

THE AMERICAN

Incorporating the Church Herald

THURSDAY JANUARY 13, 1966

A WELCOME CHANGE OF MIND

All of us must surely support the call by the ARCHBISHOP OF SYDNEY, THE MOST REVEREND H. R. GUTHRIE, for our prayers for a "just and lasting peace" in Viet Nam, even though it is not about Viet Nam appearing on this page, are somewhat less direct and effective.

Nothing is more disarming, certainly to gain approval than the courage involved in public admission of error—even when the admission is only tacit. Eight months ago the ARCHBISHOP rejected out of hand the opportunity to associate himself with resolutions leading to a just and honourable peace. His public utterances in the intervening period, until now, made it appear that his sole interest was in military victory.

Overtaken, as it were, that he has changed. His GRACE has swung into the great stream of world Christian opinion by making it clear that he wants peace on just terms. Thus to change his mind is an act of great courage, for which he deserves all credit.

Compared with this courageous reversal of view, the few small inaccuracies in what His GRACE has said about Viet Nam are relatively unimportant. It is well for the record, however, to put them right.

To claim that Australia supports the U.S. in Viet Nam "to prevent the spread of communism" is truly mischievous. First, it is untrue. Second, it is to suggest a system of belief by torture, murder, high explosive or malice. Did horrible mutilation and death change the beliefs of Christians in the First Century? Or Protestants under the liquidation? Or the millions under Nazi occupation? Second, the form of government chosen by Chinese, Australians, Americans or Viet Namese is their own affair for others to interfere, or attempt to establish in Viet Nam, national law and practice, and it is precisely for this reason that the U.S. and Australian Governments claim that they are not intervening at the request of the Government of South Viet Nam. Third, it is untrue, especially because His GRACE mentions that "this is a fight for freedom and the Australian and American troops there are inspired by this knowledge, even as the Americans were inspired by World War II," we need as a matter of self-preservation to look carefully at the truth about this free and independent Government of South Viet Nam.

(Parenthetically, the Government of North Viet Nam allies the Russians also fighting for "freedom" as we use the term? Or were we fighting for "freedom" as they used the word? Or were we all fighting in defence of our national interests?)

The Government of South Viet Nam which originally requested and received military help from the U.S. and Australia, the late Ngo Dinh Diem. But there are two catches to this fact, namely:

● **NO DINH DIEM himself was actually chosen, transported to Saigon, installed and maintained, in office, by the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States, in the belief that he would be a compliant tool of the C.I.A.**

● **He was deposed by the C.I.A. in November, 1953, and murdered with a U.S. rifle and a U.S.-made M113 personnel carrier after it became plain that, inter alia, he would no longer do as he was told.**

No elections of any kind whatever have since been held in South Viet Nam. The successive "governments" of DUONG VAN MINH, NGUYEN NGOK THO, NGUYEN KHAI, PHAM KHAT SON, TRANG VAN HUUON, PHAM KHUAT, NGUYEN VAN THIEU and Nguyen Cao Ky have held office during the measure of successive U.S. victories on the spot in Saigon.

No "government" in Saigon could conceivably last twelve hours save by favour from the United States. In these circumstances, Mr. WALTER LIPPMAN has perhaps something of a point when he comments so scathingly on the "invitations" of these creatures to the U.S.

It is unfortunate that the ARCHBISHOP OF SYDNEY did not have the opportunity of meeting in Saigon last year the present "Prime Minister," SUR BREGOIERE GENERAL NGUYEN COO KY, and of assessing his character. The present "Prime Minister" is a French and the U.S. General KY is from all accounts a competent fighter pilot, a man of military courage and considerable intelligence. Now, it does not seem particularly surprising, especially in view of the military nature of his career, that he should possess uncommon attributes of statecraft.

CATHERINE DE MEDIT, a woman, possessed uncommon attributes of statecraft. LLOYD GIORIO, a womanizer, was an outstanding Prime Minister in time of peace. General DAVENPORT, with all his sins of the flesh, was a better statesman than ROBERTSPIERRE, and SOLOMON had good judgement! What trait is it that his proud, arrogant, and self-righteousness is insufficiently appreciated about GENERAL KY? What trait is it that his proud, arrogant, and self-righteousness is insufficiently appreciated about GENERAL KY? The most direct count upon which GENERAL KY is guilty, and

PEACE IN VIET NAM

In a surprise piece written on December 9 but only released last week, the Most Reverend H. R. Guthrie, has now publicly taken the same stand on Viet Nam as the fourteen archbishops and bishops who wrote to the Prime Minister, Robert Menzies, in October.

In March last year, the bishops expressed their hopes that "our Government would take positive steps, with others, to bring about a peaceful settlement of the fighting in Viet Nam."

His GRACE, who is now urged "constant prayers" for "our diplomats and politicians in seeking for a just and lasting peace as speedily as possible."

He did so in his monthly letter to a private magazine circulating in many parts of the Diocese of Sydney.

It is stated in the magazine that "responsibility for opinions stated in this magazine is borne by His Grace the Archbishop of Sydney."

This warning is included, it is understood, in order to make it plain that His GRACE is not writing in private capacity, and not on behalf of the Diocese, whose members might not have agreed with his opinions.

Others to receive His GRACE's letter on Viet Nam is:

The war in Viet Nam is correctly stated to be a civil war.

The spread of communism is not only a threat to the U.S. but to the world and that it is impossible for the U.S. to remain neutral in a war from that country, such a withdrawal would be a military and moral triumph for Communism.

Also: The war in Viet Nam may be the last war in the world.

It is also stated that the U.S. has proved increasingly costly in casualties.

The U.S. and Australian Governments and the Australian and American troops there are inspired by this knowledge, even as the Americans were inspired by World War II.

We need as a matter of self-preservation to look carefully at the truth about this free and independent Government of South Viet Nam.

(Parenthetically, the Government of North Viet Nam allies the Russians also fighting for "freedom" as we use the term? Or were we fighting for "freedom" as they used the word? Or were we all fighting in defence of our national interests?)

The Government of South Viet Nam which originally requested and received military help from the U.S. and Australia, the late Ngo Dinh Diem. But there are two catches to this fact, namely:

● **NO DINH DIEM himself was actually chosen, transported to Saigon, installed and maintained, in office, by the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States, in the belief that he would be a compliant tool of the C.I.A.**

● **He was deposed by the C.I.A. in November, 1953, and murdered with a U.S. rifle and a U.S.-made M113 personnel carrier after it became plain that, inter alia, he would no longer do as he was told.**

No elections of any kind whatever have since been held in South Viet Nam. The successive "governments" of DUONG VAN MINH, NGUYEN NGOK THO, NGUYEN KHAI, PHAM KHAT SON, TRANG VAN HUUON, PHAM KHUAT, NGUYEN VAN THIEU and Nguyen Cao Ky have held office during the measure of successive U.S. victories on the spot in Saigon.

No "government" in Saigon could conceivably last twelve hours save by favour from the United States. In these circumstances, Mr. WALTER LIPPMAN has perhaps something of a point when he comments so scathingly on the "invitations" of these creatures to the U.S.

It is unfortunate that the ARCHBISHOP OF SYDNEY did not have the opportunity of meeting in Saigon last year the present "Prime Minister," SUR BREGOIERE GENERAL NGUYEN COO KY, and of assessing his character. The present "Prime Minister" is a French and the U.S. General KY is from all accounts a competent fighter pilot, a man of military courage and considerable intelligence. Now, it does not seem particularly surprising, especially in view of the military nature of his career, that he should possess uncommon attributes of statecraft.

CATHERINE DE MEDIT, a woman, possessed uncommon attributes of statecraft. LLOYD GIORIO, a womanizer, was an outstanding Prime Minister in time of peace. General DAVENPORT, with all his sins of the flesh, was a better statesman than ROBERTSPIERRE, and SOLOMON had good judgement! What trait is it that his proud, arrogant, and self-righteousness is insufficiently appreciated about GENERAL KY? What trait is it that his proud, arrogant, and self-righteousness is insufficiently appreciated about GENERAL KY? The most direct count upon which GENERAL KY is guilty, and

which makes nonsense any claim that he is concerned for "freedom," is that he is a self-confessed, public admirer of Hitler, as long ago as July, 1941.

record in an interview duly published in the London Press as saying:

"People ask what my heroes are. I have only one—Hitler. But the situation here is so desperate now that one man would not be enough. We need four or five Hitler in Viet Nam."

Not while he lived! But, if we understand him, and presumably as the ARCHBISHOP OF SYDNEY uses the word, must include GENERAL KY's freedom to live whatever kind of personal life he wishes, and to hold whatever religious, political and social views, and pushing things a little far, however, to hold that Australian youngsters should be conscripted to fight and die in the precious name of freedom for a Viet Nam.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

It is not necessary for a man who stands for everything to which the fathers of those same young Australians were opposed—and against which they, too, fought and died.

CLERGY NEWS

BARRETT, the Reverend E. R., to be Assistant Curate of St. Stephen's, Canterbury, Kent.

BORDEN, the Reverend R. E., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

BURROWS, the Reverend L. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CANNIE, the Reverend P. F., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

CHAPMAN, the Reverend J. H., to be Assistant Curate of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, Kent.

ASIAN RACE AND RACIAL

THIS IS THE TEXT OF AN ADDRESS GIVEN AT S. MARK'S COLLEGE, CANBERRA, BY PROFESSOR W. E. H. SPANNER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY, RESEARCH SCHOOL OF PACIFIC STUDIES, AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY.

1. I suppose I have been asked to speak on this subject because as an anthropologist I may be expected to have a special interest in the facts of race and in the social problems arising — or supposed to arise — from them.

That qualification "supposed to arise" is the essence of what I have to say. It begins, then, by explaining why I think it an important qualification to make.

There are observable physical differences between the races; there are hidden physical differences; the differences are variable; we are not sure positively that they are, but they could turn out to be connected with obscure mental, temperamental and personality characteristics; and the races have performed differently in history.

But as yet there is no experimental, or even quasi-experimental, evidence that really warrants leaning from the phre of physical differences to the plane of mental capacity, or the plane of civilisation, or performance, or history.

In all the alleged facts and arguments so far put forward, to support the contention that there are some inferior races, some superior races, there seems always to be some flaw or fallacy, something unconvincing or wrong from a scientific point of view.

A test has to distinguish, truly distinguish, between the innate powers and people affected by environment, training and motivation, and by "culture". We are still working on it, and are not and not merely trying.

2. It is important that the general public should understand that, in other aspects, too, we are only just beginning to see what we are talking about when we talk of human races.

A number of specialised disciplines are now concerned with themselves with it — not only physical and social anthropology, but also general anthropology, ethnology and archaeological prehistory, and even several branches of biology and genetics, geology, ecology, and psychology, and other specialisms.

Not one of them, as far as I know, would claim to have made more than a beginning. The very man his own expert approach is no longer possible. This study is shifting from the contrary to the latter. What this means is clear enough.

It is a warning to beware of popular theories about what "race" is and signifies. They stand to scientific and demonstrable knowledge as astrology stands to astronomy.

ANTIPATHY

3. There is apparently no need to postulate a "racial instinct" or a "universal instinct of racial antipathy." An adequate explanation of racial antipathy can be found in impulses and instincts that are independent of race.

And the intimate experience of living with people of other race certainly gives no reason for supposing that on the level of human nature people anywhere are very different from people everywhere.

Because of that experience anthropologists have become more or less colour-blind, so to speak, towards racial differences. They forget to notice the tint of someone's skin, or the shape of the latter's nose, or whether his hair has a kink or a curl.

Most of them have come to agree with Confucius that men's natures are alike; it is their habits that carry them far apart", habits in this case meaning beliefs, customs, standards and ways of life.

Here, in their opinion, is the source of the conflict and the ground of prejudice.

But this is not what is going on in the world in the name of race some distinction — or supposed to arise — concerns what is now widely known as "race".

A "race" is one who propagates the dogma that some races are better and will be perpetually inferior to others for reasons of "race". "Race" is the advocacy or practice of a policy expressing racial differences.

A thoroughgoing extreme policy is to regard all the familiar races, and even the physical differences directed against particular races, e.g. the African Negro.

More widespread is an ideological racism, strong but not strong enough to be able to deny the national policies, although it may handicap them.

The most pervasive of all is a vague but unshakable suspicion that there probably is something inferior about the inferior races, the argument in relation to particular races.

I suppose that this suspicion has been expressed more fully and most persistently about the Aborigines, although it is not so obvious that it probably runs true than a close second.

STRONG WORD

"Racism" is too strong a word to apply to it. I think it serves no purpose other than to serve as a political controversy, to label the races, to label the inferior races, to label the inferior races, to label the inferior races, to label the inferior races.

It is hard to know how best to put this, but I think that we might speak of degrees of "racism".

In the present text, in my opinion, is whether a national policy and practice defines discrimination on the basis of race, or general or specific inferiority, or the description "racism" to it.

There would be problem with the use of "racism" in recent years we have discovered, that several branches of biology and genetics, geology, ecology, and psychology, and other specialisms.

Not one of them, as far as I know, would claim to have made more than a beginning. The very man his own expert approach is no longer possible. This study is shifting from the contrary to the latter. What this means is clear enough.

It is a warning to beware of popular theories about what "race" is and signifies. They stand to scientific and demonstrable knowledge as astrology stands to astronomy.

3. There is apparently no need to postulate a "racial instinct" or a "universal instinct of racial antipathy." An adequate explanation of racial antipathy can be found in impulses and instincts that are independent of race.

And the intimate experience of living with people of other race certainly gives no reason for supposing that on the level of human nature people anywhere are very different from people everywhere.

Because of that experience anthropologists have become more or less colour-blind, so to speak, towards racial differences. They forget to notice the tint of someone's skin, or the shape of the latter's nose, or whether his hair has a kink or a curl.

Most of them have come to agree with Confucius that men's natures are alike; it is their habits that carry them far apart", habits in this case meaning beliefs, customs, standards and ways of life.

to unnerve many authorities. It is not the climate of opinion it can thus have easy access to.

5. For the sake of perspective let us remember that race is not a biological fact as old as history and have probably been used by all peoples as old as history.

In very ancient monuments there are references to the relationships of conquerors and conquered and master and slave.

Cicero advised Atticus not to obtain slaves from Italy "because they are so stupid and so utterly incapable of being taught that they are not fit to form part of the household of a Roman."

In parts of Africa where I have heard that there was an atrocity of Hamites or Nilo-Hamites and a subsequent class of negroes.

I heard Masai, the Nilo-Hamite cattleherders, speak with contempt of the Hutu people who produced some Kenyan.

African students have been heard to say that they are "those black things". Some Aborigines I know used to refer to the "black fellows" language people implying.

The very universality of racism, the fact that it is so much put much trust in the assurance which some people of goodwill may have to it, to modify it in a major way the racial aspect of the world.

Experience and commonsense tell us that it is not so. The argument is inherently false. It is not so. The argument is inherently false. It is not so. The argument is inherently false. It is not so.

For example, it is widely asserted that perhaps even truly believed, that just as we know how to "build, say, computers so that they know how to plan to avoid racial tensions, frictions and conflicts, so that they need never happen there."

This is a statement of faith, not of demonstrated or demonstrable truth. The rather cynical dialectic which has fitted so well in with reciprocal racism is a strong reason for caution.

In a simple fashion — that communities and nations can deal with the problem of the individual persons of goodwill.

A simple fashion — that communities and nations can deal with the problem of the individual persons of goodwill.

A simple fashion — that communities and nations can deal with the problem of the individual persons of goodwill.

A simple fashion — that communities and nations can deal with the problem of the individual persons of goodwill.

A simple fashion — that communities and nations can deal with the problem of the individual persons of goodwill.

A simple fashion — that communities and nations can deal with the problem of the individual persons of goodwill.

A simple fashion — that communities and nations can deal with the problem of the individual persons of goodwill.

A simple fashion — that communities and nations can deal with the problem of the individual persons of goodwill.

seem outward and visible signs of tribalism, but they are not.

There is no motive to exclude because of difference turns the signs into symbols, by building up much vivid ideas about them and charging them with emotion.

There are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

more and more to appeal to tribalism, but they are not.

There is no motive to exclude because of difference turns the signs into symbols, by building up much vivid ideas about them and charging them with emotion.

There are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

These are not "racial" instincts, but there are instincts that all manner of fears, and probably of self-protection.

The tension built up over the years did not break until the fields began to dwindle.

Envy, jealousy and fear were among the root causes. At one time there were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields. There were nearly 50,000 Chinese on the Victorian goldfields.

ADDRESS (To which receipt will be sent)