

Effect on Wages.

Has the fact that nations keep up armies and navies any effect upon general economic conditions?

"Undoubtedly. The increase in taxation and the amount of capital and labor wasted in the upkeep of military forces have driven up the cost of living all over the world. Borrowing on a larger scale has been necessary for war equipment, and with the national debts increasing, up goes taxation. Wages must increase also, but they never rise so fast as the cost of living, and where salaries are paid these are not increased in anything like the proportion they should be."

How does the upkeep of armaments affect the position of the worker?

"In this way. There is so much waste—men are idle and the upkeep is great. That upkeep has to be borne by those who do work. The direct result is that a country does not earn as much as it should, and industrial enterprise languishes. Take France. There the soldier gets a halfpenny per day in wages and is kept by the community, whereas the men ought to be earning on an average 4/ per day. It is largely because the thousands of men in the armies are not earning anything that taxation is so high. In France alone there are nearly a million people out of work because of stagnation in industry. With less preparation for war there would be better wages and the community would not be supporting so many idle men."

Two Factors for Peace.

But does not preparedness for war prevent war?

"That is the maxim of the war traders and those who have interests at stake. I contend that the less prepared a nation is for war the less danger there is. As nations become equipped with war material the danger increases."

What do you consider will bring about universal peace and disarmament?

"Two things. Firstly, the impending bankruptcy which is already making war impossible on the part of some nations; and, secondly, education. Every man who thinks for himself is opposed to war unless he be directly interested in it. At the same time I believe there may be some who honestly believe that the best way to avoid war is to be prepared, but I do not hold that view. Look at the difference between the relations of Canada and the United States and of the countries of Europe. Between the States and Canada we have 4,000 miles of border line, but there is not a soldier on it, and there has not been one for 100 years."

Are there any prospects of wars?

"I don't know of any nation in respect to which another country has any desire for aggression, unless it be in regard to Turkey. There Constantinople is looked upon with longing eyes by Russia and Austria, because if either nation acquired that capital it would get a big lift up in the commercial world. The Turkish war was a most unfortunate affair, because Bulgaria (a very decent nation of farmers) was almost out of debt, but now it is very flat. Montenegro also suffered severely in the loss of men."

Australia and Japan.

Has Australia much need to fear an attack from the East?

"I have heard a lot about that suggestion, but there is absolutely nothing in it. I have been in conversation with the leading men in Japan, and an invasion of Australia by way of the Northern Territory has never been dreamed of. I found the scare of a possible Japanese invasion had also reached Java, the Philippines, Siberia, British Columbia, and California, but in each instance it is equally groundless, and has been started in most cases in the interests of the provision of a bigger navy. Financially the Japanese are not in a position to undertake a foreign invasion, and I have always found that their great ambi-

tion is to be thought well of by the Anglo-Saxon race. They know that it would be suicidal for them to go to war with either Great Britain or the United States, especially as the big men in Japan have been educated abroad and have had their eyes opened. With only a small territory, Japan has a debt of one-third of that of the British Empire, and the country is poorly off in regard to roads and railways. I am firmly convinced that the Northern Territory does not constitute any immediate menace to the peace of Australia. The danger may be in the fact of capitalists bringing in Asiatics. Japan is not a colonising country. In fact, the greater part of the north of Japan is practically unoccupied, for the simple reason that the people have not learned to grow crops that will thrive there, such as rye and oats, and to rear cattle. It requires capital to start those industries, and the Government are not in a position to give the necessary assistance. The Government did make an attempt to make it profitable, and they placed people there to grow rice, which would not thrive owing to the cold, and starvation was the result. Such a scare about an invasion from Japan does Australia more harm abroad than here, because when the reports are read in England they have the tendency to keep capital out of this country, and this fine land is looked upon in a way that it does not deserve to be."

A Prosperous Country.

Have you formed any opinion of Australia as compared with other countries?

"I have found that Australia is more prosperous than most parts of the world, and it seems to be feeling the general rise in the cost of living to a lesser extent. In Japan and Italy, where the people are nearer the bread line, the people have felt the increased cost of commodities more acutely than elsewhere."

Questioned as to the Australian cadet movement, the professor said he preferred not to express an opinion, but he added—"I don't believe any nation which can avoid militarism should take it on."

Why War is Wrong.

Under the auspices of the International Peace Society Professor Jordan delivered an interesting address before a good attendance at the Prince of Wales Theatre, Adelaide University, on Monday evening, when the Rev. Dr. Bevan (president of the South Australian branch of the society) occupied the chair.

The professor, who spoke on "War and manhood," said:—War was wrong—the whole spirit of it was wrong. If a thing was morally wrong it was intellectually wrong, and if it was intellectually wrong it was scientifically wrong. Men to-day who were engaged in the work of promoting a universal peace were not willing to begin with the fact that war was merely wrong, but they undertook to find out scientifically why it was wrong. They sometimes thought of the present time as a period of business and science, and yet they who were interested in science knew that there was nothing in the world so scientifically wrong as war. The laws that governed heredity in animals were the same as those which governed the development of man, and by the process of killing off the best they were destroying the virility of the people. (Applause.) The general type of man that existed in one generation denoted the type of the next. The men left determined the next generation, and the same applied to a herd of cattle. The whole art of it was selective breeding. If they knew the kind of blood a nation was composed of they would know what the next generation would be. The Danes had an apt proverb that "it did not do any harm to be born in a duckyard if you were laid in a swan's egg." (Laughter.) No nation ever lost its good place except from one of three causes. The first was emigration—the strong men going out of a country, although they were not a permanent loss to the world. The second cause was immigration—the bringing in of slaves to do the work previously carried out by the strong and vigorous, as in the case of Rome. The third cause was war—the killing off of the strong and breeding from the weak. The troubles of the world were never due to the strength of the strong, but to the weakness of the weak. (Applause.) The history of Portugal provided an illustration of the three causes of decay that he had referred to. Now Portugal (a republic) was no longer a factor in human affairs, and its decline only showed how

a nation might fall. Spain had followed in the same direction, but had not deteriorated to the same degree. The cost of killing a man in war time was far greater than that of keeping him. He was not for peace at any price, but he would say, "Let's see your price-list." (Applause.) To him the most interesting thing on earth was the historical phenomena through which Great Britain had passed, and the way that nation had sent out men who had colonised in a manner that had been unequalled by any other country. A Greater Britain had been established. In that Greater Britain he included the United States, in which there were twice as many Englishmen and Scotsmen as were ever in England and Scotland respectively, and he did not know how many Irishmen. (Laughter.) But that had not been done without cost to Great Britain. Then, all the churches contained tablets to the memory of brave Englishmen who died in battle. When a strong, virile young man died a whole nation of men of a similar type died. Those strong men should live to take the bull of history by the horns, and not be called to arms, perchance, at the behest of some speculating financier. What was it that lay behind the slums of England? The cause was not because those poor people were "born in duckyards," but because they were not "laid in swans' eggs." They were the section of the nation that could not be used up in wars, and so they continued generation after generation. At best war should be the last and not the first recourse as the cure for anything. War to-day was more destructive than it was at any other time, because with the improved weapons men could be mown down at long distances just as one might knock grasshoppers off the garden fence with a hoe. One writer summed up the position of war thus—"Wars are not paid for in war time; the bills come later." (Applause.)

Daily Herald
24/3/14

UNIVERSAL PEACE

A DISCIPLE IN ADELAIDE

"THE PEOPLE DO NOT WANT WAR."

Universal peace! The cry goes up from a handful of enthusiasts amid the clash and din of nations arming to the teeth for the great war which ever menaces the world. Just when the mighty conflagration will break out is problematical. In the meantime those who compose the members of the World's Peace Foundation are earnestly preaching the gospel of universal peace. They are in a hopeless minority. From time immemorial man has settled his differences by force of arms. The methods have varied with the passage of the centuries, but the human instinct has not changed. We can but hope, however, that the little leaven of universal peace preached by its disciples will have the effect of leavening the whole lump. That such will be the case is the belief of Dr. Starr Jordan, Chancellor of Leland Stanford University (U.S.A.), the first director of the Peace Foundation. The doctor is at present on a visit to this city, and chatting with a representative of "The Daily Herald" yesterday explained the origin, objects, and aspirations of the foundation.

"Mr. Edwin Ginn, a wealthy publisher of Boston, stated in his will that he desired the interest on the proceeds of one-third of his property should be devoted to the promotion of universal peace and the spread of propaganda with that object in view," explained the doctor. "In round figures the sum amounted to £20,000, the interest on which was utilised in the manner desired. No one was paid anything but out-of-pocket expenses. I was chief director of the fund at the beginning, but the work became too heavy, and the conduct of the organisation has been handed over to Mr. Edwin D. Mead, of Boston, who has been engaged for many years in peace work. He is an editorial writer, and a man of outstanding ability. Since Mr. Mead took control I have been able to devote the whole of my spare time to the investigation of the state of the nations of the world so far as their social, financial, peace, and war conditions are concerned."