

outward manifestation. Not a word, however, of his argument was lost. He carried us on to a masterly exposition of the difference between Germany's Imperialistic ideals, to realise which she sought a "place in the Sun," and Britain's. Are the German Imperial ideals good enough to justify her in imposing her "kultur" upon the nations, and in seeking to Germanise the world? [Her Imperialism was, in a word, for domination, such domination to be acquired by the sword and maintained by the sword. She considered Britain decadent, but in reality it was the spirit of Britain's Imperialism that she totally failed to appreciate. She did not understand Britain's colonies, each working out each special quality and destiny by means of free responsible self-government, and each bound to each and to the Motherland in an imperishable bond of free, moral, and reciprocal union. It had amazed her to find the Empire more unified than ever by the call of the war. She had made a monumental miscalculation here. Her political conceptions were crude. Again, she had developed a doctrine, mainly through the teaching of Professor Treitschke, that all political and Imperial action was referable to the State and its advancement. If the State, the German Empire, advanced, that was sufficient reason for everything. This end justified every means. It seemed desirable to Germany to dominate the world in order to produce the expansion of Germany. But she has never considered the point, apparently, or asked the question, whether other States had not a similar right to expansion, and whether they had not, consequently, the right to decline Germany's compulsory colonisation. This was another unfair blunder of the Teutonic mind, logical only for itself. The actual colonising experiences of Germany did not give much encouragement either. Her own people infinitely preferred the free self-governing colonies of Britain. Neither by logic nor by experience could she justify her self-imposed duty to Germanise the world. If she actually did do it, it would not be a world of liberty and free peoples and governments, but a hard and compelled domination, in which the only force was the power of the sword. Could this be regarded as likely to contribute to the best interests of Australia? The truth was that the Treitschke's teaching was quite astray. There was a power beyond that of any single State, however great. It was the moral power and sanction and control of the nations in general, and

should be expressed, possibly would be expressed, as an outcome of this war, in an International Court of Arbitration, freely formed by the Empires, and pledged to uphold its decisions for the good of each and all, if necessary by the sword. No State could then again act as Germany was doing, or hold such overwhelming ambitions about its own destiny. German political ideals, German Imperialism, was a faulty thing, by no means comparable to its philosophy or technical science, and not likely to be very serviceable to the world.

The Professor's concluding efforts were devoted to displaying the real superiority and ultimate triumph in the process of civilisation of moral forces over material forces and resources. He quoted Napoleon's famous dictum, "In any protracted struggle the moral counts over the material as three to one." It would be so in this war, and the issue of the war must be the just humiliation of Germany, the repudiation of her Imperial ideals and ambitions, and the right more firmly established than ever of every State, big or little, to work out its destiny in accordance with its innate powers, and contribute its quota of service to the general advancement of the race. The sacredness of treaties and the sanctities of national life would be rendered more secure than ever.

So with a few quiet, yet moving, words of appeal for Belgium's present needs, after a remainder of her imperishable glory as the modern emulator of the ancient self-sacrifice of the

---

Spartans at the Pass of Thermopylae, this finely-reasoned and memorable lecture closed, and it is likely to be fruitful in our future life in Balaklava. It reveals the power of a cultured mind over the ordinary man and woman. We had no adventitious attractions. Massive reasoned, intellectual thought, finely expressed, ably elocutionized, was sufficient to hold us, and then grateful thanks having been duly rendered, we sang "God Save the King" and went to our homes to believe more strongly than ever in our British Empire's righteous struggle, and to help it on for all we are worth.

---

*Advertiser, 11 June 1915*

On June 5 Mr. Justice Gordon received information from the Defence Department that his son-in-law (Lieutenant Neil Campbell) had been wounded at the Dardanelles. Lieutenant Campbell, who is a nephew of the Chief Justice (Sir Samuel Way), is an alumnus of the School of Mines and the University of Adelaide. He fought as a lieutenant in the South African war, and was recommended by Colonel (now Brigadier-General) de Lisle for a commission in the English army. Lieutenant Campbell, who is 32 years of age, secured his commission in Western Australia in open competition among the officers.

*Advertiser, 14 June 1915*

Dr. J. I. Sangster, jun., died at the age of 43 years at the North Adelaide Private Hospital on Saturday. He was the eldest son of Dr. Sangster, of Glenelg, and took his degrees of M.B. and B.S. in 1893. In 1897 he went to England, and was made M.R.C.S., England, and L.R.C.P., London. On his return he went to the Burra, and



Dr. J. I. Sangster, jun.

practised there for about 10 years, after which he spent three years at Glenelg. About 18 months ago he returned to the Burra, and went into partnership with Dr. Steele, with whom he was associated at the time of his death. He was at one time Mayor of Burra, and was a member of the Glenelg Bowling Club. He married a daughter of the late Mr. G. M. Turnbull, of North Adelaide, and he left a widow and three young sons.