*Department of Biological Physics, Eötvös Lóránd University, Budapest, Hungary*

Three distinct turning points (“bottleneck breakings”) in universal evolution are discussed at some length in terms of “self-reference” and (corresponding) “Reality Principles.” The first (origin and evolution of animate Nature) and second (human consciousness) are shown to necessarily precede a third one, that of Marxist philosophy. It is pointed out that while the previous two could occupy a natural (so in a sense neutral) place as parts of human science, the self-reference of Marxism, as a *social* human phenomenon, through its direct bearings on the *practice* of society, did have a stormy history. I conclude that the fall of Bolshevism was unavoidable, and still, we might uphold our hope for a truly free society of humankind, just on the very basis of what we have learned of the fate of Marxist philosophy as such, as a *recursively evolving social practice*: the freedom of humankind of its own ideological burdens (constraints).

*KEYWORDS: Self-reference in universal evolution, Reality Principles, depth psychology, Marxism, freedom of humankind.*

### INTRODUCTION

Marxism is not a very fashionable social theory nowadays, particularly in Eastern Europe, which, given the practical consequences of its reign of Bolshevism, is not curious. Its existence is more ambiguously endured in Western Europe and America (the swastika is condemned unconditionally; the red star is not, at least not unconditionally), and this embarrassment (particularly in Europe) can be understood in simple terms. The declared ideals of Marxism are the most sacred ones humanity had had ever before, as not only *attainable* but also a *necessity to attain*, and so it can, in principle, be upheld, in most sincere terms, by so-called progressive social groups, despite the practical horrors of the reign of Stalin and numerous “petty monarchs” in Eastern Europe.

In fact, Marxism, as a necessary stage of *universal* evolution (in general terms as well as specially that of humankind) has an intrinsic hidden danger of its own

---

Address correspondence to András Balázs, Department of Biological Physics, Eötvös Lóránd University, H-1117 Budapest, Pázmány sétány 1, Hungary. E-mail: balazs-andras2002@yahoo.com

as a social ideology, and I will try to uncover this aspect of it in the present brief article, in close correspondence to previous prerequisitional similar breakthroughs in that (special or, for that matter, universal) evolution. First of all, I show that these fundamental bottleneck breakings are usually coupled to certain *evolutional non-linearities* of their own. For this reason, these non-linearities (or “self-references”) should primarily be grasped.

## SELF-REFERENCES AND REALITY PRINCIPLES IN UNIVERSAL EVOLUTION

*Self-reference* marks the occurrence (emergence) of a *new quality* and is always related to breaking the corresponding bottleneck in (universal) evolution. Rather than to try to define it, I circumscribe it as *strong non-linearity*, and recall that it has its role in mathematics and physics as well as in biological evolution (e.g., Hofstadter 1979). Its general formulation might be given, then, as having the consequence of a proposition contradicting the very proposition in an undecidable way; in physics, it corresponds to a physical “effect” depending on *itself* as “cause.” In pure logics, it is sometimes called circular reasoning or “*vicious circle*.” Its lift (or resolution) is to couple in an “outside” (corollary, meta, or “third-party”) system (or proposition) to arrive at a “mediated” (“weak”) self-reference, which can be recursively applied to make the non-linearity *converge* (to a “fixed point”) (Varela 1975; Gunji 1994).

### *The First Bottleneck of Universal Evolution: Self-Reference in the Origin and Evolution of Biological Systems*

Restricting ourselves firstly to biology, as I have pointed out in a separate study (Balázs 2007), the very origin of life can be conceived as a relaxation (lift) of strong “molecular self-reference,” a *reaction* to a primordial, original *quantum measurement*.

Recapitulating briefly the argument, as it was first introduced by Pattee (1971), the origin of the *genetic code*, as a quantum-molecular many-to-one mapping (symmetry breaking), was the first, objective appearance of quantum mechanical measurement. As a physical “creation,” the argument is that the former cannot have *begun* by *human measurement* by “*classical devices*” and, thus, has also an evolutionary history, being, as such, central to *any* biological system’s *existence* interacting with the environment (“measurement”). It is, in this way, in relation to a general quantum mechanical “Reality” (Balázs 2007). One might call it, in context with the Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics, also antecedently referring to the next section, the Quantum Mechanical Reality Principle (of Life). It is rather hard to avoid this conclusion in relation to the later fundamental *measuring activity* of biological systems, up to humans, on the evolutionary ladder.

To pinpoint the process at hand even more, we introduced in this respect the concept of symmetry-breaking of *time-inversion* (accompanying *every* quantal measurement; Belinfante 1975), and a concomitant self-reference in biological

systems as that of the underlying molecular subsystem (coding RNA/DNA), where the causality of the time-evolution in universal evolution *terminated locally* (Balázs 2003, 2004). Coding RNA/DNA became *locally* an unstable final object of chemical evolution, a *cause* as well as an *effect* (of itself). The *physical* (quantum mechanical) resolution was then the reaction (relaxation, lift) of the underlying forces of the system to couple in, from its environment, amino acids, peptides (and/or proto-proteins) as the “third-party” *Reality*, the system stabilizing itself in a *special process of special (reactional) measuremental existence*. In this way, in our scheme, coding by nucleic acids and subsequent protein production by the same (co)polymers were two-step *reverse processes*. Proto-proteins of the replicase nature thus closed the self-reference back on RNA/DNA polymers (replication), converging toward, and stabilizing itself in, a *limit cycle*. (That the origin of life was a self-referential (nonlinear) process, is widely accepted today (see, e.g., Dyson 1999, and references quoted therein; also Pattee 1995; Balázs 2003, 2004). Life is, in these terms, thus the birth of a special *reflection* of Reality of the Universe on itself, in fact, in the Copenhagen interpretation, the birth of a special *Reality itself*).

As noted earlier, and discussed at some length (Balázs 2007), the special *evolution* of biological systems was then subject to the laws of Darwinism, which, however, basically acted on the harmony/disharmony of the special *internalized* Realities of the system’s measurements on the surroundings (i.e., setting initial conditions of its own in relation to the mapped, internalized natural laws, the latter appearing as internal material constraints, Pattee 1979; Balázs 2007). As we probably can accept, as a first approximation, that biological evolution *vertically* corresponds to rise of complexity (e.g., De Duve 2002), evolution progresses toward more and more accurate and adequate *internalized “Realities”* (Balázs 2007) in evolution, in relation to external measurements. Evolution, in fact, progresses toward more and more adequate nervous systems (sensory organs and central information processings). In general terms, concerning self-reference, *phenotype* as such, and cerebral evolution in particular, is but the enlarged, useful mediating agent of the prevailing intrinsic nonlinearity, which, coping with Reality, uses a *special biological route* of return to time-inversion symmetry (by *constructing* the very past of the system by successive relatively freely set measurements) as *replication*. The corresponding grasp of Reality, then, by animal species, is either (grossly) inherited or acquired by learning (“wiring in the brain,” e.g., Changeaux 1985) and is a general mapping of the environment, just as it happens at humans (see later).

This biological viewpoint, as was also discussed (Balázs 2007), leads eventually to a discovery (gradual realization) of *freedom* in evolution, of freedom of “*initial conditions*” (of the system) from the proper internalised *natural law*, that is, the universal freedom of matter (or “spirit”, “existent”, etc.) *from itself*. The *first step* toward *liberation* in universal evolution thus was made evidently by the origin and phylogeny of biological systems, that is, the birth of *animate Nature*, as the lift of inert unity of natural laws and their initial conditions by a fundamentally (initially molecular) *measuring, reflecting entity* (Balázs 2007). However, complete freedom in evolution is only based on, but being far from, pure biological existence; still,

it is that which provides the grounds on which the evolution of humankind, as a species, is founded in universal evolution.

*The Second Bottleneck of Universal Evolution: Self-Reference in Human Consciousness According to the Theory of Depth Psychology*

The second bottleneck of universal evolution is the advent of self-reflecting *consciousness*, which is clearly the product of the evolution of animate Nature: an acquisition of the pre-social evolution of certain primeval primate groups.

In fact, if we accept the continuous, step-by-step nature of biological evolution, and also the concept that the complexity of the phenotype is the channeled, canalized route (Waddington 1969) of it vertically, then the unavoidable progressing toward information processing on the material basis of the evolving central nervous system was at the heart of the issue. The appearance, at some stage, of a *secondary reflection* as *the Reality Principle of human consciousness* was a necessity.

This secondary reflection is the reflection of the system *itself as distinct from the surrounding world*, a reflection of his own existence, the birth of the (human) *Ego*. This development was crystallized, apparently as a gradual process, around directing the use of the organism's own body as a practical instrument (in tool-making and, coupled to it, in the birth of *language*; e.g., De Duve 2002) in his *re-forming (rearranging) his environment*, his suppressing (postponing) his internal drives to a later satisfaction, when satisfaction can be obtained in safer environmental (natural, also group) conditions. This circumstance is that which clearly shows its animal roots: delaying immediate action as *internal inhibition*, subordinating instinctive actions to information-processing, is a general evolutionary channel, at least in the animal kingdom, as its "Reality Principle." Therefore, as it has been discussed at some length (Balázs 2007), *cause and effect are separated* by intervening inhibitive, cognitive behavior. Thus, contracting perception-inhibition-action (of/on the surroundings) into a single phrase, *it is but measurement in a generalized sense*: it is setting again the system's own initial conditions (Pattee 1979; Balázs 2007). The resulting newly acquired mental structure is now well understood. Some discussion of it is in order here, in particular concerning the *true Reality Principle* of the authentic science of depth psychology (Freud 1958).

The main feature of the mental apparatus is, accordingly, the very fact that it is *structured* in relation to "Reality." Primarily, it is a *functional* structure. It goes through a long and complicated ontogenesis, both programmed inheritedly (archetypes and other symbols of *internal expectations*, Jung 1954–1979) and also largely modified by interaction with reality. Basically, this is a *socializational* development, with the well-known "wiring in" the brain (Changeaux 1985). The self-reference (self-consciousness) is a *mediated* one by this interaction with the outside world, and leads to the well-known triple structure of the ego as "unconscious Id," the "Ego" (refining into *being* a Reality Principle, Freud 1971a), and "super-Ego". It is interpreted as "childish" ego (of instincts and desires); mature—"adult"—Ego (of dealing—coping—with the outside world, as a mediating—compromising—structure); and "parental" Ego (of moral requirements, values,

expectations of the society, primarily mediated by the elementary cell of the society, the family.) This triple structure is a final product of a long succession of (libidinous) object-possession in the outside world during ontogenesis and their later abandonments, the latter with the well-known effect of strengthening of the Ego (*the* general “measuring agent” of humans on Reality), until mature object-possession is carried out. In this way, it is the Ego (in this narrower sense) that is at work in delaying (postponing) satisfaction until proper outside conditions are available, also *acting in accordance* with the *internalized* moral rules of the super-Ego, in the identificational development in the adolescent period (based on childish internalizations).

This well-known basic theory (and practice) of depth psychology (Freud 1953–1974) then, casts light on the very existence of the complicated *inner structure* of the ego: namely, the different parts of it *can refer to each other*, fundamentally *through the (partly internalized) environmental Reality* (as meta-system), therefore making self-reference, as self-distinctioning from the environment, possible. (In biological terms, it is sometimes suggested that the triple structure of the ego is in a certain relation to the well-known organic layers of the brain as brain stem/mid brain/cerebrum  $\longleftrightarrow$  reptilian/old mammalian/new mammalian brain. This, however, has been proved definitely as a very loose correspondence. The relation of mental activity and the organic structure of the brain remains a fundamental challenge for our science.)

The *content* of the unconscious part is rendered an intrinsic (inherited) and outprojected, self-aggression, also sexual lust,<sup>1</sup> and concomitantly a general thrust for a stimulus-free (“Nirvana”) state (Freud 1955). These components have their roots in the process that might be called a “secondary time reversal”: it prescribes the system to follow a special biological “route of return” (to the inorganic state, still avoiding it by self-reproduction), that is, to follow the basic biological process (Freud 1955), established earlier in the section The First Bottleneck of Universal Evolution. In general terms, thus, it is the unconscious Id that decides *what* to do, Ego *how* to do, and super-Ego that is *in relation to what or whom*.

It is readily seen, then, that in fact it is the Ego, coping with “Reality” (as an important aspect, in a recursive *cognition*-information processing-process, Pylyshyn 1980) that has direct significance for social relations. Ego is the reservoir of transient past and also mature persistent internalizations of Reality, from which, in a convergent way in evolution (both onto- and phylogenetically), it is dissociated as Self (-reference). The content of the super-Ego, as direct identificational agent, will become that part of the mental apparatus that has its own identificational ideals and ideas (and ideologies), along which actual social actions will be carried out (Freud 1971b).

Finally, it follows from the earlier discussion that *any* kind of philosophy (ideology) with its ontology and epistemology is subject to these mental constraints, is a product of the conscious Ego, but *its working* relies on the super-Ego, which may unite individuals to *perform* corresponding social actions (transformations) by internalization of (identification with) social ideals (ideologies), mediated by substantiating individuals, as prevailing social Reality. This latter interrelation might seriously distort the declared ideals and values of a specific system, given

the limits and contingent false consciousnesses of the very individuals, in practice. Particular is the case with Marxism, which claims, at the outset, that it is itself *the philosophy of action* (“Reality”).

The utmost declared value of depth psychology itself is exactly *consciousness*, that is, by the unconscious becoming conscious (through verbally seizing the memory traces to become conscious memory), harnessing and ruling humankind’s primordial instincts and desires. The means of it is to directly coupling in “Reality”; the declared goal is the mature Ego, having intimate, “good relations” with Reality (first of all, that of the social environment).

However, *harmony with Reality does not imply global acceptance of the “social system” as a whole*, as it *belongs to another realm (level) of human existence and experience*. Social existence, as noted earlier, is only *mediated by*, but is not *identical with*, individuals. (Incidentally, for that matter, from *practice* we know that, on the subjective side, in terms of the allegorical language of depth psychology, there are different *degrees* of undertaking *social role*: we have individuals putting on “full armor,” putting on “just the helmet,” or, occasionally, even, “trampling on it”; which complicates matters even more of forming society by the individuals.) Therefore, changing the social consciousness of *individuals* does not effect fundamentally the dominating and compelling *social consciousness as such* of the age; it results in conformity to, yet not ruling, but being subordinated to, that very special existence of humankind. As we know from human ethology, the mental structure of humankind was adapted to existence in smaller (50–150-member) groups (Csányi 1999). Society as such is an ultimate, necessary, but *inherently foreign*, agent to the individual.

### *The Third Bottleneck of Universal Evolution: The Self-Reference of Marxism as Consciousness of Consciousnesses*

**Marxism on Its Own.** Marxism is the social theory of the industrial revolution of the nineteenth century. This self-evident fact is far too often overlooked. The roots of capitalism in social evolution were clearly identifiable on one hand, and it showed its most fierce aspects, on the other. Marxism (Marx and Engels, 1957–1988), both as a *method* and *theory* (just as depth psychology) is declared to be a kind of “consciousness of consciousnesses,” a kind of “psycho-analysis of society” (of every historical age). In terms of what has been said earlier, it corresponds to a revolution in the evolution of social consciousness. It would be superfluous to discuss in details its theorems and inferences, because these are widely known. I comment on only those that have direct relations to our topics here.

In fact, Marxism is claiming at the outset that human society as such, in every age of the history of humankind, has as its basis the *mode of production* (having its sub-structures the *forces* and *relations* of production), upon which the social superstructure of certain “free, independent” activities such as science, art, religion, politics, and so on are built. In this way, the roots of these higher mental activities can be found in the mode of production. It is a deeply materialistic philosophy with the starting point that, as Engels recalled it at Marx’s funeral

(Engels 1950), “people must house, eat, drink, cloth, before they can practise cultural activities” (in particular, politics).

It is thus stated that up to the birth of Marxism, *social consciousness was generally a false one*, regardless of what the leaders (and thinkers) of the historical ages held about themselves. Once having discovered this relation, it is claimed, the new philosophy can thus be stated as kind of “science of the consciousness of consciousnesses.”

There is, however, a keen point of *strong self-reference* in the fundamentals of this theory: if the theorem applies, as such, to *every* system, what is the guarantee that the Marxist philosophy is not only a “false consciousness” *itself*? Or, making a stronger assertion, that Marxism is not only a transient, *false* (social) *consciousness*? Of this circumstance, of course, Marxist philosophers and supporters are aware. *Self-reference was seemingly resolved already by Marx himself: Marxism is the materialistic philosophy of the working class, a free critic of capitalism* (whose almost “official” ideology is necessarily Marxism), by its members being *free* (in the famous “double senses”: of production instruments on one hand, and to sell freely their workforce, on the other).

Marxism, then, has a strong finalistic flavor of the Hegelian kind (the Prussian court as the ultimate end (goal) of the evolution of Spirit). Nonetheless, we can have an apparently naive standpoint (to which we are certainly entitled) and look at Marxism as a strongly self-referent system, ordering its upholder to *practice* (social “Reality”) in a nonlinear way, where it is *functioning* as a kind of “objectivated” Marxism. This *objectivated* Marxism, then, however, is burdened again with the usual *blind forces* of social existence; social events just *happen* uncontrolled, exactly the way it is described by the *theory*. Thus, accordingly, it renders us back to a modified (actualized) version of the theory.

Thus, a gigantic iteration (*recursive evolution*) between *theory* and “conscious” social *practice*, arises. This, however, involves that the risk (danger) of false (social) consciousness is high *during action*. In particular, even the *working class may fall victim* to false (immature) consciousness. This is all the more a danger, because, as a first step in the iteration and, as Weizsäcker (1989) also concluded in a different context, in our terms, not only “Matter produces Spirit” but in fact, also, in turn, *as a reaction*, “Spirit produces Matter,” that is, in this respect, it produces *social reality*. Given an inherently false consciousness of *social revolution itself*, the possible cradle of modern social cataclysms and global threats for humankind is clearly set.

*And just this is what actually happened.* It is, in fact, how Bolshevism (and, for that matter, *denying* it from the outset, as its reverse false consciousness, National Socialism) was born.

**The Relation of Depth Psychology and Marxism.** Some words are in order here about the relation of the already sketched theory of the Ego of depth psychology and Marxism, because this relation, in my view, is crucial for a possible (improved) synthetic social theory (see later) and was stubbornly blurred by the official version of Marxism in the “socialist countries” in Eastern Europe.

First of all, both are *materialist* systems, although both started out, rather, as *sensualist* theories. Marx dealt with Epicurean philosophy in his Ph.D. thesis, whereas Freud became first engaged in the phenomenon of the special fates of sexual lust (Freud 1953). Only later did they adopt a clear cut materialist theoretical system with the notion of pure matter as inanimate Nature (Marx and Engels 1932; Freud 1955; see also, in this respect, Matsuno 1984; Balázs 2007). In this respect, both deal with the problem of (individual/social) *consciousness*.

The basic difference is that whereas Marx takes for granted the individual, with his selfish instincts, drives, and desires, Freud takes for granted the social environment with all its conditions, expectations, the social “rules of the game,” and analyzes the effect of the latter on the individual. In fact, in its microcosmos, Freud tries to reconcile the two in a compromise. Marxism, analyzing the macrocosmos, apparently runs counter it, as trying to “change the rules” (by revolting). This view, however, is due to a false standpoint. The microcosmos and macrocosmos are two distinct areas of quality in Reality; *they are on different levels of consciousness*. An individual may be in harmony with his microcosmos while being in opposition to global *social practice* (and, in particular, to its *consciousness*).

The crossing point is the existence of mature, *well-socialized*, self-conscious, if still basically *selfish*, Egos, well aware of their needs and *interests*, free of false consciousnesses (both individual *and* social). Ready to unite, in accordance with the laws of depth psychology (Freud 1971b), they can face the “system,” in order to satisfy those needs (change *social Reality*). This common ideal is outlined as *free individuals of a consequently self-conscious, so in a sense free, society*, ruling their own faith, existing *as* individual self-realizations, the latter *being* social re-production; all this strictly on a sensualist, materialist basis.

Actually, Freud (1986) himself noted that, in our terms, a consistent theory of humankind would be depth psychology *and* an adequate theory of the structure of the Reality of society.

## ON SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS IN THE POSTMODERN ERA

Accordingly, as has been pointed out earlier, Bolshevism, having appeared at the beginning of the twentieth century, was a false (social) consciousness, built directly on the basis of the self-referential fundament of Marxism. Its claim as having exclusively the legacy of Marx, denying *in practice* Marxism, had serious consequences. Its leader, V. I. Ulyanoff (Lenin 1963–1979), was well aware of this circumstance, and advocated several times the view that the basis of this consciousness of ultimate legacy is necessarily transient and contingent. He, however, also could not escape the limits of the era. No one could have foreseen that a whole age of scientific–technological revolution still lies before humankind, with all the concomitant consequences and social transformations. Therefore did he think that time was up for power takeover, and in a deeply “*voluntaristic*” home policy, together with a foreign policy of “exportation of the revolution,” catching up with the West is possible.

This false consciousness, with the necessarily accompanying strong voluntarism, is what leads to, as a rule, as a *social practice*, to irrationalism and the



apparent result of Bolshevism going hand in hand with fierce *violence*. The social consciousness of Marxism *in its self-reference*, admits that *not any* social system can be claimed to reign forever; that once the *forces* of production run counter to the corresponding *relations* of production in social evolution, the latter is overthrown (people revolt against them); however, it has claimed that this is *not* valid for Bolshevism, itself being “consciously existing Marxism” (“socialism”).

I think that, even if the fall of Bolshevism was unavoidable, on the very grounds of *Marxist theory itself*, it represented a special *necessary* dead-end street: it had the historical mandate of fighting off feudal remains and creating corresponding material grounds as general economical circumstances for *modern* national capitalism in Eastern Europe. It performed this *practice* on the grounds of self-exploitation of the working class *via* the State, as state capitalism. With its fall, as a false consciousness facing Reality, that is, with its *economical* fall, we have the next recursion as having a corrected theory of postmodern capitalism. (As for *practice*, for example, we already witness the newly emerged economical and social fierce fight between *global international* and the young, still vulnerable, small-intermediate *home* capital, in the new democracies.) False (social)consciousness could become a leading ideology in Eastern Europe exactly because it was this region up to the 1989–1990’s which was not (yet) a developed capitalist region and so *defined itself* as capitalism’s *ideological antagonist* (perceiving its “deeper contradictions”). This holds true already for original Marxist theory, too.

In fact, entirely ordered to practice (“Reality”), we give up having a good working *theory* of that practice, and fall victim of postmodern multi-valuedness and relativism. On our part, for example, we can, in fact, abstract from reality some self-evident (trivial), if disturbing, observations, of the fundamentals of globalization.

Besides *necessary* side-effects such as environmental pollution, robbing Nature, or global warming up, we have special inherent signs of danger to global stability.

First, note that, strictly speaking, the basis of the concept of a working class has melted away. The worldwide *socialization of production* (every social class, even that of industrial capitalists, *en gross*, actively takes part in production) has developed. The interaction in production of intellectual workers (the primary important workforce nowadays) is overwhelming, due to the informatical revolution. Therefore, *fall of the capitalist production’s cornerstone, the law of value, is more and more in time*. No one can judge the value of production of individuals who are largely interacting (uncontrollably influence each other’s workforce) concerning production. Value, as “minimum socialwide time of production” is fading away (Almásy 1974); *the whole society cannot be paid*.

Second, on the very basis of this circumstance, *extracting profit* from the system (even for reinvestment), given a worldwide market, results in staggering of stability as overproduction slump, *on the very definition of profit*. Of course, horizontally from individuals to commerce banks, and vertically from small countries to economical geopolitics, there are incredibly fine and involved channels, both state and private, to deal with (avoid) this fact; still, regular destabilizations are unavoidable. Therefore, *constant expansion of global market (and economical growth)* is as fundamental for modern capitalism (globalization) as geographical expansion

was for the Roman Empire. This is the reason of grouping of capitalist countries into larger and larger units, together with protection of an internal market and a breakneck competition for the *international market*, with all the corresponding economical/social/legal consequences witnessed in the postmodern era.

However, globalization as such (worldwide entirely free trade and the unity of a worldwide market of both goods and labor) being very far from being complete, particularly concerning the huge areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, still evidently a long and victorious march of modern capitalism is before the global society. It cannot, at present, be predicted, however, that after reaching the point of fully evolved (exploited) globalization, what turn history will take. We might, nonetheless, express the hope that the era, subsequent to global capitalism, will follow the trend of universal evolution of rendering even more freedom of self-realizations to the members of the society. We can judge that the *prerequisite material basis* will have been produced.

### CONCLUDING REMARKS

Self-reference is an important phenomenon in universal evolution. It marks certain turning points (“bottleneck breakings”) of the latter that, giving rise in a natural way to more and more extended “Reality Principles,” are amounting to more and more freedom of the (individual or social) successive participants of this evolution.

Particular is the case of Marxism, which, integrating into itself previous self-references in evolution of pure biological and individual nature, has the self-reference (and corresponding Reality Principle) of its own. As it has been deduced (Balázs 2007), the appearance (grasp) of self-references and Reality Principles is what lends evolution gradual freedom. This all the more applies to Marxism as its *recursive evolution (as it has been proved in practice)* gave rise to, up to the present, a *false (social) consciousness*, an ideology that, without a real *conscious grasp of itself* (which can be done only recursively), resulted in “freedom” of humiliating, torturing, and killing, in mass dimensions, of members of the society, in the name of “higher” values and ideals. The *realization* of Marxian rules came into actual existence by the predictable *economical fall* of upheld “Marxism” in Eastern Europe. Real relative (improved) freedom appeared, resulted by *denying* these very rules in the name of modern civil society. (Note that this kind of theorizing is well-known in philosophy as “dialectics.” I definitely abandoned the use of the term in the present study, as it has become strongly associated with the Hegelian–Marxian philosophy on one hand; and it covers the universal, provable existence of self-reference (nonlinearity) of these systems *themselves*, on the other.)

Maybe the fixed point of this social recursive evolution (unification of theory and practice (Reality)) will never be attained. Still, we can have the *conscious hope* for a society where the *creative nature* of humankind can fully and freely develop; where society (its institutions) are *not foreign*, but are *direct expressions* of the social interaction of individuals. In general terms, ordered to practice as a first step, the gradual fall (elimination) of Marxism is, at the same time, the fall (elimination) of *every* ideology; getting rid of our various ideologies (of Marxism, “the ideology

of ideologies,” in a recursive way), gives step-by-step place for “philosophies” (*generalizations*) of *different branches of science*. In this way we can cast off the ballasts of the former and liberate the human mind of their ties, the latter, as *faithful models* of social consciousness and practice, in relation to the correspondingly *self-conscious individuals*. There are encouraging signs of the emergence of this kind of development *in science*, that is, the application of the results of more exact sciences (e.g., biology of both body and mind, mathematics, even physics) in the humane studies. Hopefully, this definitely welcome postmodern achievement will prove to occupy the empty throne of ideology, as an ever changing, yet synthetic, “world view” of a more and more *free social practice*.

Certainly, at least as a vision, we may have “*auffreiem Grund mit freiem Volke*”, before us.

## NOTE

1. That the human brain is such an extended reservoir of sexual lust (libido) is probably explainable on biological (evolutional) grounds: it evidently counterbalances the many wired-in mental interests, skills, and concomitant more qualified social efforts of coping with Reality. The resulting social occupations (requiring high attentiveness and relying heavily on transformed libido), together with the long and tedious bringing up of the human child, might have, otherwise, provided a serious drawback in evolution (concerning reproduction).

## REFERENCES

- Almási, M. 1974. *Frequency numbers. Conversations about the modern America Rezgésszámok. [Beszélgetések a modern Amerikáról]*. Budapest: Magvető. (In Hungarian)
- Balázs, A. 2003. On the physics of the symbol–matter problem in biological systems and the origin of life: Affine Hilbert spaces model of the robustness of the internal quantum dynamics of biological systems. *BioSystems* 70: 43–54.
- . 2004. What does a molecule want? The myth of the self-replicating molecule (comments on the selfish–gene paradigm). *BioSystems* 73: 1–11.
- . 2007. The ontological roots of human science: The message of evolution—The physics of freedom (choice). *World Futures* 63(8): 568–583.
- Belinfante, F. J. 1975. *Measurement and time reversal in objective quantum theory*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Changeaux, J.-P. 1985. *Neuronal man: The biology of mind*. New York: Pantheon.
- Csányi, V. 1999. *The human nature/Human ethology [Az emberi természet/Humán etológia]*. Budapest: Vince Kiadó. (In Hungarian)
- De Duve, C. 2002. *Life evolving: Molecules, mind and meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dyson, F. 1999. *Origins of life*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Engels, F. 1950. Speech at Karl Marx’s funeral. Eds. E. Devecseri and Z. Liszkai, In *Of Karl Marx. [Marx Károlyról]*. Budapest: Szikra. pp. 7–9 (In Hungarian)
- Freud, S. 1953–1974. *The standard edition of the complete psychological works*. (Translated from the German under the General Editorship of James Strachey in Collaboration with Anna Freud), Vol I.–XXIV. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho–Analysis.

- . 1953. Vol. VII. *Three essays on the theory of sexuality*.
- . 1955. Vol. XVIII. Beyond the pleasure principle, 7–64.
- . 1958. Vol. XII. Formulations regarding the two principles in mental functioning, 215–226.
- . 1971a. Vol. XIX. The Ego and the Id, 3–66.
- . 1971b. Vol. XVIII. Group psychology and analysis of the ego, 67–143.
- . 1986. *Quoted in F. Erös, Psychoanalysis, Freudism, Freudomarxism. [Pszichoanalízis, freudizmus, freudomarxizmus]*. Budapest: Gondolat, 34–35, 38–39. (In Hungarian)
- Gunji, Y. P. 1994. Autonomic life as the proof of incompleteness and Lawvere's theorem of fixed point. *Applied Mathematics and Composition* 61: 231–267.
- Hofstadter, D. R. 1979. *Gödel, Escher, Bach: An eternal braid*. New York: Basic Books
- Jung, C. 1954–1979. *The collected works of C. G. Jung*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press and London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Lenin, V. I. 1963–1979. *Collected works of Lenin. [Lenin összegyűjtött művei]*. 55 vols. Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó. (In Hungarian)
- Matsuno, K. 1984. Is matter inanimate?: Protobiological information from within. *Origins of Life* 14: 489–496.
- Marx, K. and F. Engels. 1932. *Die deutsche Ideologie*. Historisch–Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Part I, vol. 5. Berlin.
- . 1957–1988. *Works. [Művei]*. 48 vols. Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó. (In Hungarian)
- Pattee, H. H. 1971. Can life explain quantum mechanics? In *Quantum theory and beyond*, ed. T. Bastin, 307–319. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1979. The complementarity principle and the origin of macromolecular information. *BioSystems* 11: 217–226.
- . 1995. Evolving self-reference: Matter, symbols, and semantic closure. *Communication and Cognition—Artificial intelligence* 12(1–2): 9–27.
- Pylyshyn, Z. 1980. Computation and cognition: Issues in the foundations of cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 3: 111–169.
- Varela, F. 1975. The calculus for self reference. *International Journal of General Systems* 4: 243–253.
- Waddington, C. H. 1969. The basic ideas of biology. In *Towards a theoretical biology*, ed. C. H. Waddington, vol. 1, 1–31. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Weizsäcker, C. F. 1989. *The German titanism. [A német titanizmus]*. Budapest: Európa Kiadó, p. 17. (In Hungarian)