

Redirection, like  
the Bush York  
a the Huron  
At 4000, to  
a fape?

Share in  
Scotch shavings  
are high in a  
paying market.  
has not yet  
received the

Example  
You kindly  
promised  
They should  
have  
I am  
I am of  
them.

(3)

May 7.  
1 Market Road  
London W.

My dear Sir

I have been reading Mr  
Frazier's papers, and remain open  
to conviction, but unconvinced:

In J.R. Magp 834. he says "each  
Totem group was charged with  
with the ~~the~~ control of some  
department, ~~the~~ from which it  
took its name." Had this  
group the name; say bandicoot;  
before it received the  
"charge; or was it ~~the~~  
because it now received the  
charge of bandicoots, that it  
took the bandicoot name?

Very sincerely  
A Lang

In the former case, - the Origin of Totemism is still to seek -

Why had the groups the names?

In the second case, what kind

of "groups" were there already capable of cooperative co-organization? What held each

group ~~the~~ together? What kind of names had they, or what principle of cohesion in the absence of Totem name, Totem name in gesture language, badge K.T.A?

I can't work it out either way.

Now can I see how the great change in ideas, which caused exophagy, came to operate on other Australian tribes, similar in conditions of culture, or

yes never touched the Arunta.

As to the source of myths about heeding exclusively in the Totem (which cannot be true) the explanation is fairly enough in Frazer's own lamented

theory. And the other myths contradictory to me. It's theory repose in a hypothetical context social, just as does the theory of blacks who have a

Maingue, or a Benjil. Somebody distributed the charge of department, to groups hitherto not Totemistic. It agrees with the blacks as to the "charges" but drops the god or first culture hero who originated and enforced them.

Evolution does not work in  
that way: the way of the  
Law of Lycurgus or of Moses.

There is a side-pipe. The "great  
spirit" of the Arunta, as I  
understand your book, is a mere  
practical joke, a Mumbo Jumbo  
or Duck Duck, known as such  
to the initiated, like the

Paramulung of the Wiradjuri, who  
has ~~Baiame~~ <sup>Baiame</sup> over him, but is a  
mere jape himself: "a booby of the  
universe". I, then, the origin of the  
Baiames, and Mungah ngahs; have  
their tribes duped themselves into  
a genuine belief in their own  
jape? Or has the coherent  
Arunta system of philosophy shelved  
a pristine Baiame, and