

Register 12/4/21

EVENING CHAMBER MUSIC RECITAL.

A delightful recital of chamber-music was given in the Elder Hall on Monday evening, in connection with the Music Teachers' Conference, by Mr. Gerald Walenn, Miss Nora Kyffin Thomas, Miss Sylvia Whittington, A.M.U.A., Mr. Harold Parsons, Mus. Bac., and Miss Maud Puddy, Mus. Bac. Miss Ada Wordie, A.M.U.A. acted as vocalist, and Mr. Harold Wylde, F.R.C.O., as accompanist. Schumann's Quartet in A. major, op. 41, No. 3, afforded scope for just the delicacy of rendering for which this group of musicians is noted. Playing together so often gives a special value to their work—perfect ensemble without loss of individual qualities of tone and expression. The first movement, "Andante espressivo," with its appeal of tender subdued pathos, the "Allegro molto moderato." The succeeding movement "Assai agitato," with its contrasting effect, the fine gravity of the "Adagio molto," and the inspiring "Finale—allegro molto vivace;" each movement, in turn, was interpreted with a fine appreciation of the composer's message. Miss Ada Wordie, whose clear, pure voice was at its best, sang charmingly a bracket of four songs—three were by Schumann:—"The Almond Tree," "Tears of Joy," and the dainty "Green Hat." Then came a delightful song—"The Blackbird," by Hook, an 18th century composer, modernized by Corder. Hearty applause was forthcoming from the audience throughout. The concluding concerted number was Caesar Franck's "Quintet in F minor." Miss Maud Puddy imparted to the piano part just its right value, her characteristic purity of touch being effectively. Mr. Walenn, as first violin, played with his accustomed brilliancy and finish, Miss Nora Kyffin Thomas evinced a fine command of tone and expression, Miss Sylvia Whittington, as usual, showed an easy mastery of her instrument, and Mr. Harold Parsons, with his 'cello, gave fully the richness, depth, and colour, which meant so much. There is ample scope in this writing for contrasted effects and expressive treatment. The first movement—"Molto moderato quasi lento"—and the "Allegro" led up to the haunting sadness of the "Lento con molto Sentimento," with its ever-deepening feeling; this movement was rendered with artistic restraint, which added to the effect. "Allegro non troppo ma con fuoco," with its bizarre opening and almost barbaric effects, made a fitting climax.

TO-DAY'S PROGRAMME.

This morning Mr. I. G. Reimann will lecture on "The development of piano teaching." During the afternoon Madame Clara Serena will give a vocal recital, and Mr. W. H. Foote a bassoon recital. In the evening there will be a violoncello, organ, and piano recital by Mr. Harold Parsons, Mus. Bac., Mr. Harold Wylde, F.R.C.O., and Mr. George Pearce. Lectures will be delivered in the lecture room under the Elder Hall.

THE SCHOOL OF FORESTRY.

It was at the desire of the Government that the School of Forestry of the University of Adelaide was founded in 1912. As there has been no failure to attain the object in view—the promotion of the study of the higher branches of science in application to forestry problems—it is remarkable that any consideration should be given to a proposal for discontinuing the school. The suggestion placed before the Government is that in lieu of the local institution an inter-State School of Forestry, to be situated in New South Wales, should be supported by an annual South Australian grant. To this inter-State school students now attending or in the future likely to attend the school at the Adelaide University would be encouraged to go. What would they or the State gain by the abolition of the present facilities for instruction in this city? There would be no advantage whatever, but a positive and serious loss. In the Commonwealth South Australia was the pioneer in the State organisation of a Forest Department, and its University was the first, and remains the only, University in Australia which provides a complete curriculum, both theoretical and practical, in the science and art of forestry. So broad in scope and so thorough in detail is the training offered that the University awards, on its successful completion, the degree of Bachelor of Science. That the course is of practical as well as scientific value is shown by the fact that several of the graduates in forestry at our University hold positions of importance in other States.

The Adelaide school gives effect to the idea that an Australian University, besides making provision for the broad essentials of higher education in such branches as arts, science, medicine, law, &c., should, when possible, specialise in some particular field of study not occupied to an equal extent by other Universities in the Commonwealth. Music is one of these specialities in Adelaide, but in a still higher degree agriculture promises, as a result of the Waite bequest, to become another; and already one agricultural subject—forestry—has been lifted here to a unique position. When, in collaboration with the Roseworthy College, a new course leading up to the degree of B.Sc. in Agriculture is fully organised by the University authorities there is no doubt that forestry will form an integral part of the curriculum, and the present strong position of the Forestry School will facilitate the arrangements to that end. It is necessary to bear in mind that under the Forest Act of 1919 the University, through the lecturer in forestry, controls the administration of the Kuitpo Forest. This is a most valuable annexe to the school as affording a field for practical instruction, but its utilitarian possibilities admit of a large development. The

University will be able to use this extensive and easily accessible area as a field laboratory for botany, zoology, geology, engineering, and agriculture. Plans have already been formulated for an exhaustive topographical, geological, botanical, and zoological survey of the area, and a start has been made with the soil survey which has been carried out by Dr. E. O. Teale, the only one of its kind as yet undertaken in this State. The value in connection both with agriculture generally and forestry in particular of a training ground like Kuitpo is too obvious to require much emphasis, but it may be pointed out that while Kuitpo is an asset to the University it is managed at very small expense to the Government, who for their expenditure secure, not merely the services of a lecturer and a full University course in forestry, but also an efficient administration of this area. All the advantages of the connection of forestry instruction with a University will be lost if the Government assent to the proposal for the transfer of the South Australian students to an inter-State school in New South Wales.

The latter institution will not be associated with any University, and therefore will not command the services of a full University staff. Consequently the standard of the course to be provided for will necessarily be inferior to that in Adelaide. It will not justify, and will not lead to, a B.Sc. degree in forestry, so that students aspiring to this distinction will be obliged to seek it in some other country. The Adelaide school is both efficient and economical. All the scientific subjects related to forestry in a broad and complete curriculum are offered to the students in other branches of the University, and the cost to the Government is limited to the salary of the lecturer and a small additional sum for clerical assistance. Much is obtained for a trifling expenditure, whereas the subsidising of the inter-State school would involve a comparatively large outlay for insignificant and unsatisfactory results. The Government, we trust, will avoid a hasty decision in this important matter. What is at stake is the destruction of a school already established and accomplishing useful work of a character not attempted in any other Australian University. The other States, having done nothing in forestry instruction, have, unlike South Australia, nothing to undo, and the proposal to subsidise an inter-State school naturally, in the circumstances, presents itself differently to them. They will establish a system inferior to our own; why should we assist them at the cost of sacrificing the better work done here?

Advertiser 13/4/21

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

AUSTRALIA AND HER OBLIGATIONS.

LECTURE BY PROFESSOR PHILLIPSON.

In the concluding lecture of his series on the League of Nations, delivered at the University on Tuesday evening, Professor Coleman Phillipson dealt with the attitude of the United States and with the status of the British Dominions. There was a large audience, and the lecture was listened to with the same marked attention as in the case of the preceding addresses.

Few people, said Professor Phillipson, understood the effect of the American Constitution in its relation to the control of foreign affairs. Congress had the power to raise armies, to make war, vote supplies, and carry out treaties. The treaty-making power, however, was in the hands of the President, and the sanction of two-thirds of the Senate was necessary. From the time of Washington there had been a struggle between President and Senate in regard to the powers given them by their own Constitution. In practice secret treaties were sometimes left to the President and the Department of State, and the Senate was content to ratify, but there had been many exceptions, and 68 treaties had been amended by the Senate. Therefore it would have been wiser for President Wilson to have consulted the Senate all along the line in regard to his action in Paris. The world was deceived as to his powers to negotiate a treaty unaided, but there was no reason for the statesmen of the world to have been deceived. There were certain specific objections apart from this against the Covenant. In the first place, America objected to the representation of the British Empire by six votes on the Assembly, whereas they, the United States, would have one. They did not object to the status of the Dominions, but to the effect of having a league like the British Empire within the League. The constitutional position of the Dominions was not properly realised in the United States. The Dominions were not like the

states of the American Union, but were practically sovereign and independent. The Americans thought that British votes would be used to their disadvantage, but it was just as likely that the votes of the 17 American republics would be used in favor of the United States against ourselves. Next, America objected to article 10, which involved a guarantee of territory and independence of members, thinking that their Monroe doctrine was endangered thereby. Many Americans believed this article was due to British underhand policy in the interests of the British Empire, presumably the work of Lord Robert Cecil, one of the most idealistic of statesmen. But Dr. Wilson had assured the Americans that Article 10 was his own pet provision, the offspring of his own brain. Nevertheless, a good deal of propaganda was set on foot in the United States, especially by Sinn Feiners, and that had had an influence on the views of the population. In point of fact, Article 10 was hardly more than an extension of the Monroe doctrine to the world at large. Besides, if this doctrine was affected by the covenant, it was not so much Article 10 that did it as the entry of the Latin American Republics in the League. Further, the Americans objected to Article 15; they claimed to decide for themselves whether matters to be submitted to the council fell within their domestic jurisdiction or not; also to decide matters relating to the Monroe doctrine. Lastly they objected to Article 16, which applied the sanction of the League, namely economic boycott, and, if absolutely essential, war. President Harding had endorsed all these objections, and in his message of April 12, 1921, urged that the American Constitution must be safeguarded and their traditional policy preserved—no entanglements or taking part in permanent military alliances, peace and friendship, and the settlement of disputes by mediation, conciliation, and arbitration. But they were in favor of a world court for justiciable questions, public opinion being the guide. All those methods, however, were tried before 1914, and did not prevent the Great War. The covenant expressly preserved sovereignty in regard to domestic jurisdiction, which would include the White Australia policy.

The Restrictions Imposed.

What restrictions were imposed upon the members of the League? The main question was were they fair, just, and equitable? In a society of nations the right of each was limited by the right of every other member, otherwise it would not be a society but a pandemonium. Absolute independence was a chimera and a contradiction. It was only assignable to a god, not to a limited being or group of beings. The whole conception of absolute sovereignty and independence had been worked out in the political philosophy and theoretical jurisprudence of Germany, and all knew with what dreadful results. The only restriction the League imposed was to refrain from war and to settle disputes by discussions. (Applause.) On the question of nationality and nationalism, the lecturer said the League did not prejudice the spirit of nationality; indeed, it would exercise a wholesome rationalising influence upon it. It was necessary to follow the golden mean between the extreme views on this question. Some people defied nationalism, and others eliminated it altogether. The best attitude was to adopt a union of nationalism and internationalism. (Applause.)

Dealing with the position of the British Empire and the League, and the question of the status of the Dominions, Professor Phillipson said the Dominions gained separate representation at Paris. That was a remarkable innovation and a diplomatic achievement, a reality trumping over formalism. The Dominions played a glorious part in the war from the first, while states like some of the American Latin Republics declared war late, and then only to please the United States, and they remained ony spectators. Should those small Republics, with populations less than 500,000, have been represented at the World's Conference, and the Dominions, which had poured out blood and treasure, not have been represented? Common sense answered the question only in one way, overriding the formal relationship of the Dominions and Great Britain. (Applause.)

Australia's Position.

As far as the League was concerned, the Dominions had acquired equal status with Great Britain. Australia's nationhood was definitely recognised. She was not yet an international person in the full sense of the term; her position in regard to foreign affairs would, no doubt, be adjusted in the present Imperial Conference.