

Dealing with the actual and potential losses of warfare, the Chancellor said that the strife of nation against nation meant the great weakening of both victor and vanquished. Both sexes were dreadfully involved, yet war had even greater horrors for women. Men who fell on the battlefield gave not only their own lives, but the lives of their potential descendants, so, if a man was strong, his death meant the loss to the world of a thousand descendants. War was futile, mad, sad, squalid, and heroic. It was heroic, because men acted like heroes there, but their bravery could be better manifested in other ways. In democratic countries especially force or violence served no good purpose, as the violence was worse than the wrong suffered, and under freedom there was no wrong that could not be righted. The South African War cost £8,000 for every Boer who was killed. Emigration of the strongest and the best of a nation to go on to the battlefield was inimical, yet in every part of England, in almost every church in the many counties, were tablets commemorating young manhood killed in battle away from their homeland. The interests of men and women were alike in the sordid posts of human slaughter, and the time was coming when it would be found that it would be detrimental to both sides to have political or international differences settled at the mouth of the cannon. A nation in arms could not remain a nation of democracy, and the bogey cry of the threatened Japanese invasion of Australia was only the work of scoundrels. If Japan were plotting to dismember the British Empire by invading Australia she would require millions of pounds, and to get the money she would have to borrow it from England and America. Was such a thing possible?

INTERVIEW WITH MINISTER.

The Minister for External Affairs (Mr. Glynn) on Monday accorded an interview to Professor Starr Jordan (Chancellor of

the Leland, Stanford University of California), and discussed informally the question of Australian relations with the East. The professor expressed the opinion that from his experience with the Japanese there was no cause for alarm. Professor Jordan based his idea on the fact that he was in Japan about two years ago, and made enquiries then into official and general life there. Mr. Glynn mentioned that it was the wish of the Australian people to preserve intimate and peaceful relations with all the nations of the East, and it was the desire of the Government to develop the most friendly feelings with their neighbours in that part of the world. The progress of Japan during the last generation or two, and the relations which existed between the Commonwealth and Japan had, if anything, increased the respect of Australia for Japan as a nation. The principle of a white Australia was based upon biological and not racial reasons, and it was its desire to administer the government in a manner that would not derogate from the respect entertained for it by nations whose standing in civilization, though different from that of Australia, might be quite as adequate and elevated. Professor Jordan gave the Minister interesting information on social questions in America.

RECEPTION BY DR. BEVAN.

In the afternoon the distinguished advocate of universal peace was the chief guest at "an home," held by Dr. Bevan, at Parkyn College. There were present representatives of the various churches, and of educational and commercial interests. Among those who paid their respects to Dr. Starr Jordan were Sir Edwin Smith, Sir Charles Goode, Professor Rennie, Professor Darnley Naylor, Professor Kerr-Grant, and Mr. W. J. Sowden (Editor of The Register). After the introductions had been effected Dr. Bevan said that the guest would be pleased to answer any questions which might be put to him bearing on his mission of endeavouring to establish peace throughout the world. Several of the visitors asked Dr. Jordan to explain his views on international matters. Perhaps the most interesting of his statements was in regard to the Japanese. The whole trouble in California, he said, had arisen chiefly from the influx of Japanese from Hawaii. Japanese of the very lowest class had been taken to work on the sugar plantations there. They found themselves virtually slaves, anybody being paid a dollar a head to apprehend a Japanese labourer who was found walking the streets. When America annexed Hawaii the conditions of serfdom vanished, and many of the Japanese, instead of returning home, went to California. They engaged in certain indus-

tries, and in time 1,200 of them became landholders. Then arose the unjustifiable outcry against them. Asked if he preferred the Japanese to the Chinese, the Chancellor said that there was no sense in bumping the Chinese and the Japanese and the Hindus together, because they were totally different people. The Japanese did not like being called Asiatics. The Chinese were industrious, and not ambitious, while the Japanese were both industrious and ambitious. The Chinese were plodding and full of superstition, while the Japanese were plodding but not superstitious. In that connection he believed in time that the great body of the Japanese people would become Christians, but they would amend the Christian theology to suit their own particular views. The Chinese had been compared with the Japanese as business moralists in favour of the former. As a matter of fact, the Japanese was a young business man compared with the Chinese. The Japanese was a genial fellow, if he was not crossed, and was apt, if he could not meet his business obligations, to rely on a friend. On the other hand, the Chinese was most punctilious. He would pay up at the very moment stipulated, even if half the money he tendered was counterfeit. (Laughter.)

THE EVENING LECTURE.

At the Prince's Theatre, Adelaide University, in the evening, Dr. Jordan delivered an address on "War and Manhood." Dr. Bevan presided over a large attendance. The lecturer said that war was a dreadful drain on any nation, because it killed off the best of young manhood and drained the virility which in the ordinary course of events would have assisted to make that nation stronger. There was an analogy in the development of the merino sheep of Australia. The best of foreign stock had been imported to improve the local stock, and the result was perfection. But supposing the reverse had been done and the flockmasters had ruthlessly doomed to destruction the prime of their young male sheep, what would have been the result? (Laughter.) If that rule applied to sheep, why not to men? Life was just like seed farmers used in the harvest. They sowed the best they had, and the type they sowed came up like that type, and perhaps better. So it was with mankind. One general type repeated itself in the next, and if it was known what kind of people was left in a nation in one generation, the characteristics of the succeeding generation could be guessed with certainty. But war upset such estimates, for it destroyed the best and left the after results to be achieved by those who were not so fit. The Danes had an excellent proverb, which was that it did not matter whether a swan was born in a duck's house or not, as his qualifications depended on the egg he came out of. But if he was to turn out a swan he must be contained in the germ of a swan's egg. (Laughter.) No nation had ever gone down except through three causes. The first was the emigration of its best manhood, which necessarily implied womanhood. The second was the immigration of inferior peoples. But the third cause was the worst. It was war—war which killed off the strong and left the weak to breed from. Every farmer would know what that meant. In spite of history, which mostly told what it should have left unsaid and did not record what would have benefited mankind, the ills of the world were not so much due to the strength of the strong as to the weaknesses of the weak. History had shown, however, that the nations who had trusted to war and rapine had perished or decayed. Two modern examples were Portugal and Spain. Those two once mighty countries were now but insignificant factors in the affairs of the world. Travellers had said that there were still beautiful women left in Spain, but if that country had been robbed of its manhood the world would have been poorer still. And beautiful women were still required. (Laughter.) He had been asked whether he was a peace advocate at any price man, and in answer his reply was—Let me see your pricelist. He meant that it was very much more dear to kill a man than to preserve him. Taking the cost of the last South African war, Great Britain had had to pay £8,000 for each Boer killed, and if that money had been spent in spreading those fine people about the earth, so that they could have lived and prospered and transmitted their qualities to future generations, how much, he asked, would have been gained instead of lost? He had travelled much over the world, especially in Great Britain. In the hundreds of beautiful churches in that country tablets were erected to the glory

of men who had died in battle, but he contended that by the destruction of such "heroic" men the virtues of courage and strength and determination which they had evidently possessed perished, when without war those qualities would have been passed on to the improvement of future generations. (Applause.) Heroism was chiefly claimed as the virtue of the battlefield, but it was just as well shown in other walks of life. As a matter of fact, according to the historians, every war had its phases. In dealing with the latest great struggle between the Turks and the Christians in the Balkans, the London newspapers had described the war as heroic; then mad; and then sad. That adequately described all wars. War should be the very last and not the first recourse for the cure of any ill. It was all summed up in the words of Franklin that "war is not paid for in wartime. The bill comes in later." (Applause.)

On the motion of the Chairman a vote of thanks was accorded Dr. Jordan.