

40
Advertiser 16/8/21

ELDER CONSERVATORIUM.

VIOLONCELLO AND ORGAN RECITAL.

There was a large attendance at the Elder Hall last night when a violoncello and organ recital was given by two popular members of the Conservatorium staff. Both Mr. Harold Parsons and Mr. Harold Wylde, in their respective musical appointments, carry the esteem and wide recognition of Adelaide audiences. Mr. Parsons verified his worth as a cellist of high attainment in a programme of intense interest. With Mr. Wylde at the piano two sonatas were played, the first from a set of 12 sonatas, composed by Giuseppe Valentini for three stringed instruments. This one was No. 10 of the series, and was a Piatti arrangement for pianoforte and violoncello. The work was a distinct success, and the artists fully deserved the appreciation offered. The second sonata was Grieg's task for both instruments. Originality of design and the striking brilliancy of the themes allowed the musicians an all-sufficient outlet for artistry and fine conception. With organ accompaniment Mr. Parsons played the ever-welcome "Air" by J. S. Bach; Schumann's "Abendlied" and an "Andante cantabile" by Nardini, exhibiting further his experienced control and perfectly judged interpretation. Mr. Harold Wylde's organ solos were scholarly in treatment, finish, and detail. With infinite regard to expressive representation the organist played the "Three Impressions" by Karg-Elert. The numbers contain strangely beautiful progressions and originality of harmonic treatment, and occur in the order of "Harmonies du soir," "Clair de lune," and "La nuit." For this work Mr. Wylde was generously applauded. A second organ solo was skilfully portrayed—the Finale from the sonata in G minor by Piatti.

Advertiser 17/8/21

IS THE PEACE TREATY JUST?

From "SIR ORACLE":—It must now be obvious to "Broader Views," Mr. H. S. Taylor, of Renmark, and a few others that it is a dangerous and pernicious habit to indulge in spasms of temerity, presuming to hold different opinions from those of Professor Colman Phillipson on such questions as the above. He is an authority, though not yet "the" authority. Do they now realise that the professor has descended from his lofty heights, nearly in the clouds, and to create an "infra dig" precedent? Perhaps having read, or re-read, Demosthenes, Cicero, and Juvenal, and imbibed refreshing and mind-stimulating draughts from these classical but sadly neglected gentlemen, your correspondents will realise the enormity of their turgidity. The professor is not a pill dispenser; he uses heavy artillery, which by now even Mr. Taylor will understand. If not, no doubt the professor has a "Big Bertha" in readiness for the next occasion when he condescends to answer persons whose opinions are shared by only a negligible quantity. The professor, to warn such people for the future, should preface his lectures, &c., with a cautionary note, such as—"I am Sir Oracle, and when I open my lips let no dog bark!" Then "the negligible quantity" would listen, with bated breath, and make no comments except in whispering humbleness.

Critic 17/8/21

DENTAL CONGRESS.

Progressive Programme.

The following is the prospective programme for the fourth Australian Dental Congress, to be held in Adelaide next week, under the presidency of Dr. E. J. Counter:—

Sunday, August 21—10 a.m., Railway station, reception committee, meeting of delegates; 2.5 p.m., Morialta Falls, tram ride, afternoon tea; 5.17 p.m., return to Adelaide; 6.45 p.m., church service, St. Peter's Cathedral (corner Pennington Terrace and John Street, North Adelaide).

Monday, August 22—12 noon, civic reception by the Lord Mayor, Town Hall, Adelaide; 3 p.m., South Australian School of Mines and Industries, North Terrace, His Excellency the Governor, Sir Archibald Weigall K.C.M.G., will declare the congress open; 4.30 p.m., official photograph, entrance steps

to school; 7.30 p.m., manufacturers' exhibits, opening by President (Dr. E. J. Counter); 7.45 p.m., evening session, papers, illustrated by lantern slides.

Tuesday, August 23—9 a.m., general session of congress, clinical demonstrations; 12 noon, reception by the Chancellor and University Council at the University, North Terrace, Adelaide; 2.30 p.m., general session, clinical demonstrations and papers; 6.30 p.m., the Chairman of the S.A. Dental Board (Wallace Bruce, Esq.), will tender a dinner to visiting members of other State dental boards and chairmen of delegates; 7.30 p.m., evening session, papers, illustrated by lantern slides.

Wednesday, August 24—9 a.m., general session, clinical demonstrations and papers, discussions; 12.30 p.m., returned dental soldiers, reunion lunch; 2.30 p.m., hiss motor drive, with afternoon tea at National Park, members and their wives, at the invitation of Sir Joseph Verco (Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry), and Lady Verco; 7.30 p.m., evening session, papers, illustrated by lantern slides, discussion.

Thursday, August 25—9 a.m., general session, clinical demonstrations, and papers, discussion; 2 p.m., general business meeting of congress members; 3 p.m., reception by His Excellency the Governor and Lady Weigall, to congress members and their wives at Government House lawn; 7.45 p.m., congress dinner, The Grosvenor, North Terrace, Adelaide.

Friday, August 26—9 a.m., adjourned general business meeting of congress members, followed by federal council meeting of the National Dental Association of Australia; 2 p.m., general session, clinical demonstrations and papers, discussion; 7.45 p.m., theatre party.

Saturday, August 27—General farewells.

The Hon. Secretary is Mr. Alex. Swann, Rockville House, 209, North Terrace, Adelaide.

Critic 17/8/21

ELDER CONSERVATORIUM.

Messrs. Harold Parsons and Harold Wylde, the two popular exponents on cello and organ drew a large crowd to the Elder Hall on Monday night for their recital. Friends and pupils rallied up in full force. Mr. Parsons gave a particularly fine rendering of two sonatas, the first by Giuseppe Valentini (from a set of twelve) for three stringed instruments. This was No. 10 for pianoforte and violoncello it was accorded a perfect ovation. The second for both instruments was by Grieg, and brilliantly rendered by both artists. J. S. Bach's air "Schumann's Abendlied" and Nardini's "Andante cantabile," with the organ accompaniment were further gems that met with appreciation. Mr. Wylde's organ recitals were brilliantly rendered. Karl Elert's "Three Impressions" was a study in expression, "Harmonies du soir," "Clair de lune," and "La nuit." Mr. Wylde contributed infinite pleasure to the many music lovers present. His second organ recital—the Finale from the Sonata in G Minor (Piatti) was most enthusiastically received.

Herald 18/8/21

IS THE PEACE TREATY JUST?

PROFESSOR PHILLIPSON'S REJOINER TO 'VERITAS'

I had decided to take no further part in this controversy, but as "Veritas" has discontinued his personal abuse and is in a chastened mood, I would like to make the briefest possible observations on some of his statements charging me with mistakes or contradictions.

—1. The Fourteen Points.—

Despite the repeated assertions of "Veritas," the armistice terms were an essential basis of the treaty. President Wilson himself said so, over 1000 delegates from all parts of the world held it to be so, and the Germans regarded it as such when the armistice terms were put before them. Why did they not reject these terms, continue fighting, and insist on the 14 points alone? Why attention to Ludendorff and Hindenburg are not "away from the point." I referred to them to show their view of the terms the victorious Allies were to insist on. They knew the terms, and the rest of their countrymen were aware of the terms; and with that knowledge they laid down their arms. How, then, could they have been deceived? I did not say that "the treaty did not violate the 14 points." I referred to President Wilson's expression to that effect. What I said was that the treaty did not violate the 14 points as supplemented, modified, and amended by later pronouncements, express reservations, and the armistice terms. Moreover, in past wars the armistice has usually had not merely a military, but also a political significance—that is, as between the belligerents in regard to the ultimate terms.

—2. Justice.—

I claimed that generosity had been shown by the Allies. "Veritas" has not proved that to be wrong, notwithstanding his assertion. The reason why I claim it is simple enough to appeal to a child. The Allies were entitled to demand full reparation for damage. Had they exacted and obtained full reparation that would have been justice; but they demanded considerably less than full reparation, and so showed a large measure of generosity. "Veritas" naively suggests that the Allies should submit the whole case to a "neutral court." He forgets that under international law and practice they were entitled to impose their terms themselves. Did Germany in 1871 (not to mention other occasions) submit the question of terms to a neutral court? Did she not rather exact three times her cost of the war? Did the United States in 1891 (in the war with Spain) submit to a neutral court? In the Russo-Japanese settlement in 1905 was a neutral court asked to adjudicate? Can "Veritas" mention a single example of a victorious party referring the question of terms to outsiders? Does "Veritas" really think that the application of international justice is and must be exactly like the application of civil justice, despite the entire difference of conditions. It may be that when the League of Nations is securely established and operates in the way hoped for, then it may be not only possible but necessary to submit international differences to a special tribunal. The League of Nations was only brought into existence by the very Treaty of Versailles, which laid down the Allied terms as accepted by the Germans; so that, apart from other considerations, there could not have been an appeal to a being which was not yet born.

—3.—Atrocities.—

I kept very close to the parallel drawn by "Veritas," and which he now makes again. He says:—"If Germany had to pay so heavily for her misdeeds in Belgium, on the same reasoning Great Britain should pay for her atrocities in Ireland." Now, I ask you, "Veritas," do you really say that is a parallel, and that the same reasoning applies? Was Ireland part of the United Kingdom? Was Belgium part of the German Empire? When the British authorities took steps to put down rebellion and disorder in their own territories, can they be said to have lawlessly invaded those territories? When Germany invaded Belgium in 1914, did she merely take steps, sanctioned by law, to put down rebellion and disorder in her own territory? Do you really think that the

"necessity" pleaded by the Germans is of the same kind as the necessity to preserve order in one's own country? May I refer you to another book of mine, "International Law and the Great War" (1915), in which I have examined the German pleas of military "necessity." You will find a copy in the Public Library.

—4. Authorities.—

No, no, "Veritas," I did not "sneer" at Mr. Asquith's daughter. I am sure not a single fair reader could interpret my reference in that way. Why in the world should I sneer at her? To tell you the truth, which I thought would have been evident to you, it was yourself I laughed at for citing her as an authority. And I am disposed to believe you have enough sportsmanship to join with me in the laugh. Think it over calmly, and please don't interpret in the worst spirit everything I say.

—5. Responsibility for the War.—

"Veritas" must remember how in July, 1914, Sir Edward Grey begged and prayed of the German and Austrian authorities to meet in conference and not to resort to violent measures; how he assured them full satisfaction; how Serbia again and again offered to submit the Austro-Serbian dispute to the Powers, or to The Hague tribunal, or to anybody in the world; and how the Austrians, backed by the Germans, rejected all offers and entreaties. Do try to be fair and reasonable. We know that there had been before that a good deal of mutual suspicion among the Powers; but surely that was a clear issue in July, 1914. I remember seeing the mass of evidence produced in Paris by the various delegations, and only one conclusion was possible. Since then nothing of a material character has appeared that can substantially modify that conclusion.

—6. Germany Can Pay.—

I gave a few figures to prove this. "Veritas" calls them a "maze of statistics." If any reader looks at them again he will not agree with this description. Of course, we all know that capital and labor are necessary for getting the coal from the Ruhr Valley. I mentioned the richness of this coalfield to show that Germany was not badly off for coal and had ample resources for meeting her debt. She has many other sources of wealth, but I mentioned this one as an example. The figures I gave were extracted from German papers and official statistical documents. "Veritas" says my maxim, "Let justice be done, though the heavens fall," means loss to ourselves. What if it over? He confuses justice with mere expediency. Because of the international ramifications of trade and industry, every nation suffers more or less when a great State suffers. That does not mean that suffering should not be inflicted on a great State when it does damage to others. It might be expedient, from our own point of view even, to refrain from imposing hard conditions on Germany; but justice does not demand such a course. Justice and expediency do not necessarily coincide. "Veritas" refers to Socrates; does he say that Socrates maintains that they coincide? I know my Plato fairly well, and I can assure my critic that in several of the dialogues (including the "Republic"), Socrates "squashes" those of his interlocutors who claim such identity. Further, "Veritas" emphasises my view of expediency by telling us that Germany is "winning the peace," but he does not observe that in doing so he has undermined his whole position. He sets out to prove that Germany was unjustly and hardly dealt with, and then goes on to establish that Germany is better off than the victorious Allies! And only the other day, in his previous article, he wept over Germany's dreadful and unfortunate position!

—International Law.—

My opponent raises one or two points here that have given rise rather to a misunderstanding than to a dispute as to the application of principles. First, the question of Alsace-Lorraine. Now, when I used the words "to right a