

disposed to accept the verdict, taking refuge under an ambiguously worded treaty.

#### —The League of Nations and Reduction of Armaments.—

The professor speaks of the great achievement of introducing a "League of Nations." Nobody is more anxious to see a real League of Nations than I am, but I wish to ask if the Governments were sincere in signing the covenant. Dr. Dillon, in his book, "The Peace Conference," gives evidence, melancholy enough, to show that they were not, nor is Dr. Dillon the only one with such opinions. But let us take three or four points since the peace to see whether the Allies are honoring their "scraps of paper."

1. I need not speak of the reduction of armaments. Had the Allies been concerned merely to defeat Germany, had they been perfectly united, they would ere now have reduced their armies and navies, instead of spending two or three times as much as before the war.

2. How many Governments have brought before their Parliaments the recommendations of the International Labor Congress? Has Great Britain? Has Australia? I apologise for my mistake if I am wrong in saying "No."

3. The debates on the Nauru Island question in the British House, the statements of the French Colonial Minister in the French Chamber, show that the Governments are not thinking much of their "mandates," but are regarding these colonies as their own.

4. Why has not the Polish question been submitted to the League of Nations?

#### —The "Magnanimity" of the Australian and New Zealand Governments.—

I take from Stead's "Review" of November 13, 1920, the following accounts of the situation in New Guinea:—"... for the good fame of Australia it is highly necessary that light should be thrown on the things that are being done there, and that protests should be made against the arbitrary action of the Government in dealing with the German settlers and their property before it has the mandate... of the League of Nations. Surely, until the mandate is received it is premature to interfere with the arrangements which were made for carrying on the government of the country during the war. Why should an Expropriation Board be appointed, be rushed hastily up to Rabaul, and immediately set to work to expropriate German property in the territory before the Commonwealth has received authority for dealing with this property? Here, indeed, the Australian Government has ignored the League of Nations, and broken its treaty obligations (at least, the spirit of the higher obligations).

The German residents of New Guinea have suffered great hardships at the hands of our authorities, but into that question I shall not go. Let me give Stead's account (in May 23, 1921, number) of the manner in which the German residents were expropriated, and let readers (and Professor Phillipson) judge if there was much "generosity" here:—"Those who were ordered to be deported read the order that they could neither sell their property, take it with them, nor destroy it... Each individual might take a small sum of money (£15) for travelling expenses, but otherwise must leave his bank account untouched. For the value of their property, they would be given orders on the German Government... Many of those selected for deportation wanted to buy woollen clothing to protect themselves and their families in going to a cold climate, where they knew both food and clothing were scarce. They were not allowed to draw on their own bank accounts.

"Without authority New Zealand officials established a civil Government. They raised the taxes until they became a heavy burden... The building of roads and improvements stopped. The newspaper has been taken over by the Government, and the people have no means of protest. British officials placed a 15 per cent. tariff on British goods, and a 22 per cent. tariff on American goods to favor themselves. The Samoans had sold their copra in San Francisco, and bought their goods there. Now the tariff is prohibitive of trade." Very generous, Professor Phillipson?

—Some "Arguments" answered.—

#### Atrocities.—

Are the Germans to pay all these penalties, as the professor suggests, because of the "atrocities" and "crimes" of their armies in Belgium? Then, on the same reasoning, Great Britain should lose her

navy, her trade, her colonies, her raw materials, and pay a huge indemnity in Ireland. Twenty thousand raids in two years upon Irish private houses (and some of them horrible enough). At Fermoy on June 23, 1920, 400 British soldiers "broke out of barracks, and in two and a half hours did £40,000 worth of damage in wrecking and looting about 70 shops and other houses." Concerning outrages, let me quote further from Erskine Childers:—"Let us now arrive at totals for the whole four years, May, 1916, to May, 1920. The Castle attributes to Sinn Fein less than 2000 outrages, including 36 murders. Sinn Fein specifically charges against the Castle 35,636 acts of aggression, including 45 murders and seven deaths due to prison treatment." Think of the burning of Cork, the destruction of creameries, the murder of Ellen Quinn, and a dozen other things. Think of the evidence of the British Labor Commission, the Quaker Commission, the Bishops of Belgium, Phillip Gibbs, Hugh Martin, Mr. Asquith's daughter, archbishops, lords, and commoners, and one cannot take refuge in the plea of lack of reports. And yesterday we read that because one R.I.C. inspector had been killed Irish houses to the value of £250,000 had suffered destruction.

Professor Phillipson perhaps has no knowledge of the French horrors on the Rhine. The following account will perhaps enlighten him. It is taken from the article of E. D. Morel, in the London "Daily Herald," April 10, 1920:—"The French militarists are perpetrating an abominable outrage upon womanhood, upon the white race, and upon the civilisation. Not content with using hundreds of thousands of primitive African barbarians in the war... they are over-running Europe with them, 18 months after the war is over... to the number, I understand, of between 30,000 and 40,000.

There they have become a terror and a horror unimaginable to the countryside, raping women and girls—for well-known physiological reasons the raping of a white woman by a negro is nearly always accompanied by serious injury, and not infrequently has fatal effects—spreading syphilis, murdering inoffensive civilians, often getting completely out of control...

One may read the following passage in an article in last week's "Clarke" (Paris):—"Apart from the barely restrainable bestiality of the black troops, syphilis is making terrible ravages where they are stationed. Many dangerously contaminated prostitutes have been sent from France to Wiesbaden and Mayence (Mainz). The hospitals no longer suffice..." And this is only one side of the canvas. I have before me a number of depositions from relatives, victims, doctors, lawyers, of cases of rape, some of them of an atrocious character, of parties of young girls returning from labor in the fields waylaid, and humble working women seized in the streets after dark; reports of the continual and increasing disappearance of young girls from the towns and villages of the Saar Valley, of dead bodies

of young women discovered under manure heaps, and so on.

From Mainz, Ems, Wiesbaden, Ludwigshafen come advices that the local town councils must provide maisons tolerées (an increasing number) for the use of these black troops, to pay for their upkeep, and provide fuel to heat them. At Saarbrücken, it seems, the cost to the town of these brothels is no less than 70,000 marks. It is reported to me that the mayor of a certain town (I do not here name it for obvious reasons) was told that his hesitation in complying with demands for this purpose was rendering him liable to court-martial. It was impressed upon him that such houses were "specially necessary" for black troops, girls, "and boys" would pay the penalty.

Will Professor Phillipson assert that such observance of the Versailles Treaty is dictated by the spirit of "generosity" and "magnanimity," or even of "justice"? Surely all the devices of law cannot blind us to these horrible facts and their terrible vindictiveness.

#### —What Germany Would Have Done—

One of the most curious and illogical "arguments" is to justify the terms of the Versailles Peace Treaty by reference to what Bismarck did in 1870 (or, as a recent protagonist did) by reference to the Brest-Litovsk Treaty. That is, we first call the Versailles Treaty magnanimous and generous, and then say, "Well, it is not as merciless as the treaty of 1870, or of Brest-Litovsk." We compare a "magnanimous" treaty and justify it by saying that we, defenders of freedom and all that is good, were

not as harsh as those Germans, children of force and of evil. Really, one must be bankrupt of material in order to put forward such a pitiful plea as that.

In point of fact, the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, which Germany imposed upon Russia, was not (though one of the papers a day or so ago contended that it was) anything like "as drastic as the peace the Allies compelled Germany to sign." For unanswerable evidence, I refer readers to "Stead's Magazine," May 23, 1921. There was no indemnity, no surrender of the Russian navy and mercantile marine, no continuance of the blockade; there were joint commissions in which Russians had an equal say. What becomes of the Versailles Treaty in the light of these facts?

What the Germans would have done! Undoubtedly their terms would have been severe, very severe. But are we to follow the example of these cruel, rapacious, immoral Huns, we the incarnation of all that is lovely and good? Are we to accept the ethics of the brigand? We pick and choose carefully! We denounce German militarism; we justify our conduct by reference to its standards!

Moreover, in December, 1916, Germany did offer peace at a time when the Allied military position was unfavorable enough. What were the terms? Germany promised—(1) to evacuate North France and to evacuate Belgium, and pay to Belgium as indemnity or to surrender the territory of Trentino; (2) to agree to neutralisation of the Dardanelles and Trieste; (3) and possibly to surrender all German colonies except German East Africa. And our Government suppressed all discussion, and would not even allow the question to be talked about!

#### —The Responsibility for the War.—

Then we have the old cry which I thought all students would by this time have discarded in view of its hollowness and untruth—the cry that Germany was solely responsible for the war, and must therefore pay the penalty.

Let us take the obvious facts. The Peace Treaty does not touch those who guided German foreign affairs—it hits the working man, the middle classes, and the little children. No amount of legal quibbling can get away from that fact. No one will dare assert, I think, that the mothers

and infants who suffered so much from the continued blockade did anything to bring about the war. The treaty hits the innocent and not the guilty.

Furthermore, no one who has read international politics with an impartial mind can honestly believe that only one Government—the German Government—was guilty of engineering the war. I challenge any paper in Australia to publish evidence which I have collected, and I give them the right to criticise it at length. One does not say that the German Government did not have something to do with causing the war. What one does say is that other nations were also guilty. If that is so, then the Peace Treaty, based as it is on a wrong assumption, is fundamentally wrong, unjust, and vindictive.

#### —Final.—

Let us have done with hypocrisy, and face facts. Let us have patriotism, but not blind conceit. Let us who love our country save it from this type of ruinous self-praise, and let us realise the deeper patriotism of service. Love is not blind. It sees the faults of those near and dear, and it works to remedy those faults. We must do the same, and be worthy of the noblest. We must dissociate ourselves from materialistic ideas of greatness, which take refuge under high-sounding phrases. In a word, we must become more spiritual.

Dr. Dillon has spoken of the leaders of the conference as "dwarfs" when facing international affairs, "merest novices," men who lacked knowledge and vision. After reading of Professor Phillipson's advice, I have come to the conclusion that the little as well as the "big" men all come under the same category.

## Catherine Helen Spence Scholarship.

The abovementioned Scholarship, which has been provided by the South Australian Government to enable the holder to enter upon a course of study relating to Social Science, is open to women of South Australia of not less than 23 and not more than 40 years of age, who have been bona fide residents of South Australia for five years. The total value is £300, and it is tenable for four years.

Applications should be sent to the Director of Education, Adelaide, not later than the 31st October. Applicants should forward a full statement of their educational qualifications and testimonials as to ability and character.

A copy of the regulations governing this scholarship and other necessary information may be obtained on application to the Education Office.

The envelope containing application should be clearly marked, "Application for Catherine Helen Spence Scholarship."

W. T. MCCOY,  
Chairman Catherine Helen Spence Advisory Committee.

Register 6/8/21

## CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY.

SIXTY YEARS AGO.

By the Rev. F. Slaney Poole, M.A.

It is nearly 60 years since the writer made his first acquaintance with this old and renowned university. It is an occasion that one cannot possibly forget, for the new life is so strange and unexampled to a lad of 17—an age at which impressions are keenly and sharply engraved on the tablets of memory—that even after the lapse of so long a period as 60 years the impression is still clear and vivid. In my particular instance there were accompanying circumstances that aided the impression, for I was quite unsophisticated, and (beyond what I had managed to learn in school life) inexperienced. Both home and school discipline had been of a strict character, and it was somewhat uncanny to hear myself addressed as sir by the tradesmen and college servants. I felt as if I had in one step passed from boyhood into manhood, and the wearing of a gown and trencher cap accentuated this feeling. Then, too, was added the fact that three rooms were allotted to me for my own use, and the sense of proprietorship rose strong in me. It was with a pardonable pride that I felt when the doors were shut and the blinds drawn, "I am monarch of all I survey." The great northern manufacturing town from which I came had an atmosphere begrimed with soot and smoke. There were in it unquestionably some fine buildings here and there, but huge cotton mills and factories dominated the picture; and the change from such murky surroundings to the clear, pure air of Cambridge, and the vision in actual fact of her famous and ancient colleges, of which one had heard and read so much, aroused in one feelings which cannot easily be described or less easily be forgotten. Nor again can one forget his first visit to what are known as the "Backs" at Cambridge. The gardens and grounds of many of the colleges slope down to the small river from which Cambridge gets its name. "Lawns and meadow ledges midway down stand rich in flowers;" while stately elms keep sentinel and help to shelter the buildings from the cold bleak blasts that come careering across the flat fenland of the old county.

#### —Novel Experiments.—

My first visit to the "Backs" was on the morning after my arrival. As my people were not wealthy, I had travelled from the north to Cambridge by what was then known as the Parliamentary train. It stopped at all stations, if my memory serves me right; and it had been enacted by Parliament that it was to provide accommodation for passengers at the charge of a penny a mile. The examinations for which I was entered began on the following day. Until they were over, and the results published, the candidates were the guests of the college. I thought a stroll in the open air after breakfast might have some effect in clarifying my brain, and I took my first walk in the college grounds. It was well understood by me that, if I were not successful in the competition for which I had entered, there was no hope of a university career for me; but, seized in anticipation with a kind of proprietary claim on all these beautiful trees and gardens, I went off to the examination room determined to do my best to make my claim good. Fortunately for me, I did so. There is an age-long rivalry between the two old universities in England. Here I am no traitor to Cambridge if I admit that Oxford as a city, and as a collection of colleges outranges all that Cambridge