

132  
Registers 2/8/21

Herald and  
Advertiser 4/8/21

Herald 4/8/21

### CONSERVATORIUM.

#### SUCCESSFUL VIOLIN RECITAL.

His Excellency the Governor (Sir Archibald Weigall) was present on Monday evening at the ninth concert of the 1921 session of the Elder Conservatorium. He was received by Professor Harold Davies, Mus. Doc., and others. The programme was one of particular interest and attraction—a violin recital by Mr. Gerald Walenn, in which that accomplished artist threw his whole soul into the rendering of some of the greatest works composed for the violin. To state that Mr. Walenn was at his best is saying a great deal. Above a striking command of his instrument, he displayed that insight into the meaning of the master minds of music, and telling interpretation of their message which mark the artist who has gone beyond thinking of mere virtuosity, and is rendering almost subconsciously the music which has become part of himself. That the audience could not fail to recognise this was proved by the enthusiasm which grew and strengthened after each number. Handel's best-known sonata for the violin, the "Sonata in A," was the first number. Mr. Walenn made the music live in all its fine freshness and sincerity, the gravity of the andante, and the brightness and florid complexity of later movements being equally well rendered. In the "Concerto in G minor, op. 26," by Bruch—one of the greatest compositions written for the violin—Mr. Walenn was also successful in revealing the characteristics of the writing, his purity of tone was specially noticeable. Mr. George Pearce gave the piano part just the right value. Indeed, his playing was artistically sympathetic throughout. "In a Boat," by Debussy, haunting, delicate, and charming; "Minuetto," by Milandre, quaint and effective; and "Mayflower," by Hubay, tender and dreamy; were each interpreted delightfully. Two compositions of Mr. Walenn's own were received with acclamation. He had to repeat, "Impressions of the East," with its curious rhythm and distinctly characteristic effect. "Butterfly" was a charming thing. In this the very butterfly-soul—hovering, darting, drifting—was revealed; just winged joy, with the hint of all too short a tenure. Mr. Walenn played it so that it seemed to flow spontaneously from the flying bow—and the audience demanded it again. The violinist, however, gave another number. "Gipsy Melodies," by Sarasate—a particularly brilliant piece written by one who was a virtuoso in his day—concluded the programme of a most successful concert.

Critic 3/8/21

### ELDER CONSERVATORIUM

His Excellency the Governor (Sir Archibald Weigall) was present at the fine violin recital in the Elder Hall on Monday evening, throughout which the audience proved most appreciative. Mr. Gerald Walenn is a true artist, with a brilliant execution. Handel's Sonata in A was given with a charm of expression that quite delighted the audience. Max Bruch's "Concerto in G. Minor" was another admirable performance, in which Mr. Walenn received sympathetic support from Mr. George Pearce at the piano, as the same composer wrote the piano-forte accompaniment. The combined whole is a masterpiece in which both of the talented instrumentalists scored. Mr. Walenn is sensitive of the finest transmission from light to shade. Lighter compositions followed. Debussy's "In a Boat," Milandre's "Minnetto," Hubay's "Mayflower." The dreamy theme of the last mentioned made a strong appeal, and Mr. Walenn had to repeat it, his own composition "Impressions of the East" proved equally popular, and again Mr. Walenn had to submit an encore. Another of his writings "Butterfly," a delightful work, met with a great reception, and Sarasate's "Gipsy Melodies" completed a most enjoyable programme. Mr. George Pearce is to be congratulated upon his work as accompanist throughout the evening.

### IS THE PEACE TREATY JUST?

From Professor COLEMAN PHILLIPSON, the University:—I notice in "The Advertiser" of August 3 a letter from "Facts." The writer, who hides himself behind the veil of anonymity, says that on May 12 I made certain statements about the Peace Treaty, and that on July 29 I made statements inconsistent with those. He goes on to suggest that I "pandered to public opinion," and dealt "in vague generalities," &c., and reminds me that the public is not short-minded. Let me say, in reply, that the anonymous writer is not merely short in memory, but lamentably deficient in the grasp and understanding of statements carefully made, not, as he glibly alleges, of vague generalities, but of a considerable amount of detailed facts. Before he rushes into print in this way let him first carefully think over the attack he makes, not by reference to a few phrases he has snatched at and brings forward, but on the basis of the whole context and the point of view from which my observations were made in each case. Now I am sure it was quite clear to all my hearers at the League of Nations Union lecture that in comparing President Wilson with Mr. Lloyd George and M. Clemenceau, I was showing the difference between the idealism of an inexperienced man and the practical disposition of men of experience and knowledge of human affairs; and I showed that, considering the Treaty and the negotiations from the idealistic point of view, certain defects might obviously be pointed out. Defects can, indeed, be pointed out in all human institutions. Certainly I said the fourteen points were not fully and literally realised; because President Wilson himself, even before the conference began, had made various modifications, and added to them other desiderata as a basis for arranging the terms to be imposed on the vanquished enemy. That is, it was not the fourteen points that exclusively furnished the basis for the Treaty. This I emphasised before the Chamber of Commerce; so that when "Facts" says I am inconsistent, he says so without sufficient thought and without a due sense of responsibility. Further, the obscure writer of the letter says I am again inconsistent when I say on July 29, that the Peace Treaty is just, and on May 12 that M. Clemenceau was animated by the principle, "I love France and abominate Germany," and that he was dominated by the idea of "revanche." Has the writer the least notion of what justice is? Perhaps, also, he does not know the meaning of the word "revanche." Is indignation or even hatred of the violators of all the laws of God and man, or the determination to take back what one was forcibly deprived of, inconsistent with a sense of justice and fair play? Are not criminals punished every day, and hated by the public when the despicable deeds committed become known, and if they are found in possession of others' property, are they not dispossessed of it, and in such treatment of and attitude towards malefactors where is the injustice? Again, I said on May 12 that "politicians and local preachers were not the best peacemakers and world-rebuilders." Of course they are not. What in the world has that to do with the question whether the terms actually imposed on Germany were just, as I held them to be? Partners in a firm may surely dispute among themselves to a certain policy, and yet their disputatiousness does not necessarily imply injustice, when their policy is afterwards adopted towards a third party. If we want to see whether the Treaty is a just one, the best way to do so is to look at its terms, which "Facts" evidently does not do. It is for this purpose altogether irrelevant to consider the attitude towards each other of those who made the terms. A punishment is inflicted on a burglar or a libeller, say, without regard to any debates that may have taken place in the Legislature where the law was formulated. Even if there were opposition and bickering between the members of Parliament, that does not mean that the punishment was unjust. I should have thought it would have been clear to any person of average intelligence that on May 12 I was discussing the mode of making the Treaty, the difficulties encountered, the clash of personalities, the inevitable disadvantages of compromise, and the conflict of idealism with practical politics; whilst on July 29 I considered whether the actual terms imposed on Germany were just. That is to say, in the one case I dealt with the process, in the other with the product. The two points of view are different, and perfectly compatible. All these considerations may also "arouse amusement" among such people as "Facts," of whom there must be very few; but in the minds of others they will arouse contempt for the intellectual capacity of such a misguided interloper as "Facts." I shall be glad to meet him before any public on the whole question when and where he likes. If he thinks my reply rather severe, he has only himself to thank for the impudent tone of his letter, rather than for his careless errors and misconceptions.

### IS THE PEACE TREATY JUST?

#### Reply to Professor Phillipson

CONDITIONS CRITICALLY EXAMINED.

(By Veritae.)

Professor Phillipson's latest public effusion will scarcely enhance his reputation as a thinker or the reputation of the university to which he at present belongs. His address is little more than a mixture of bad logic, hypocrisy, and misstatement of facts, and it is a misfortune that a seat of learning (the aim of which should be to seek truth) should be connected with an utterance which is both unfair and untrue.

#### —The Treaty Does Not Violate the Fourteen Points!—

The Allied Governments (let us not make it convenient to forget) agreed to an armistice on the basis of the 14 points (with two exceptions—reparations and freedom of the seas). The treaty should therefore have only worked out in detail the application of those principles. So it did, says Professor Phillipson. Let us see.

#### —Removal of All Economic Barriers.—

One of Wilson's 14 points decided that all economic barriers should be removed. What the treaty does is:—

1. To take from Germany all mercantile ships over 1000 tons, one half between 1000 and 1600 tons, one quarter of her trawlers and other fishing boats; and Germany promises, if ordered, to build up to 200,000 tons a year for five years for the Allies. That is, German shipping is wholly at the mercy of the Allies.

2. Deprives Germany of at least one-third of her coal supply and three-quarters of her iron, thus hampering German industry.

3. Takes from Germany 5000 locomotives and 150,000 waggons.

4. Demands 140,000 milk cows.

5. Imposes heavy tariff disabilities:—For five years Germany to give the most favored nation treatment to the Allies, but not to receive it.

Alsace Lorraine may export to Germany (as much as the 1911-15 average) without duties, but no similar provisions for Germany.

Polish exports for three years and Luxembourg's exports to Germany for five years to have similar privileges, but not so Germany.

6. On river commissions the Allies take control, i.e., Germany cannot control even its own river traffic, even rivers wholly German, i.e., the Allies can do what they please with German inland traffic.

7. Germany must give up to 20 per cent. of its river tonnage.

8. The rights of all German people in Russia, Austria, Turkey, Hungary, Bulgaria, China are at the mercy of the Allies, and these people may be expropriated. As Keynes puts it, the Allies have "dictatorial powers over all German property whatever," and "may point to any business, any enterprise whatever, and demand its surrender." This is an unprecedented thing. People who have been good British colonists have been sacrificed to the rapacity of unprincipled politicians.

9. Germany loses her rights, also Siam, Liberia, Morocco, and Egypt.

10. Germany loses much potash in Alsace.

11. Through being deprived of manures and feeding stuffs, it finds the soil productivity lessened by 40 per cent., and quantity of live stock by 55 per cent.

12. The Allies may demand 35,000 tons of benzol, 50,000 tons of coal tar, 30,000 tons of ammonium sulphate, 50 per cent. of dyes and drugs in Germany at the signing of the treaty, may demand until 1925 25 per cent. of the drugs and dyes produced in Germany—all at the prices fixed by the Reparation Commission!

13. German submarine cables are taken away.

14. After all this Germany must pay an indemnity or—wait, how many thousand millions?

Very magnanimous and generous, indeed! Highly altruistic! No trade barriers, no economic inequalities. Really a training in law is a valuable thing if

it enables one to say that such terms—involving, according to some 40 of the leading scholars of England, the "economic servitude" of Germany—are just and magnanimous!

#### —Impartial Adjustment of Colonies.—

The professor admits that some of the colonies might have been left to Germany, although she is not fit to govern them owing to her cruelty and harshness to the natives. I lament the harshness and cruelty with him, but is he not aware of the abominable Belgian Congo question, the Putumayo atrocities, the terrible records of French trading companies in Africa? It will perhaps be news to him to learn of British methods in Egypt, British spoliation in past days in India, and the not blameless administration in East Africa. Perhaps he is unaware that dozens of natives were poisoned by settlers in our own Australia.

He apparently overlooks the fact that the Allied Governments, which fought only for freedom and righteousness, made a number of secret treaties among themselves, and bargained away German colonies and other lands long before 1918. If he wishes for fuller information he may consult the 1915 treaty with Russia, the 1916 treaty concerning the partitioning of Asiatic Turkey, the 1915 treaty with Italy, which disregarded the rights of small nations, the 1917 treaty with Japan, by which England and Japan (I mean their Governments) divided the German colonies in the Pacific. This is the wonderful generosity to Germany, and the excellent application of the Sermon on the Mount to international affairs!

#### —Self-determination!—

Professor Phillipson declares that the Allies allowed "individual liberty" to those people in the parts of Germany which by the treaty were permitted to decide whether they wished to remain under Germany or not. Another half-truth which is nearer by far to falsehood. Take Eupen and Malmedy, for example. There the people ostensibly were given the rights of self-determination. But how? With Belgian officials in those parts the people were not even allowed the privilege of recording their votes in secret (i.e., by the ballot box), but had to come and make an open declaration in front of alien officials that they wished to remain with Germany. I should say that it would require an exceptional amount of courage for a voter to face foreign officials in that manner, and I am certain that there is no valid reason why the Allies should have withheld the ballot box method.

If the professor will consult his own book, "Alsace-Lorraine: Its Past, Present, and Future," written two or three years ago, he will find that he then wrote that "a carefully and impartially organised referendum" was a necessary condition for a just settlement of the Alsace-Lorraine question. He then quoted evidence to show that Alsace-Lorraine before the war would have been content with home rule within the German Empire, that after the war it would probably have preferred "neutralised independence" to reunion with France, and that reunion with France would involve several difficulties, possibly even ignoring the wishes of the Alsatians and Lorrainers themselves. However, it appears that Professor Phillipson overlooked (or altered) his views of two or three years ago when addressing the Chamber of Commerce, for it goes not so much as if he criticised the French annexation of those two provinces.

Nor did he mention that this "individual liberty" was permitted only in places which suited the Allies—not in Ireland or Egypt, for example—and that when the referendum was actually taken in Upper Silesia, some people seem ill-