

Advertiser 21/7/22  
W. O. H. T. Rischbieth

idea of a first cause conceived of the Deity as apart from His creation, creating it and leaving it away from Him, so to speak. Modern religions though dwell on the idea of God as immanent, mind shaping the details of the universe into a coherent rational whole. So life above or below consciousness is viewed as the formative influence, giving unity to an immense multiplicity of factors serving a discernible purpose, and capable of being interpreted in regard to it. Professor Doncaster, F.R.S., in a recent essay on biology since Darwin, stresses this incapability to explain organic unity as the breaking point of the mechanical theory. He says that we are almost as far away from a satisfactory scientific interpretation of life as ever we were.

Professor Robertson left the impression that the believer in the free creative activity of mind rested his case on the failure of the mechanist to explain the whole thing. But it is not that conscious freedom claims to exist only till it is explained away, but that consciousness claims to reveal itself, actually and positively, as being of such a nature that it cannot be reduced to physical and mechanical terms. Prolonged remorse reacts on the machinery which serves the mind. It is accompanied by profound biochemical reactions, but remorse for the past affirms its existence as a fact of a totally different order—an order not capable of being got into a test tube. "What we want to believe has nothing to do with it," says Professor Robertson, but it appears to me that the persistence of materialism is due to a very exaggerated form of the will to believe. If it were true it would represent the complete framework of omniscience—the formula that only waits the filling in of the details to be able to explain everything. But to force facts into a framework which demands that their essential characteristics should be left out is surely the supreme scientific sin. Science relies for its trust in itself on the belief in the power of our minds to present facts in a trustworthy manner. Consciousness presents aspirations, judgments of value, creative activity as the activities of a free self-conscious self. We can make mistakes in this region, as we can make mistakes with our eyes, faulty attention being to blame nearly always. But if we cannot trust our self-consciousness to give us an account of itself fundamentally true to its own nature, what basis have we for knowledge at all? Materialism means the denial of the right of self-consciousness to speak for itself, a claim far beyond the competence of any theory based solely on the observation of material facts.

News has just been received from England that Mr. O. H. T. Rischbieth, M.A., has been appointed Reader in Ancient and Modern Geography and head of that department at the University College of Southampton. Mr. Rischbieth took a high degree in honours classics at Adelaide University, and has since distinguished himself in the field of ethnology, especially with reference to geographical environment.

Advertiser 21/7/22

### ANTHROPOLOGY.

#### ITS RELATION TO SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PROBLEMS.

Professor Brailsford Robertson, who presided at the public lecture delivered by Professor Darnley Naylor in the Institute Room, North-terrace, on Tuesday night, said the professor was lecturing at the request of the British Science Guild. There were certain problems which were of vital interest to the public. Anthropology was one of these, but, unfortunately, it had not yet claimed its due recognition from the British race.

Professor Darnley Naylor said he had called anthropology "Mother of the Muses," borrowing the epithet from Aeschylus. He used it over 2,300 years ago, and applied it to memory or record. The muses presided over all forms of knowledge; over literature, including prose, poetry and drama, and over science. But if they were to understand the distinguished daughters they must understand the mother, and to do that implied knowledge of man, of his memory and record throughout the ages. Here was no mere allegory, for anthropology, in its widest sense, not only formed the basis on which knowledge rested, but also was all their knowledge. In fact, anthropology was alike the source and the content. Greece had done the pioneer work in art, literature, mathematics, philosophy, and all those branches of knowledge which now arrogated to themselves the title of science; Rome had taught law and statesmanship, and shown the building of an Empire and its administration for centuries. He had spoken of Greece and Rome as pioneers, but they had done more than blaze the tracks: they had made roads to knowledge along which all to-day must travel. Anthropology had awakened new interests, especially in the regions of ethnology and language, not to mention comparative religion. Ethnology and philology could throw light upon the racial and political problems of twentieth century Europe. Why, for instance, did Lithuania and Estonia part from Russia in 1917? First, because their inhabitants spoke in many cases a Turanian and not a European language, and, secondly, because they were, on the coast at least, long-headed Nordics and not short-headed Slavs. For the same reason there was trouble in East Karelia, Lithuanians hated Poles because the former spoke perhaps the oldest form of Indo-European language, and because they regarded the Slavs as (comparatively) modern intruders. A Lithuanian peasant can read simple passages of Sanskrit.

All these were questions of great moment to-day. Take the Englishman. He was mixed Nordic and Mediterranean, but the Nordic lay heavy above and rarely allowed the Mediterranean to bubble to the surface; the English seldom "mafficked," but in certain lands where the Mediterranean was uppermost, to "maffick" was a daily occurrence, and, alas, firearms took the place of fireworks. He would illustrate the value of ethnology in his own department of literature. Why were the Athenians clever and full of talk, while the Spartans were slow and "laconic"? Because the Spartans were nearly pure Nordics, and delighted in Alien Exclusion Acts, whereas the Athenians were a happy mixture of Nordic and Mediterranean, and he fancied the Mediterranean predominated. One might wonder whether the genius of Shakespeare might not be traced to some similar happy mixture of Welsh and Saxon blood. Among the ancients, Alexander the Great showed the mixture in an odd, one might almost say ostentatious, fashion by possessing one eye blue (the left) and the other very black. He was said also to have had an aquiline nose, fair skin, and gently curling yellow hair.

A striking instance of the value of knowing some ethnology was seen in a certain passage of the Choephoroi of Aeschylus (the second play of that trilogy). Orestes had just returned to Mykenae. He was unrecognised after many years of exile since boyhood. He placed a lock of hair

on the tomb of his father (Agamemnon), and offered prayers to the dead. Presently his sister, Electra, appeared with a procession of women, bearing libations. Orestes drew aside. Electra made her offerings and suddenly noticed the lock of hair and a footprint near the altar. At once she concluded that Orestes had returned from exile and that the hair and the footprint were his. No doubt to modern minds this verged on the comic, particularly when Electra compared her foot with the print, and found that they coincided. Here, no doubt, they had the ancient folk lore tale, which was not so silly after all. The family of Agamemnon was a family of royalties surrounded by a conquered indigenous people. It was a Nordic family, whereas the conquered people were Mediterranean. The lock of hair was golden, therefore it belonged to a member of the royal family, the large footprint implied the same. A lock from the head of a commoner would have been black and the footprint small. Early Greek women were always represented with large feet. Thus the "silly" recognition scene became a natural and even impressive part of the play. How much real history must lie concealed under such tales.

Many of the Homeric heroes were golden-haired; the very gods themselves were often Nordic, and it might be that the golden hair of Apollo was responsible for the sun-god myth. Even Judge Rindmanthus in hell had a golden wig. Regarding Rome, let them ask who were the Patricians but Nordics. The plebeians were native Mediterraneans. In a flash they could now understand the whole history of early Rome, the eternal struggle, not as they thought between two classes, but between two races. (Applause.) Julius Caesar, with his tall stature, his dark piercing eyes, suggested at once a plebeian admixture in his family tree. The plebeian strain evidently largely disappeared in his successors. Suetonius scribed Augustus as having slightly curly hair, inclined to be golden in color, of a medium complexion, and short of stature. Tiberius, according to the same authority, was large and strong and above the average stature and of fair complexion and had unusually large eyes. Caligula was very tall and extremely pale. His picture of Nero, was not very winsome; it described him as being above the average height, with light blond hair, weak blue eyes, a thick neck, and having "a prominent belly," and very slender legs. Galba was of average height, bald, with blue eyes, and a hooked nose. On the other hand Horace was short, and doubtless dark. He was a Greek Mediterranean. Art had kept alive the tradition by painting the thieves dark and the Christ blond in the representations of the Crucifixion. Nobody ever dreamed of blond devils or brunette angels, much less a Japanese or negro angel. In mediaeval times the baron was always represented as fair, and the serf at his horse's rein as dark. Why, too, were prince and princesses always "fair"? Why did "fair" also mean just? Why was the hero of melodrama blond and stupid, while the villain was black and clever? All these questions were answered by ethnology, and the answers were more interesting than dates of battles. Did William Rufus ever excite an intelligent question about his red hair? They only thought of Normans as wicked Frenchmen, oppressing the noble English race, when, as a matter of fact, Nordics were then employed in cutting one another's throats, as they were doing largely from 1914 to 1918.

The application of all this was:—First, there was little doubt that a knowledge of ethnology would be of advantage to many a politician. The racial distinctions recognised by Australian legislators were often unscientific and certainly capricious. For instance a great outcry was made over the introduction of Maltese into Australia. No one, however, voiced a protest against Spaniards, Southern Italians, and Greeks. And yet the Maltese were racially similar to the Mediterranean (in the ethnological sense), and actually showed many Nordic characteristics. It was true that they might already be introducing too many of the Mediterranean stock, but there was no special reason why they should bar the native of Malta. It might, on the other hand, be well to avoid the unrestricted importation of Alpine Slavs, such as Slovenes, Serbians, and Bulgarians. Above all, they should remember that any embargo on the Mediterranean type would logically bar out Welsh and Irish and a considerable number of Englishmen. Lastly, there was that all-important task Australia had been performing in Papua since 1906, and since 1920 in the mandated territories in the Pacific. The Federal Government did vouchsafe a report on Papua, but so far he had been unable to obtain any official information about the mandated territories. Judge T. H. P. Murray, however, in speaking of the great change in native life from war to peace, from pleasurable idleness to reluctant work, had said it was really the lack of interest in life that wrought such havoc among the native races who had come under European control. They should strive to understand as far as possible the complex web of custom and institution which constituted the life of a native, so

as to eliminate the bad and leave the good, and this was the aim of anthropology. In 1920 the Federal Government created a Department of Anthropology, which had already done useful work. The material collected had a real administrative value. They had lost most of their opportunities of studying the Australian native already, and the chance was gone for ever in Tasmania. The advantages of the vast natural anthropological laboratory afforded by German New Guinea and the Pacific islands in general must be seized upon before it was too late, for in another decade the natives would be too sophisticated. They must remember that they held these territories in trust for science as well as humanity. (Applause.)

Advertiser 24/7/22

### UNIVERSITY SYLLABUS.

From "GONZALO"—The thought of enforcing so many as 12 novels to be read in one year makes me gasp with astonishment. I would like to mention, as one who is studying English literature, that the present year's syllabus necessitates much careful study. For many young men it is imperative that they pass the senior examination, and the studying has to be done in the few hours left after their day's work ceases. The syllabus this year contains 49 poems, 200 lines of which have to be memorised, a play of Shakespeare, a book of essays, and two books in English composition. It is to be seen from this that the senior student is kept busy. I hope the existing regulations will not be altered.

From M. S. SPIVAKOWSKY.—Having read the opinions of students about the proposed revision of Latin, I wish, as a senior student, to say what I feel and think. Latin is a difficult subject, which statement is upheld by nearly all students, brainy and otherwise. At present we have three text books—two of translation and one of grammar—to study, and even with this "paltry bit of work" there are very many who fail to obtain a pass in one year. Some even take as many as three and four years to "get through." How long, then, would it take to pass the subject if the directors "raised the standard just a little" by setting 12 text books for study? When I think of how I might easily fail in Latin next year, the thought of twelve text books next year gives me a headache already. Not only does it cause a grudge to be formed against Latin, but it is not giving the future students the chances of the past ones. Also, let us remember that we, as Australians, desire "a fair go," and next year's Latin students would have anything but that if the syllabus were changed as intended. I am also certain that in the long run there would be a more scanty knowledge of Latin than at present, for how many would continue the subject under such grave difficulties? Let us then hope the directors of Latin will acknowledge their mistake in setting twelve text books.

Advertiser 21/7/22

### UNIVERSITY SYLLABUS.

From "GHOST O' JAMES L."—What's this, Buchanan? They want less Latin. No, never, Mon, d'ye ken hoo you had me at everych morn at five, wet or fine, and hoo we read together Vergil's twal books of ten thousand lines, all his Georgics, Bucolics, and the rest, and hoo you pulled me through fifty books of Livy's history and a heap more? What I learned o' Greek I hae forgot, Mon, 'tis three hundred years langsyn! No, no, I'll never agree with yon feller that wants twa books. Let him talk more rummilkumpton. I'd put him on a cuddy-stool. It makes me snortle when I think o' it. Gie 'em muckle Latin and stouth and outh o' it. Are there naw Scotch professors aboot the noo? Speer aboot fer ink and quills, I'll write a counterblast!

From "PERPLEXED"—I also protest against the proposed incomprehensible innovations. If the "powers that be" wished to create an atmosphere of mysticism, they must be abundantly satisfied just now. Mysticism, however, is not always desirable in matters which affect a large percentage of the public. As one who still has vivid recollections of the days when Senior Latin was the order of the day, I can add my testimony that two books are as many as the average student can well cope with. It is a matter of common knowledge that Senior Latin, as at present constituted, is one of the largest subjects in the syllabus. Any increase in the amount to be traversed will heap confusion upon the heads of candidates. Other correspondents have stressed the inconvenience which of necessity must fall to the lot of country students, if the new syllabus is adopted. This aspect is vastly important.

Advertiser 25/7/22

### UNIVERSITY SYLLABUS.

From "CNEIUS MESCIPPIO"—No kennin' Buchanan, I'm no sayin' onything aboot him, but kennin' you see weel as I do, Jeemsie, ma laddie, I'm no surprised ye kent Vergil's twal books, his Georgics an' Bucolics, Livy's history an' the rest o't. Mayhap, ye had naething else tae dae tae while awa' the weary hours. It mattered naething tae ye whether ye kent it or no. But we dinna' a' lme the guid (or is't bad?) lark tae belang tae the Hoose o' Stuart. Mony o' the laddies maun pass an examination an' who maun gang oot tae earn their siller an' hae only an hoor or twa a' nich's tae delve amin' the mysteries o' Vergil an' his ilk. Onywey, what guid was't tae ye, laddie? D'd't help ye tae settle the fechtin's o' yer Kirk an' yer Parliament or the German an' the Spanish questions? Mayhap if ye had kent hoo tae rule yer kingdom sae weel as ye kent the Latin ye mightna' hae been a ghost sae early as ye were.—Tae the Deil wi' ye, Jeemsie! (if ye are no there a'ready.)