

THE 2nd ANNUAL
MINORITY RIGHTS GROUP LECTURE

given at

Chatham House, London

on

12th December 1973

"THE INTEGRATION OF MINORITIES"

by

Prof. Edmund Leach

Copyright

The Minority Rights Group
36 Craven Street
London, W.C.2.

I must start with an apology to my hosts. In reading through my draft of this address I find that substantial parts of it might easily be construed as a direct attack on everything that the Minority Rights Group stands for. That is not my intention at all. My thesis rather is that what the Minority Rights Group does is, of its kind, excellent, but that why it does what it does, or what it hopes to achieve by doing it, needs a lot more thought and clarification.

The bogey which links the various activities of the Minority Rights Group together is discrimination. MRG is, as an issue of principle, against discrimination. It recognises that the circumstances which generate discrimination are always complicated but it has faith that there are plenty of men of goodwill in influential places and that only good can arise if the facts of the case are better known.

So MRG pays for on the spot research into situations of notorious discrimination and publishes the results in the form of factual reports, most of which have quite rightly received high praise. But let me draw your attention to an initial paradox. The reports are written in English so that it is an English speaking public opinion that is being stimulated, but nearly all the cases of discrimination which have so far been examined lie within the political jurisdiction of non-English speaking governments.

In the last analysis, is MRG trying to influence British foreign policy or to interfere with local administration in foreign countries?

The heart of my anxiety is this. The days of gun boat diplomacy are over. We are no longer likely to use the suppression of the slave trade as an excuse for sending in the marines. But moral imperialism is still with us and I am by no means certain that MRG is not an example. My comments therefore are intended to raise queries. What is MRG really hoping to achieve and where?

My lecture has been advertised under the title: "The Integration of Minorities". Actually I shall not arrive at that topic in any explicit sense until rather late in the proceedings but it would be as well if you were to keep the formal possibilities in mind all the way through.

If a sovereign political state incorporates more than one distinguishable cultural community - as is nearly always the case in modern states - there are, broadly speaking, three (and only three) 'ideal types' of long term development, even though in practice the combination of these ideal types may produce all kinds of variation.

Ideal type one is that of 'total integration'. The guiding ideology is that the political state 'ought' to be culturally homogeneous. The culture of the politically dominant group must prevail in all contexts. Minority values and minority customs are seen as a threat to the cohesive solidarity of society and must be eliminated. In its extreme form, this ideal goes along with a drab egalitarianism. It is not simply that every individual must have equal opportunity; every individual must remain the exact equivalent of every other for fear that the fabric of society may be torn by the divisive influence of culturally distinguishable classes.

Ideal type two is that of 'federal association'. The guiding philosophy is that of tolerance. We are required to accept the thesis that people can be equal even when they are different. The ideal of federation is very attractive to liberal minded Englishmen such as most of those now sitting in this room. Some federations are more successful than others but it is a well known fact of history that in Switzerland the combination of cultural diversity with political federation has proved to be a perfectly viable possibility which has endured for centuries. And of course there have been a great variety of other less stable versions of the same kind of thing.

The practical difficulties are well known. One of the federated cultural units tends to dominate the others. Alternatively, if there are several groups, they sort themselves out into a hierarchy. Hierarchy then implies exploitation. Or does it? Is our English liberal objection to formal hierarchy simply a prejudice? As heirs to the confused philosophies of the American and French Revolutions most Europeans are inclined to take for granted some version of the thesis that by nature all men are born equal. We recognise that in practice we live in an hierarchically ordered society in which the economic classes are culturally distinct but, in different degrees, no matter whether we are politically on the Right or on the Left we feel compelled to pay lip

service to the doctrine that this is regrettable. We manage to talk all the time as if we believed that hierarchy was a necessary evil rather than an essential quality of human existence.

This valuation of equality is so strong among most peoples of recent European origin that even such a markedly exploitative regime as that at present in control in South Africa feels impelled to justify the theory of apartheid by claiming that the separate Bantustans are intended to be equal though different.

But this post-eighteenth century European doctrine is not a human universal. The Indian caste system (which in one version or another has managed to survive for well over two thousand years) is based on the contrary proposition that hierarchy is part of the natural order of things. Indian caste ideology is comparable to that of South African apartheid in that cultural difference is treated as the equivalent of species difference - members of different castes are felt to be as distinct from one another as cats and dogs - but in the Indian scheme there is no suggestion that separate castes should be linked in a federation of equals. The structure is fundamentally hierarchical and it would be a contradiction of the caste order to suggest that it could ever be anything else. Perhaps you feel that this is shocking. How could a society in which discrimination is part of the basic ideology have any merit at all? But liberal minded Englishmen need to be cautious before they assume that their own scheme of things is any better. I shall come back to that.

Finally, ideal type three is that of "separate coexistence".

Only a few centuries ago a majority of the total human population of the world lived in economically self-sufficient communities of a highly specialised kind closely adapted by technology and traditional skill to their immediate ecological environment. Most such specialised cultural systems have now disappeared but a few survive in extreme ecological conditions ... nomads in the Sahara, Amazonian Indians, remnants of past cultures among the Eskimo, the Australian Aborigines, the Bushmen, and so on. In such cultural systems approximate self-sufficiency is intrinsic. Any close interaction with neighbouring communities leads automatically to cultural destruction and sometimes to the destruction of the human population as well. Under con-

temporary conditions most of these situations relate to very small human populations. But they are romantic and photogenic and the weekend colour supplements ensure that we shall not entirely forget their existence.

The resulting propaganda, which emerges from organisations such as Survival International rather than MRG, is paternalistic. Explicitly or implicitly the argument is advanced that when a "primitive society" of this sort exists within the political frontiers of a modern sovereign state the Paramount Power has an absolute moral duty to preserve and protect the primitive minority. The rationale of the argument is the same as that which says that when a wild animal species is likely to become extinct it should be protected by legislation and kept in existence in a game reserve or even in a zoo.

But can such doctrines really be applied to human beings? The moral issues are extremely complicated and it seems to me that very few of those who issue propaganda pamphlets on the subject have really thought the problem through at all.

But now I am going to change the subject. I shall return eventually to the practical problems surrounding cultural integration and its alternatives, but first I want to say something about the moral premises which underlie the MRG attitude to these problems. Meanwhile I should like you to keep my three ideal types in mind as well as the philosophical doubts that I have already raised.

In the printed hand-out which summarises the "origin, aims, reports" of MRG, an early reference to "discrimination against cultural minorities" is modified by stages until, at the end, it is said that the aim of MRG is "to secure justice for minority or majority groups suffering discrimination". Why this change of emphasis? I suggest that this seeming equivocation arises because the English liberal conscience, nurtured on Benthamite ideas about the "greatest happiness of the greater number", which were in turn generated in the political cauldron of the French Revolution, finds the concept of "minority rights" an emotive and very sensitive point. The whole structure of liberal democracy, as it has become enshrined in British institutions

since 1790, rests on the proposition that the Will of the Majority shall prevail. The minority has no rights. In accordance with this doctrine we have developed elaborate electoral procedures which are designed to select candidates who represent majority opinion. These elected representatives then sit on all kinds of committees where once again it is assumed that the correct decision will be reached by discovering majority opinion on the basis of one man one vote. Throughout our system it is taken for granted that, for the time being anyway, any elected majority has a perfectly legitimate right to discriminate against its minority opponents in any way it chooses.

Now this belief that majority opinion is 'right' cannot be justified by any process of rational calculation; it is simply maintained as a religious dogma. There is no reason whatsoever to suppose that the decisions of elected majorities are likely to be wiser or more just than decisions arrived at in any other way, nor is it at all obvious that the social systems which have resulted from nearly 200 years of the practical operation of this kind of thing are in any general sense "better" than societies of very varied types from other parts of the world which arrive at political decisions by entirely different means.

The relevance of all this in my present context is this. Because democratic liberal Englishmen like to believe that the ethics of government by majority is an ethic of fairness and justice, it touches us on the quick whenever anyone raises a banner proclaiming justice for minorities. For, after all, as soon as you come to think about it, it is quite obvious that government by majority can never be 'fair'. The conventions of parliamentary democracy may be tolerable, but no one could reasonably suppose that it is fair or just that 49% of the population should have no share in political decision making whenever the other 51% are opposed to them.

So there is something quite paradoxical about parliamentary democrats getting themselves worked up about the rights of minorities.

However, once you start looking around the world for actual examples of political behaviour which are likely to give grave offence to the liberal Englishman's sense of justice and fair play, a curious fact emerges. By and large it is not disfranchised minorities which

are suffering discrimination at the hand of properly elected majorities; it is just the other way about. Government is mostly in the hands of a minority which has successfully twisted the rules so that it can discriminate against the majority. So almost as an afterthought, MRG seems to have become schizophrenic; the objection to discrimination has become all embracing; it covers not only 'justice for suffering minorities' such as the Burakumin of Japan but 'justice for suffering majorities' such as the Blacks of Rhodesia.

I have to confess to a feeling of distaste for self-righteousness on such a global scale. By the criteria which most of us in this room would be inclined to accept, injustice and discrimination exists everywhere, but do the members of MRG really claim that the Englishman's idea of justice and fair play is a human universal corresponding to a kind of Platonic natural justice, which exists 'out there' in the mind of God, irrespective of the structure of the human society to which it is supposed to be applied?

Of course I am well aware that over the past 2500 years European philosophers and theologians have been persistently maintaining that principles of natural justice of just this universal kind exist and are discoverable, though they have seldom agreed as to just what they are. But from my anthropological point of view such assumptions are quite unacceptable. The observable facts of the case are that, although every human society sets great store by the system of moral values in terms of which its own political and legal affairs are conducted, these moral systems vary enormously; indeed it is extremely difficult to detect any moral principle which is universally held to be valid.

That being so, the liberal democratic Englishman's feeling that he can detect injustice and discrimination by inspection can only be justified on the basis of a belief in moral progress. He must claim that the structure of European capitalism in which government by committee majorities has grown up and flourished represents the culmination of human history which enshrines natural justice in its pure form.

So as an anthropologist I have to pose this question to MRG:

Is it not the case that in seeking to impose your British liberal

ideas of justice on alien situations which you do not fully understand, you are engaging in a "moral imperialism" which is only half a step removed from political imperialism?

This is not just trivial hair-splitting, or a play of words. It matters. Before you start lecturing others about the limits of tolerance and discrimination, you need to be carefully introspective about your own scheme of values.

In the 19th Century, Christian missionaries destroyed the primitive cultures of the world with reckless confidence whenever they encountered customs which conflicted with their own sense of sexual propriety or the sanctity of human life. Yet the Christian moral system which justified this cultural destruction was essentially the same as that which made it seem justifiable to drop the Hiroshima bomb or to conduct the more recent and more systematic bombing of Vietnam and Cambodia. It is easy to arouse moral indignation and a sense of self-righteousness by recounting tales of Hitler's gas chambers and concentration camps. But to a detached observer it might well appear that the actions of those who have sought to spread or defend the values of liberal Christian democracy have been just as criminal.

Here is another item from MRG's formal credo:-

"MRG believes in the intrinsic value of making the truth known in the many cases where accurate publicity leading to an informed public opinion is the only hope of redress".

Why do you believe this? Are you confident that "informed public opinion", if it knew the truth, would direct its energies to redressing injustice in any objective sense?

If you are appealing to a British sense of justice, well and good, but how can informed public opinion in England affect the social conditions of the Burakumin of Japan unless you see the operation as one of moral imperialism?

Let me reiterate my own position. I hold that there is no

such thing as a moral absolute. Every human culture has its own system of moral values. Contrariwise, every system of moral values which you can dream up, including that which is propounded by the Minority Rights Group, is simply a by-product of the cultural system within which it is generated. Anyone who tries to be a missionary, spreading his own scheme of moral values outside the boundaries of the culture of which he himself is a member, is engaging in moral imperialism. He is saying: "I know best", "I am a superior person", "the others whom I seek to convert to my way of thinking are inferior; their cultural system is altogether inferior to mine. Long live English, liberal, protestant Christian, capitalist, democracy!"

Now I know you don't think of yourselves as proselytizing Christian democrats of this kind, but that is the nature of human culture. When we respond to cultural drives that is how it seems: our culturally determined behaviour seems to us "natural" "logical" "sensible", and above all "right". But if you happened to have been brought up in some quite different culture, it would all seem quite different.

So what? The implication is this: You need to realise that the moral doctrines embedded in the ideology of the Minority Rights Group are your moral doctrines, they are also mine, they are part of our culture, they are not part of Universal Truth. If you wish to defend these moral doctrines you must do so because you believe that we are right and that the others are wrong. But that is a personal prejudice, a religious faith; reason is not on your side; and history is quite definitely against you.

Let me quote again from the MRG manifesto which I have cited before:

"MRG believes that it can make a valuable contribution to international progress by providing reliable and impartial information, and by building up knowledge and experience about victims of group prejudice - thus helping to secure greater respect for human rights everywhere. Any advances in this field will be gains for the world's civilisation and peace in our age".

Fine sentiments indeed, fully worthy of the London School of

Economics around the year 1900, but do any of you really believe in the Idea of Progress in this simple-minded 19th Century sense? The trouble with this use of the word 'Progress' lies in a failure to distinguish between the technological and the social. Progress in technology goes ahead all the time and probably accelerates. We are told that half the scientists who have ever existed in the history of the world are in active practice at the present time. Space travel, communication satellites, computers ... there seems to be no end to the "marvels" of high technology. And of course they are very important. Because of technological progress we live in a different world from that inhabited by our forebears, and our descendants will live in a different world from that inhabited by ourselves. Moreover these scientific and technological developments are cumulative ... as time goes on we know more and more about the material nature of the cosmos and to a greater and greater extent we become capable of manipulating our immediate local environment to suit our short-term local convenience ...

But the concept of social progress is something altogether different. If we knew what it was, how should we measure it? Human society changes all the time, and, in some respects at least, changes in technology determine the forms of those changes, but is there really any sense in which it can be argued that human society - or any part of human society - in the late 20th Century is "better" than any part of human society at any previous period of human history? We have better gadgets but do we have a better society?

The MRG manifesto implies that we do, or at any rate it implies that there are criteria on the basis of which it should be possible to make absolute judgements as to whether a particular society "A", existing at a particular time in a particular place, is "better" or "worse", "more advanced" or "less advanced", than some other society "B" existing at some other time at some other place. My difficulty is that I do not share this view; I do not believe that notions like "international progress" and "gains for the world's civilisation" have any practical meaning; they are just slogans which evoke emotion; they have the quality of declarations or religious faith; they do not provide a guide to any particular form of action. The Idea of Progress is "good in itself", a desirable end, even though you do not know what the end may be, and since the end can always be held to justify the means the goal

of Progress can be held to justify anything you like. It has done so in the past, and it can do so now.

From my point of view anyway, the merits of MRG have nothing whatever to do with what such activities may or may not contribute to human progress.

So let me take a different tack.

Please accept the fact that for personal reasons, because I was brought up in the cultural environment of English, protestant, capitalist, middle-class, democracy, I share the assumptions of MRG that "discrimination against ethnic, religious and cultural minorities (or majorities)" is a bad thing and that the "victims of group prejudice" will be benefitted if I publicise the facts regarding their persecution. Does this help me to know what I should do? How do I decide what constitutes persecution and who are the victims of group prejudice? This is much less easy than it might seem, as indeed eventually emerges from the MRG reports themselves, or at any rate from the best ones.

The more sophisticated the MRG investigation becomes the more confusing is the issue of who is discriminating against what. The 'rights' and 'wrongs' of the situation will not emerge from the facts of the case, but simply from the prior prejudices of the investigators. Any idea that the pursuit of "reliable and impartial information" will always reveal a clear cut distinction between the good guys and the bad guys is an illusion. On the contrary, the more reliable and the more impartial the information the more it will transpire that everyone concerned feels perfectly justified in acting as he does, according to his own lights, and that we can only distinguish between good and bad actions by applying our own prejudiced scheme of values ... at which point the notion of impartiality disappears. It is we who have the prejudices!

The viewpoint I have been expressing here will strike some of you as cynical in the extreme but the dilemma is one which is very familiar to all fieldworking social anthropologists. The normal task of any social anthropologist in the field is to study the culture of a minority which is, in nearly all cases, in political subjection to a paramount power of quite different culture. The anthropologist pursues his task by participant observation. He learns to speak the local language and he learns to understand local custom by becoming, so far as possible, a participating member of the culture group which he is trying to understand. If he accomplishes his task successfully he will come to understand the alien culture as a moral system, autonomous in its own right and distinct from the anthropologist's own system and also distinct from the moral system operated by the local paramount political power. The odds are very strong that the circumstances of the field situation will lead the anthropologist to "take sides". All sorts of factors will serve to reinforce his feeling that the people he is studying are the "victims of group prejudice" who are being persecuted by the evil agents of the paramount political power. But the "objective" status of such "feelings" is very difficult to assess. It simply leads back to a quite unanswerable question: In what circumstances does a group have the right of self-determination as against the rights of the larger political power within which it is encompassed?

Since the last World War the British Empire has collapsed. Most individual Englishmen have justified the associated events to themselves by saying that it was morally right that the component parts of the Empire should have a right of self-determination. But if this principle is universally valid where do you stop? Why not accord political independence to Scotland or Wales or Yorkshire or Hogs Norton? Almost any community however small is capable of feeling that it is culturally different from the community next door and that it is the victim of group prejudice and exploitation by the existing encompassing paramount power. Gathering reliable and impartial information will not help you to decide whether such feeling is justified. Justification cannot rest on "facts" but only on "prejudices". It all depends which side you are on - what is murder to a member of the Ulster police is a justifiable act of war to a member of the IRA. Please don't misunderstand me. I am not claiming to be any less prejudiced than the rest of you.

When, as an anthropologist, I work in an alien cultural situation my task is to discover the facts of the case. Among those facts are the tensions and exploitations which result from political domination by the members of one culture group over the members of another. But, having got that far, my role as an anthropologist seems to cease; if I go further and take sides, either on the side of the oppressors or on the side of the oppressed, I can only do so on the basis of moral values which I myself introduce into the situation from outside. These values are in no way a derivation, or logical implication, from the "reliable and impartial information" which I claim to have obtained in my role as anthropologist.

It seems to me that those who organise research and publish reports on behalf of the Minority Rights Group are faced with an exactly comparable dilemma. If they really collect "reliable and impartial information" that information will be morally neutral and will provide very poor grist for reports which ultimately have a propagandist objective. For let us be clear; MRG reports are propagandist, despite, or even because of, their claim to objectivity. The underlying sociological theory is very old style. At the beginning of this century Emile Durkheim and his associates believed that it was possible to distinguish, in objective terms, between healthy and pathological conditions of society. A healthy society was one tending towards stability and functional equilibrium; a sick society was one which exhibited symptoms of stress in such manifestations as violence, bloodshed and suicide. The Minority Rights Group seems to share this view about social health. It declares that "ascertaining the correct facts is an essential prerequisite for any remedial action". But what is a correct fact? And what is it that you are trying to remedy?

Some of you will protest that this is far fetched. It is "obvious" that Hitler's gas chambers were monstrously evil. It is "obvious" that the genocide of Amazonian Indians is a moral crime. It is "obvious" that nothing but good can come from giving wider publicity to the facts of the case regarding Biharis in Bangladesh or Gypsies in Eastern Europe. But these things are not in fact obvious. The actions which seem to you morally outrageous are not morally wrong to the actors concerned. The doctrine that publicity benefits those whose affairs are publicised is a declaration of faith, which is seldom borne

out by the event. This does not mean that I personally disapprove of the operations of the Minority Rights Group or of the MRG Reports, but I do think that it is very important that the "prejudiced" nature of these reports should be fully understood by those who put them out.

During the last War the radio propagandists on both sides adopted very different styles. The Germans sought to be believed by mixing truth and straight falsehood, while relying heavily on the proposition that if a falsehood is repeated often enough it was likely in the end to be believed. The British line on the other hand was to try to avoid straight falsehood and to encourage credibility by reporting many facts which were distinctly unpalatable to the British side, while omitting all reference to other facts which were even more unpalatable. It seems to me that the MRG Reports continue this style of British propaganda: The danger is simply that those who issue this material should in the end come to be deceived by their own apparatus, so that they imagine that their reports contain not just the truth (which is possible) but also the whole truth and nothing but the truth (which is certainly not the case).

But now let me try to approach the whole issue from a quite different angle and thereby get back to my advertised theme of integration. What are the circumstances in which MRG is likely to feel that there is a prima facie case for making a Report at all? What leads outsiders to think that there is a minority (or a majority) which is suffering discrimination?

Well first of all we have to presuppose the existence of two distinct cultural groups which remain distinct even though the one is encompassed by the political suzerainty of the other. It is easy to get confused as to just what one is talking about. The Basques and the Kirds and the Gypsies belong to one "type" of such situation. The overt policy of the encompassing and dominant political power (or powers) has been to destroy the cultural minority by assimilation. The cultural minority has successfully resisted assimilation and the observable political tension and cultural discrimination arises from that fact. If the minority would agree to be assimilated there would be no problem. Why does a minority of this sort have a right to go on making a nuisance of itself

by continuing to be different? Well it is possible to think up answers to that question but they are not simple.

The case of the Japanese burakumin - the people of the ghetto - exemplifies a different pattern. Here it is the cultural values of individual members of the encompassing majority society which reject and thereby perpetuate the values of the minority. The burakumin as a group do not now have any social function to fulfill; in a formal legal sense they have no existence and are not discriminated against. Individual burakumin would probably be glad to assimilate to the encompassing society and probably many do so assimilate. It is simply the prejudice of the surrounding society which keeps the remainder what they are. But discrimination of this sort is not a peculiarity of remote and little understood social systems.

Why pick upon the burakumin? If we came nearer home could we ever agree about what are the relevant facts concerning discrimination against the poor, the insane, ex-criminals, Blacks, Jews, women ... Where does universal philanthropy stop?

Jews in Western Europe pose yet another version of the integration problem. The Jews themselves have long been willing to assimilate into the encompassing economic system while claiming the right to discriminate themselves as an isolationist religious sect. The intolerance of the surrounding society, though monstrous in its forms, has been generated in large degree by this inconsistency in the behaviour of the Jews themselves. Why should the Jews be entitled to have it both ways?

Jamaicans in Birmingham or Blacks in Brazil provide yet further permutations. Generally speaking, such communities, though readily identifiable by the fact of colour, exhibit no collective "wish to be different". Yet they are still treated as different by the dominant elite. In cases of this sort, if we postulate that the group which is being discriminated against has "rights" as a group, we actually encourage the persistence of the prejudice!

And so on down the list.

The "minorities" which have been (or are likely to be) the

subject of MRG reports certainly have it in common that they are identifiable cultural groups within a larger encompassing social order and they also have it in common that, either in a political or economic or social sense, they are discriminated against, but there the similarity ends.

There are cases where a kind of abstract justice might suggest that the 'solution' to the issue of discrimination must lie in cultural assimilation, but in others just the opposite is the case: often it is the threat of cultural assimilation which itself constitutes the problem of the injustice. And we are easily confused by such ambiguities. Let me cite an example of the sort that constantly worries anthropologists.

In his book On Aggression published some years ago, the ethologist Konrad Lorenz claimed that anthropological study had shown that:

"head-hunting is so interwoven with the whole social system of some Bornean tribes that its abolition tends to disintegrate their whole culture, even seriously jeopardising the survival of the people".

MRG, so far as I know, has not yet rushed to the defence of head hunters on grounds of discrimination, but why not? Do not head-hunters and cannibals have a "right to exist" just as much as Christians in Russia or Amerindians in the Amazon? Anyway, what has in fact happened in Borneo? Headhunting has been abolished by external political force; the culture of the former head-hunters has thereby been destroyed; the "survival of the people" - considered as a minority community has indeed been jeopardised, but in purely statistical demographic terms there has been an upsurge of population of quite embarrassing dimensions.

In point of fact, if we leave out the Amerindians, nearly all the persecuted minorities so far studied by MRG are increasing in numbers not only in absolute terms but also in relation to their encompassing society. Though the cultures of the minorities are mostly under threat or being actively destroyed. How does this affect our judgement of the situation?

Well from one point of view it reinforces the original MRG thesis that, whenever these contentious issues are being discussed, it is important that the discussants should be armed with "the facts of the case". And that of course is what the MRG Reports are supposed to provide. But I think my argument also suggests that there are some extra dimensions, some extra varieties of "fact", which need to be taken into consideration.

The problem of minorities in its most general form - treating the concept of "minority" in the manner which is adopted by MRG - is "why does the problem exist at all?" And the most general answer to that general question is: "Because there is no assimilation (or because there is only partial assimilation) by the culture of those who are politically dominant of the culture of those who are being discriminated against". The "minority" has not been "integrated" into the larger whole. Therefore it continues to be a thorn in the political flesh.

If we then ask: "Why is there this failure to assimilate?" we may get a great variety of answers according to the particular situation and according to who asks and who answers the question, and this I suggest is where MRG Reports have hitherto been somewhat deficient. They have tended to assume that the just or "right" solution is one in which integration does not take place, and that in a just world the failure to assimilate should be accepted by the dominant group without argument and without "discrimination". But the three ideal types which I talked about at the beginning of the lecture suggest that the problem is much more complicated. The concept of discrimination is, in some respects at least, a function or reflection of the barriers to integration which have been set up on both sides. So 'justice' is ambiguous.

Let us consider briefly a case which has not so far been the subject of an MRG Report - that of the Australian Aborigines. The Australian Black Fellows have been the victims of a century and a half of vicious discrimination, based originally on the proposition that they were not really human at all, and subsequently on various doctrines, (which still persist), concerning their innate intellectual inferiority and so on. Not so very long ago it seemed that the problem would resolve itself, since the Aboriginal population would be exterminated. Not only would Aboriginal culture disappear but the Aboriginal population as well.

But today there is a large and increasing population of mixed bloods and, in so far as pure blooded Aborigines can be identified, they too appear to be increasing in numbers.

Aboriginal culture has already been nearly destroyed but not entirely. The remnants that survive are historically and ethnographically very interesting and seemingly satisfying to those who belong to such cultures. However the majority of those who are either wholly or partly Aboriginal by biological constitution, now spend most of their lives either on mission stations (where on the face of it they lead a very unsatisfactory kind of existence) or else in the status of a very low caste semi-squatter population, living parasitically on the fringes of Australian urban centres. A minute proportion of pure-blood and mixed blood Aborigines have assimilated to the White culture - they include such celebrities as the tennis player Miss Goolagong.

As you probably know it is the declared policy of the present Australian Government to "recognise" Aboriginal land rights and it has established a special commission to set up the ground rules. The Commissioners are leading experts in the field. But what should they advise? How is an Aboriginal to be defined? What is the long-term objective of the exercise? Should the Commissioners assume that ultimately there will be complete integration along with the final destruction of traditional Aboriginal culture? Should they aim at the protection of the residue of that tradition? If we talk about the "rights" of the Australian Aborigines (as against the rest of the Australian population) what rights, and whose rights, are we talking about, and what is the justification for claiming that such rights exist at all?

The Australian case is a relatively simple one. The numbers are small. There are relatively few variables. The Paramount Power has an English cultural tradition. If we could all agree that one and only one course of action was right and proper in this simple case, in the present situation, then it should be fairly easy to extend the argument to other more complicated cases such as those looming up in New Guinea and elsewhere. However, although a large number of very serious and fair-minded people have researched on the Australian situation and reflected on the outcome with great care - there is no

agreement among "the experts" about what "ought" to be done. Judgement about "ought" does not derive logically from a study of the facts of the case but from prior prejudices of the commentators.

Even so, it is better to have knowledge of the facts - in so far as they are knowable - than to base all one's judgements on ideology pure and simple without reference to the facts at all. And to that extent at any rate I would passionately defend the characteristically British empiricist stance which is represented by MRG and all its works. Let us have as many MRG Reports as we can get - but don't be over optimistic about the responses that they may engender, even among men of goodwill in the English speaking world.

Professor Edmund Leach is Provost of King's College, Cambridge, and President of the Royal Anthropological Institute.