

The doctor went on to say that he had been engaged in that work for the past five years, during which time he had travelled in Great Britain, Germany, Austria, Canada, Japan, Korea, Belgium, Holland, and other countries. In Great Britain alone last year he delivered 37 lectures, while 65 discourses have been delivered in Japan in the last two years.

What do you think of the prospects of a world peace? enquired the pressman.

"The unanswerable arguments we have been drilling into the ears of the nations for so many years must bear fruit," came the confident reply. "The position really is that the nations who have talked about war the most have not the support of the bulk of their people. They possess a few watchdogs who bark when the moon rises, the result being that the louder one group of watchdogs bark at the moon the louder another group consider it incumbent to reply."

Surely, doctor, there is more than the barking of a few watchdogs behind the universal creation and maintenance of armaments?

"Well yes, there is," the doctor admitted slowly; "but the more the matter is looked into the more discreditable does it appear. Certain bodies of influential men in each of the great nations are interested in armament works, and while these men do not actually desire that war shall break out they, in the interests of their pockets, promote the craze for it. Do you know that in the French Crenset works 20 generals and admirals are interested, which is easily understood when it is explained that the money invested returns 20 per cent. interest. Krupps, the famous German firm, pays only 14 per cent. On the directorate of the first-mentioned company, and behind it are many of the aristocrats of Prussia. They do not want war, but certainly do desire to get all the monetary profit they can out of the furnishing of military equipment to the nations. The great body of German people are not behind them, but by reason of their high station, the wealthy few dominate the many. The German people do not desire to go to war with Great Britain, but the leaders of the newspapers shout for it, the assumption naturally being that the voice of the nation is pitched in the way indicated."

"War Doesn't Pay."

"No, not even the preparations for it. Speaking from memory I believe the net profits from the whole of the commercial shipping of Germany is £15,000,000 per annum. Contrast those figures with the cost of the German navy, which is £28,000,000 yearly. If one could induce a commercial people to decide such a matter on a profit basis, the answer would be quickly forthcoming to the question—does it pay? Take another contrast. The net value of British shipping is £30,000,000 while the total annual cost of the British navy is approximately £45,000,000. In my opinion British commercial shipping would be in no more danger if the naval expenditure was only a quarter of what it is, while Germany, to my mind, needs no warships at all. The fact that Great Britain and America are largely interested in German shipping shows that commerce is universal, and needs no one country to safeguard its supposed interests."

But you must admit that those interests are extremely important and must be protected. How would you protect them?

"I think it would pay the big nations to select a small nation, say Holland, to police the sea, if that were considered necessary. Really it would be more profitable as matters stand if the nations discontinued their merchant shipping, taking into consideration the cost of the navies considered necessary to protect that shipping against the supposed greed of other nations."

Shipping does not constitute the whole resources of a nation, observed the interviewer.

"No; it is after all only a part, but it may be a very important part, you know. The cost of the protection of that shipping, it must not be forgotten, falls on the entire nation, whether the people are interested in it or not. If the commercial interests which require such costly protection were compelled to pay the entire cost of the navies they would disappear in a single year, for commerce would decline to pay 100 per cent. interest for its protection."

Professor David Starr Jordan, Chancellor of the Leland Stanford University, California, and a director of the World Peace Foundation, arrived in Adelaide on Monday on his way back to Europe after transacting business in connection with his institution in Melbourne, where he also delivered several lectures. In the afternoon he was tendered a reception at the Parkin College by the principal, the Rev. Dr. L. D. Bevan, and Mrs. Bevan. There was a representative gathering of professors of the Adelaide University, ministers of the Gospel, and public and business men, and a pleasant afternoon was spent. Professor Jordan answered numerous questions in regard to the relationship of America with other races, and dealing with other subjects on which the universal peace movement has a bearing. In the evening, at the University, the distinguished visitor delivered an address on "War and Manhood."

Reciter 24/3/14  
UNIVERSAL PEACE.

A DISTINGUISHED ADVOCATE.

Once a year is peace on earth universally proclaimed by the people of Christian nations. The International Peace Society desire to see it established on all the 365 days. In many countries associations exist for the strenuous advocacy of world-wide cessation from strife, which involves the shedding of human blood. America has taken a leading part in such work. She has sent out to the uttermost parts of the earth missionaries who have proclaimed peace. Among the leading men of them is Dr. D. Starr Jordan, Chancellor of the Leland Stanford University of California, who arrived from Melbourne on Monday to deliver a lecture at the Adelaide University on "War and manhood." Dr. Jordan is no stranger to South Australia. He came to Adelaide about six and a half years ago. Not only is he a sociologist, but he is a poet and a naturalist. In the former capacity—as an advocate of universal peace—he is best known throughout the leading countries of the world; and when it was announced that the South Australian branch of the International Peace Society had invited him to the State much interest was aroused.

—An Interview.—

Professor Jordan bears the weight of his years well. Bodily he may not be so good as he was, but his intellect is as keen as ever. He arrived from Victoria by sea, and put up at the Grand Central Hotel, where on Monday afternoon he accorded interviews to interested guests and pressmen. Among the former was Sir John Gordon. The interview took more the form of a declaration of the chancellor's views than a mere matter of question and answer. He knew what he wanted to say, and said it, because as an American in a high educational position he is more than used to being visited by newspaper men. However, one question did open the chat, and it was this:—"You are described as the chief director of the World's Peace Foundation. What does that stand for?" The chancellor explained that Mr. Edwin Ginu, of Boston (a wealthy publisher) had devoted one-third of all the property of which he died possessed, to be used to promote the interests of universal peace, and spread its propaganda throughout the world. One-third of the fortune amounted to £20,000, and the interest alone was used. No salaried people were paid, and no missionary, he would term it, under the conditions of the bequest was reimbursed anything but out of pocket expenses. He (Dr. Jordan) was chief director of the fund at first, but the work became too heavy, and the whole conduct of the organization had been turned over to Mr. Edwin D. Mead, of Boston, who had been engaged in the peace work for many years. Mr. Mead was an editorial writer, and a man of great ability, and his directorship enabled the chancellor to give the whole of his spare time to investigating the state of the nations of the world so far as their social, financial, peace and war, and other conditions were concerned. He had now been engaged for five years in such work, and in pursuit of it had travelled in Great Britain, Germany, Canada, Austria, Italy, Japan, Korea, Holland, Belgium, and other countries. He had given 37 lectures in Great Britain last year. Two years ago he gave 65 discourses in Japan, and he had talked many times in Germany.

Do you talk many languages?—Well, no. I understand English or American, of course, and I can get along excellently in German; but my acquaintance with Japanese was so scanty that I had to divide my talk into sections, and seek the aid of an interpreter.

—"Must Bear Fruit."—

Interrogated about the prospects of the world's peace, Dr. Starr Jordan said that the invincible arguments, which its advocates had been drilling into the ears of the universe for so many years, must bear fruit. The nations who apparently talked the most about war had not really the bulk of their own people behind them. They had a few watchdogs who barked when the moon rose, and the consequence was that the more any one national group of watchdogs bayed at the moon, the louder another group thought it incumbent to reply.

But, doctor, there must be more than that behind the universal creation and maintenance of armaments?—Yes, there is more than that, but the more it is looked into the more discreditable does it reveal itself. Continuing, he said:—"Certain bodies of influential men in each of the great nations were interested in armament works, and while they did not actually desire war, they promoted the craze for it in their own monetary interests. In the famous French Crenset works there were 20 generals and admirals interested, and the return for the money invested was 20 per cent. Krupps, in Germany, only paid 14 per cent. On its directorate or behind it were many of the aristocrats of Prussia. Those people in their hearts did not want war. They wished to get all the profit they could out of the furnishing of military equipment. The great body of the German people were not behind them, but the few, because of their station, dominated the many. In just the same way the people of Germany did not desire war with Great Britain, but their leaders and their newspapers shouted for it, and so the voice of the nation was supposed to be pitched in the direction indicated."

—War Does Not Pay.—

You think that war does not pay?—"Not even preparations for war," was the emphatic reply. Speaking from memory, the Chancellor said that the total net profit from the whole of the commercial shipping of Germany was 15 millions yearly. In contrast to those figures was that the cost of the German Navy was £28,000,000 a year. The question was therefore plain. Did it pay? And if you could induce a commercial people to decide such a matter on the basis of profit the answer would not be long in forthcoming. Again, the total net value of British shipping was thirty millions, while the total annual cost of the British Navy was about £45,000,000. Again, did that pay? British and commercial shipping would be in no more danger if the naval expenditure was only a quarter as large as it was, while in his opinion Germany needed no ships of war at all. Much of the share interests in German shipping was held in Great Britain and New York, which showed that commerce was universal, and required no one country to protect its supposed interests.

How would you then protect those interests?—It would pay the big nations to select a small one, say, Holland, to police the seas for them if such policing be necessary. It would really be more profitable as matters stood for the nations to throw up their shipping trade, considering the costs of the navies supposed to be necessary to protect it against the assumed greed of other countries.

But there is more than shipping involved, said the pressman.

Do you mean national honour, he asked? No, Chancellor, that is too big a matter to go into now, but shipping does not constitute the whole resources of a nation.

It is but a part, said Dr. Jordan, although it may be a very important part. But the cost of the protection of that shipping falls on the entire nation, whether they are interested in it or not. If the commercial interests, which require such costly protection, were made to pay the entire cost, navies would disappear in a year. Commerce would decline to pay 100 per cent. for protection.