

ON DIT

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY STUDENT UNION.

Vol. V.

Tuesday, 28th July, 1936.

No. 18.

DANGER OF WAR.

The international situation is getting worse every day. And we are all making the international situation worse every day by being content to watch our Australian Government (our own representatives) follow a panicky British Government in calling for more and more armaments. "We must be ready for it when it comes!" In endorsing a policy of national armaments we are not only reconciling ourselves to the inevitability of a war; but we are actively making it inevitable.

Every nation is in a panic and preparing madly to arm, and now they seem to have discarded friendly and reasonable diplomacy, and to be engaged in throwing out indiscriminate and selfish insults. In the form of suicidal tariff regulations—which are nothing less than acts of war.

Yet at the same time as individual men and women we say that we want peace.

WHAT PEACE MEANS.

Now peace, if it is anything, is surely based on friendship and goodwill. If one party to a treaty has all the goods, all the prestige, all the benefits of the treaty, and the other party is the victim of revenge, is down-trodden, and has little economic security, the treaty is not peace, but a truce between two wars. Can anyone expect the people of the dissatisfied nation to be friendly? Put yourself in their place. Would you be satisfied, a boy or girl of twenty-one, to be a member of a humiliated country; wouldn't you try to do something to right the balance? You would feel you have as much right to live as anyone else! The marvel is that Germany, Italy and Japan have been as friendly and as reasonable as they have been since 1920.

Take your own personal relationship with another person. How do you make him a friend? Isn't it a matter of confidence, mutual trust and goodwill? You set out actively to get his confidence by helping him, by trusting him absolutely, and by giving him no cause for jealousy and fear. He may start by being very suspicious. He thinks you are playing him a trick. And you overcome that, not by threatening him with force, but by continuing to trust him and being all the more ready to give of your best, your time, and your possessions to make him satisfied of your goodwill. If you treat other people well, other people will generally treat you well. And more than that, if you have the opportunity of going on treating them well, they will at last make a habit of reciprocating your treatment.

WHAT WAR MEANS.

The theory and technique of militarism are based on a psychological assumption that is self-evidently absurd. The militarist sets out to secure other people's goodwill by making war on them—that is to say by treating them as badly as he possibly can. But it is a matter of everyday experience that if you treat other people badly they will answer (unless, of course, they happen to be saints or trained pacifists) either by treating you badly at once, or, if the power to return evil for evil is lacking, by waiting in fear, anger and hatred for an opportunity to treat you badly later on. Unless followed by an act of reparation, war will always be answered by war. Hate breeds hate, and violence, violence.

CONSTRUCTIVE PEACE.

What Am I Doing About It?

"That's all very well," you say. "But how does that apply now? Our civilisation, our Empire, our democracy is menaced. We must be prepared to fight for their preservation, and in order to fight, we must be well armed."

But is there any probable or possible safety in such a resort to arms? War is not now a trial of strength between two trained armies in the field, two "test-teams." It is a matter of wiping out whole civil populations on both sides. There is no possible defence against fast planes dropping incendiary bombs and gas of incredible efficiency. War—and we know it—is now just mass murder and mass suicide on a vast and immeasurable scale. In preparing for war

economic advantages, in part, perhaps mainly, of prestige—which is the polite and diplomatic word for pride and vanity. There would have to be an agreement as to the supply of tropical raw materials; an agreement on monetary policy; an agreement with regard to industrial production and markets; an agreement on tariffs; an agreement on migration.

The greatest immediate sacrifices will have to come from those who possess the most. These sacrifices, however, will be negligible in comparison with the sacrifices which will be demanded from us by another war. Negligible in comparison even with those which are at present being demanded by the mere preparation for another war.

OVERCOME SUSPICION BY TRUST.

Think again of your dealings with another person who is already suspicious of you, angry and jealous (and there is always some reason for jealousy, if it is only misunderstanding). How do you overcome that suspicion? You overcome it by going out of your way to help him; not threatening him by force, or getting angry, but finding out the cause of his jealousy and at your own expense putting things right. If you threaten him you will lose his confidence through your obvious insincerity and fear. If you trust him, he is sure to trust you before long.

Now apply that to international politics. The British Empire is proud of all its possessions, and very frightened of losing them. There are jealous and suspicious nations all round her who are not to be put off by her threats of force: war is better to them than peace with starvation and humiliation. Such a situation with growing hate and fear on both sides leads to war: UNLESS BY GENEROSITY, TRUST AND GOODWILL WE TAKE AWAY THE CAUSE OF DISSATISFACTION.

But we must make the start. We must offer large concessions. We must disarm without fear to show our sincerity. Otherwise we make nonsense of our offers. And no one is going to go on pounding shells into us if we do not attempt to return them. You can always fight with two types of people, angry people and frightened people. You find you cannot go on fighting a person who is not angry, does not return your blows, and is not afraid. There have to be two people to play the fighting game; if one won't play, but stands fearless and calm and ready to see reason and put obvious wrongs right, the other begins to respect him. And the onlookers, too, are ready to sympathise with the fearless voluntary sufferer that does not return blows.

It is for us, the nation with great possessions, prestige and power, to foresee what is obviously approaching and to prevent it by taking away the causes of jealousy and fear. The British Empire can break out from this malevolently charmed circle of distrust and misunderstanding by ceasing to threaten and by giving generously to the ill-used countries, inter alia, Germany, Italy, Japan. One nation taking the lead in acting fearlessly and

generously can still save the world. For individually, whatever our nationality, we want peace and we want friendship.

WHICH IS MADNESS—PEACE OR WAR?

"To go in for this sort of thing is suicide," says the militarist. "I think it the duty of those in authority to frighten people," says Mr. Duff Cooper, British Minister for War. And we agree that we are taking a risk. But how small a risk compared with the risk involved in any resort to modern war, which cannot help bringing complete and indiscriminate slaughter without settling anything.

To prepare for war is to prepare for death for us all, and that pretty quickly. To work for friendship is to work for life. Which is better, to take a risk for a good cause, or to court certain death for a bad one?

WHAT WE CAN DO AS INDIVIDUALS.

Well, then, how are we going to bring all this about? By making ourselves absolutely convinced of its efficacy as the only means to peace; and more than that, by testing for ourselves in our dealings with each other the truth of this basic fact, that if you treat other people well, other people will generally treat you well, they will at last make a habit of treating you well. But if we do not put that into practice ourselves how can we expect the government to be any different in outlook from what it is now? If we start at once and spread it among ourselves in a widening circle, we are actively defending our homes, our country, and our civilisation.

We must get together as friends, thoroughly convinced, and persuade the government to use reasonable means of settling differences. And we can only do that by showing in our example that friendship and goodwill are the only possible means to peace.

There is a letter on another page of this issue which seriously suggests that the British Empire should make itself the master of the world. "Only through the consummation of war can we attain the ecstasy of peace. Let's have war then," he says.

But (1) peace rests on friendship and goodwill, not on force. A war can only lead to another war to right the wrongs inflicted in the last one, never to permanent peace.

And (2) when it is modern war we are indulging in, the ecstasy of peace can only be the peace of death: death for the British Empire and for all its enemies.

No, we must be sure of ourselves: We must work continuously for the abolition of national armaments; for unselfish and whole-hearted understanding of the needs and the opinions of the other nations whoever they are; for making trade and communication unrestricted between the countries of our one world. That means, of course, vigorously opposing those aggressive tariffs against Japan and America and Belgium, and vigorously initiating a movement to give satisfaction at our own expense to the nations who are rightly unsatisfied. And there is not a moment to lose.

This article is based on Aldous Huxley's pamphlet "What are you going to do about it?" published at threepence by Chatto and Windus, London. This puts the complete case of Absolute Pacifism.



"Understand, ye brutish among the people! and ye fools, when will ye be wise?"—Psalm 94.*

we are preparing to destroy utterly our civilisation, our Empire, our democracy or our homes. And our civilisation includes the country, the people and the homes of friends and enemies alike.

HOW TO GET PEACE.

Yes, all that we value is menaced. Is there any alternative to fighting? Yes there is. Behave well to other people, and you can always, in the long run, induce other people to behave well to you. And what does that mean at the present moment? The great monopolistic powers should immediately summon a conference at which the unsatisfied nations, great and small, should be invited to state their grievance and claims. When this has been done it would be possible, given intelligence and goodwill, to work out a scheme of territorial, fiscal, economic and monetary readjustments for the benefit of all. That certain immediate sacrifices would have to be made by the monopolistic powers (of whom Great Britain is one of the biggest) is inevitable. These sacrifices would be in part sacrifices of

*Drawing by Arthur Wrang, from "The Psalms for Modern Life," by kind permission of Selwyn and Blount, publishers.

ON DIT

Editors—J. C. Yeatman,
W. R. Harniman.

Sub-Editors—D. C. Cowell,
Miss H. Wighton.

Reporters—F. L. Crisp, J. Moulden,
Miss Edith Irwin.

You Must Come to the SHERRY PARTY Before the Union Ball, FRIDAY, AUGUST 7th.

Tickets obtainable by invitation of a
Member of the Arts Association.

With the League for Peace A PRACTICAL POLICY.

We cannot help feeling the force of the complete pacifism—the absolute refusal to resort to force under any circumstance — of Mr. Aldous Huxley. His position is absolutely unassailable: no argument can smash its integrity. While admitting its perfection, can we throw in our lot with it? In the first place it seems far too negative a policy to win the convinced and complete support of more than a handful (relatively) of the people at present. And as Machiavelli has pointed out, all the unarmed, all the pacifist prophets have failed—even the Churches of Jesus of Nazareth have temporized, the articles of the Anglican faith, for instance, include the direction that members of the Church of England may fight in a nationalist war. In the second place this world of ours is far from perfect.

An Analogy in the State.

Now this brings us to the crux of the whole matter. A State finds that, as there are in its population elements of paranoics, e.s. types, and other potentially anti-social people, it is absolutely necessary that there should be a system of law obtaining throughout the State. This system of law is effective, first, because it has the sanction of popular will and opinion. It is good that we should have order in the community. The Australian police are effective because Australians in the mass desire them to be effective. Secondly, the system of law is effective because it is sanctioned by force which the State maintains by general consent to perform just that function. Law depends, then, on will and force. And it is effective, and people still will that it shall be effective, despite the fact that frequently it may support and perpetuate manifest injustice. Some even support law for the sake of order and good government, when they feel that the whole social structure is unjust. For they see that the only alternative is the "law" of tooth and nail—the state of affairs where every man packs his gun and defends himself and what he can get by his own effort. He sets himself up as judge in his own case where previously there had been an independent (though albeit possibly a fallible) judge. Under such primitive individualism the reign of law is non-existent.

The International Sphere.

Project this picture now on to the larger screen of international affairs. The national, "sovereign" State is like

the man who packs his own gun. It sets itself up to be judge in its own case, placing its own values and interpretations on those dangerous terms "prestige" and "national honour," and its own limits to those equally dangerous phenomena "national interests." As long as they hold to the sanctity of their nationality and the integrity of their sovereignty the state of international anarchy will continue. Only when, at the price of their "sovereignty," the nations submit to a rule of law internationally can their position be analogous to that of the citizen in a law-abiding community.

Basis of International Law.

Such international law must, like civil law, be based upon will and force. There must be, through the length and breadth of every country, a "League opinion"—not just an opinion which will sanction League action against some miserable fifth-rate power, but a League opinion which will see its own national interests subordinated to the common principle. People must will their governments at all times to place at the disposal of the League such forces as the League may require. At no time must it reason or arm save at the League's command. No longer must a State be allowed by its citizens to fit itself militarily to give effect to its own judgments of its own case. Opinion must be strong enough to steel a State to "taking its own medicine" if the League should decide against it in a dispute. To take an imaginary case, the test of League opinion in Britain's case would be the measure of our people's willingness to hand over India to the Germans, or the Russians, or the Indians if the League saw in any of those peoples better rulers than ourselves. Another test is our willingness to subordinate our Minister for War, our Minister for Air, our First Lord of the Admiralty, our Chief of the General Staff, our Sir Thomas Inskip to an international commander chosen by and in all things directed by the Assembly of the League of Nations.

It will be objected that such support of the League means continued support for the injustices which the present international status quo implies. Yes, it does. But as we saw in the case of State law, our only hope of a long-term settlement of relationships is one in which the rule of law is paramount, one in which all injustices may in time be righted by action in an atmosphere of order and in a spirit not of personal, individual judgment, but of an independent or common judgment. The League Assembly must be the judge of national rights and wrongs. This is not a mere aspiration. Within a week of the outbreak of war Italy was declared aggressor against Abyssinia, Japan was declared aggressor in China. What was lacking was will in the nations to use "national" force for international ends under League leadership. So, in October last year, the great chance slipped past us. It cannot be regained. But

LETTER TO PRIME MINISTER.

Letter sent to the Prime Minister
The Rt. Hon. J. A. Lyons, P.C., C.H.

Sir,—

I have been asked to inform you that, at a meeting of protest held at the Adelaide University on Thursday, July the 23rd, a motion that "this house condemns the latest tariff moves of the Federal Government" was carried by 66 votes to 19. Although unfortunately there is much apathy within the University towards matters political, there has been a great deal of interest and discussion about your Government's recent tariff policy, and a meeting of 85 persons is unusually large for our University. The articles and letters which appear in the enclosed copies of "On Dit" express the opinions of students about your tariff policy.—Yours sincerely,

J. C. YEATMAN,

Co-Editor of "On Dit."

Next Saturday

At 8.0 p.m.

A Different Ball

INVALID CHAIR RACE

Presentation of Bowser Cup.

Tickets 3/, reserve tables with Mr. Hamilton, free of charge.

The Engineers

all is not lost. We must go on building up, building up, building up faster than breaking down goes on.

The Path Before Us.

How can we do it? We must build up the will to international law. We must make it clear to the government that we will not lift a finger to fight for "King and Country," we must oppose at every step rearmament for "national defence" and the glorification of war, we must let the Japanese walk in, rather than oppose them without League sanction. We must make it equally clear that we will fight to the last ditch for the League principle and international law, that if the League says we must provide another fifty planes we will pay taxes with a will. Not a penny for "national defence" (which means only "national suicide")! But death will not be a price too high for international law. How convert the "wronged" nations? Not by sops to their "national pride," nor balm to their "prestige"; but by faith and trust, working out on the practical side in rational, helpful tariff policies, and the capacity for infinite patience at international conferences.

There is a long course to row, even here in "enlightened" Australia. Both Liberal and Labour Parties are criminally at fault. The former clings to its "King and Country" attitude, the latter supports tariff policies like the present, and immigration views which exclude the Southern European as a non-white man.

We at the university must get behind the League of Nations Union, must make it a real power for good in this community. We must make our policy and our creed quite clear to our government. We must, above all, educate and convince ourselves thoroughly on these points before we try converting and winning others. Start now by reading Norman Angell's "Preface to Peace."

OUR PROFESSORS.

No. 1—Professor A. L. Campbell.

Of all the learned members of our teaching staff, the Dean of the Faculty of Law is probably the most versatile. Here is a professor who is an expert lawyer and linguist, a connoisseur of rare food and drink, could fight a duel with rapiers if the occasion arose, and was once a champion men's hockey player. When you consider that, his age 47½, and weight approximately 240 lbs., you see that his credentials are not to be sneezed at.

The Professor is a nephew of the Honourable J. L. Campbell, and spent his academic days at Sydney University. According to a member of the High Court Bench he was the most distinguished graduate of his year.

His University records bear recording here. Included in his academic achievements, are First Class Honours in French, German, Mathematics, and also in Mechanical and Electrical Engineering, which gained for him the Garton No. 1 and No. 2 Scholarships, the Barker No. 1 and No. 2 Scholarships, the George Allen Scholarship and Norbert Quirk Prize. It was while working for his B.L.S. degree that he made the law his mistress, and studied these two branches of learning together.

The explanation of the anomaly of a Professor of Law without LL.B. or LL.D. after his name lies in the fact that there are no such letters to be won from the Sydney University Bar Examination. After passing the last-named examination he was called to the N.S.W. Bar in 1914, and became associate of Mr. Justice Rich, as he then was.

We can therefore recommend this learned Jack-of-all-trades to every faculty except those of Medicine and Marbles, with complete confidence in

URGENT . . .

More Contributions Needed
for Phoenix.
Last Day of Entry—
Saturday, August 1.

his ability to solve their academical problems. On his inscrutable manner, yet genial smile and his universal popularity, there is no need to enlarge here. His influence extends far beyond the lecture room.

His absence towards the end of the year, when he intends to travel abroad, will leave a big gap in the Law School, and he will need to be a Big Man, indeed, who would fill the professorial chair. Our Professor will return, of course; the Law Students' only hope, apart from best wishes for his journey, is that he will not return with a new system of lecturing. The present one is entirely satisfactory, permitting the greatest amount of mental lethargy consistent with note taking.

FOR LEISURE MOMENTS !

READ

S.A. HOMES & GARDENS,

THE TATLER of the Southern Hemisphere.

Published 1st of Each Month.

Price—1/-.
Posted Free.

Annual Subscription—12/ per Annum.

Publishers:

SHIPPING NEWSPAPERS (S.A.) LIMITED.

BROWSE AMONG THE
UNLIMITED RANGE
OF BOOKS
At
PREECE'S

Britain, the World's Policeman

ECONOMIC IMPERIALISM.

Sir,—

I should like to add something to last week's controversy. Before I start I want to say that in common with most Varsity men today, I desire peace ardently, nay, with a fervour that could only be bred by cowardice and a nice sense of comfort.

The League of Nations has failed and failed badly. Italy and Germany in a twinkling of an eye, smashed the visible substance of a world ideal gradually bred in the hearts of men over the last two centuries.

Why did the League fail? I think we must turn to jurisprudence for an answer. It is a fundamental axiom of that science that the essential to an organised society is some authority capable of over-seeing the actions of its constituents, setting up a code of conduct for them, and visiting disobedience to the commands with prompt and certain punishment — or sanctions, as jurisprudence calls them. Now it is common knowledge that in a country such as England before there was any organised state a position of chaos reigned. Wrongs had to be punished either by the wronged person himself or by his relatives. Blood feuds were the order of the day. Internationally, if we regard the nations as individual units, that is the position today. The only possibility of peace is an organised international state setting up a world

tribunal for settlement of disputes, punishing wrongful acts by the state-members and establishing a code of law consisting of fixed principles rigidly enforced.

These latter functions were from the very first beyond the scope of the League. In itself, a tremendous concession to the American and English faith in amicable conciliations, it at once disproved the efficacy of that method of settling disputes and affirmed the theory of jurisprudence I have already referred to, i.e., that without a system of law and a strong body to enforce it, it is impossible to have anything approaching peace in a society of any sort. Much can be said for the results achieved by conciliation in England, but in the very first instance in which it is tried as a panacea for world ills, it failed. That is the most significant fact about the failure of the League.

Now having a reason for the League's failure clearly before us, let us look at the British Empire. Six nations bound together in a most amazing fashion. Asiatics, Frenchmen, Dutchmen, and Englishmen — these are the components of its population. Each nation is independent, rules herself, and yet openly acknowledges her tie with England. Why is this? And the answer is England.

Now every student is keenly aware that the nations of the world have during the past century constantly looked to England as an arbiter in their disputes. They, like individual Englishmen have grown to respect her impartiality, her essentially judi-

cial ability always to suggest a middle course acceptable to both parties, her adherence to ideals higher than their own—ideals expressed in principles rigidly adhered to and, being rigidly adhered to, very much like laws. They have realised that if ever a nation could formulate an international system of law that nation would be England.

But however deftly she parries thrust and counter-thrust, smooths out a difficulty here, prevents a war there, she has quite often been forced to stand by and watch the fierce struggle between two excited and unreasonable nations (e.g., Germany and France in 1870) over a cause which seems ludicrous in retrospect, and in 1914 she was dragged into the World War—this in defence of her ideals, let it be noted.

It is therefore apparent to even the most fervent of her admirers that her efforts to conciliate are almost ridiculously futile. Herself realising this, she has striven for the establishment of The League. The failure of the League, therefore, only more vividly emphasises the futility of her efforts as conciliator.

But were she in a position, not of the huffer of the world, but of the master, would we then not have peace? We could rely upon her to establish a system of international law meeting in some measure at least the favour of all parties, administering

that law impartially by means of a world court, and herself acting as the world sheriff, promptly and without any discrimination. Who better than she, then, to succeed the League? Remember that she is backed by five nations and numerous colonies cast in the same mould as herself.

Let us consider the matter from another aspect. There are only two fates for the Empire. Complete disintegration after the manner of Rome, Carthage and Egypt, or on the other hand that she should become the nucleus of the future world state without which we shall not see peace. Of these two alternatives surely the latter is the only one possible? What then must she do to further the purpose I have suggested? Surely to render her Empire as a unit so strong, so impregnable, and so independent of the rest of the world, as to put herself automatically in the position of dictator? Gracefully and neatly, but without hesitating to show force when necessary she has welded the Empire together—could not she as the core of that Empire as gracefully and neatly weld the world into one component standing solidly (to be evangelical) "on the rock of peace."

It therefore behoves England to bind her colonies to her, and as I see it the first step in that process, indeed the only logical step, is economic nationalism for the Empire. True, that may mean war. In any case, we will have to use force to discipline the world. Only through the consummation of war, then, can we attain

CORRESPONDENCE.

JUSTICE FOR JAPAN.

Sir,—

While agreeing wholeheartedly with your recent articles condemning the Tariff Policy of the Federal Government, I feel there are three points that have been left untouched.

Apart from the harm the Tariff will do to Australia, Japan's point of view should also be considered. The large population of Japan renders it imperative that she should find markets for her manufactured goods if the standard of living of her people is to be raised. One of the reasons advanced in support of the tariff is the alleged influx of goods produced with cheap labour. But what happens when you close the markets of the world to the Japanese? They are compelled to accept an even lower standard of living to overcome the tariff walls! And so ad infinitum. Japan, like every other country, has a contribution to make to the world's science, art, and culture, and a higher standard of living is a necessary preliminary to that contribution. Surely the thing to do is to lessen tariff barriers, and help Japan solve her population and standard of living problems by giving her reasonable access to our markets. International friendship and co-operation, and not international cut-throat, should be our policy.

The Ultimate Results of Tariffs.

The second aspect is one that a moment's reflection makes clear. Every tariff imposed means that the cost of the articles protected is higher. This

the ecstasy of peace. Let's have war then. Let us, like the Saxons of old, devote ourselves to the conflict, and in it strengthen ourselves for a greater destiny to come—the Valhalla of world peace.

In conclusion, I feel sure that it is considerations of this sort that dictated Mr. Cole's letter. We must not, as he says, think that "our relations with other countries are to be measured in terms of pounds, shillings and pence." We have to disregard our personal comforts and discomforts, and sacrifice ourselves for an ideal far beyond the petty concerns of profit and loss, supply and demand, and what we shall eat tomorrow.

I notice on further reading the Editor's reply that he insists that the doctrine of economic nationalism is pernicious. If by pernicious is meant pernicious in a financial sense I think that that contention is open to doubt. How can the Empire as a whole suffer financially when as a matter of economic fact it need ask nothing of the rest of the world in the way of primary produce, metals, manufactured articles, cloth, machinery, and even markets? If, by pernicious is meant that the inevitable result will be war I do not regard the possibility of war for the Empire immediately after adopting this economic nationalism, as so certain. Even if it does mean war, and I must concede that it ultimately will, that seems to me "a consummation devoutly to be wished for" taking the view that I do of the Empire's destiny.

LEIGH WRIGHT, LL.B.

results in increased costs of production and living. As long as these increased costs can be passed on, it does not matter. The increased cost of living is overcome by an increase in the basic wage; the increased cost of production by higher prices and higher tariffs. But the only person who cannot pass the increased costs on is the producer who sells in the world market, where there is no protection, e.g., wheatgrowers, woolmen, and cattlemen. It follows that every industry that is protected is living on the profits of the man whose produce is sold in the world markets. In short, legalised robbery! The process has already been carried so far that the profits of the wheat industry, the dried fruits industry, and the dairying industry are now negligible, and in most cases have disappeared altogether. The only notable exception is the wool industry. The crisis will come when tariffs have so increased that the wool industry also cannot cover its costs of production. When this stage is reached the whole system will collapse—the primary industries and the protected manufacturing industries alike.

Injustice to Youth.

The third point is the injustice of the whole tariff business. When a tariff is imposed the Government in effect cuts out some of the competition the Australian, and in the case of Empire tariff preferences, the British, Manufacturers would normally have to face. This enables them to increase their business and make more profits for themselves. Nobody else benefits. But what is the effect of this? It excludes the other nations who have goods to sell from our markets, until at last they are forced to contemplate taking colonies by force to secure a market. To do this they build up armaments. Our nation then increases its armaments to offset this and to be in a position to defend itself. The Australian manufacturers then make further profits out of supplying the armaments we need. At last when war comes, the youth of the nation (who generally are not old enough to be in a financial position to benefit from the tariff and re-armament profits) are the ones who stand the brunt of the trouble — mutilation, disease, and death. What have they had in return for this? Nothing! And what sacrifice does the manufacturer make for his increased profits? None! Then why should the youth fight? My answer, sir, is for no reason at all!

"WIM."

SMOKERS!

SPUD Mentholated Cigarettes.

CORK TIP AND PLAIN.

1/10 per packet of 20.

Cool and Soothing to the Throat.

Sole Agent:

Nat Solomons

TOBACCONISTS,

111 Rundle St. (cnr. Arcade).

GOLDEN GLORY CHOCOLATES,

MacRobertson's

WOMEN'S UNION DEBATES.

LIFE IS TOO HECTIC.

"We have made modern gods of speed and indulgence," declared Miss M. McKail (Law), upholding the motion that "Life is too hectic to be happy." In the Women's Interfaculty Debates held last Wednesday night. From the opposition, Miss B. Finn (Arts) admitted that life is hectic—but not too hectic. Man, as an individual, is a happy animal and will not deliberately let himself become miserable.

Miss G. Woodger, with characteristic vigour, pointed out the difference between happiness and pleasure, and then proceeded to show that many of the paths by which men have, in the past, obtained happiness, are now closed to them. Firstly, the happiness of achievement—no longer does the craftsman sing with joy as he plies his trade, but he has become a soulless wage slave, a mere cog in that huge chain of what we call the proletariat. (What about the whistling tram conductor?—Ed.). Secondly, the happiness of external beauty is denied to us—architectural beauty and music have bowed to the needs of modern life. While finally, the home has become a place of noise and fractious tempers.

Miss J. Hewett, giving the modern generation the benefit of the doubt, said that people know where their happiness lies and seek it. Never has the modern Miss been so involved with charity ball committees as she is today—and happiness must be the natural result helping sweet charity.

The final decision was that life is too hectic to be happy.

SCIENCE SUPREME.

The second debate was the grand finale of the Interfaculty competition, and was fought out between Science (Pro) and Med. (Con), on the subject "That the increased leisure of shorter working hours will undermine the morale of the community." Again the magnificent powers of reasoning possessed by the science team prevailed, their argument against shorter working hours being both logical and convincing. Opening the argument, Miss J. Cleland (Science) proved that increased leisure will have a bad effect upon men and women of irregular employment. She illustrated her point by a well-known truism, saying how hard it is for students taking only one or two subjects, to settle down to work.

Miss C. Wilton (Science) continued the argument by showing that brain workers would undoubtedly become de-

Saturday's Games

HOCKEY.

The A's were outclassed by Grange, who adapted themselves better to the extremely wet conditions. The scores were 3-nil.

Best players: Boomsno, Salter, Motteram, Allen.

The B's were narrowly defeated by Teacher's, Angove hitting the winning goal for the opposition, who were 3-2. Goalhitters, Rance, Close.

Best players: Irwin, Rance, Close.

The C's have reverted to their old form, and lost to Grange 9-nil.

Best players: Simpson, Field, Harper.

WOMEN'S HOCKEY.

Saturday, 25th.

A's drew with Aroha, 1 goal all.

B's lost to Durham, 2-5.

'Varsity goalhitters: R. O'Loughlin, A. Anderson.

Best players: H. Brooks, K. Ewens.

B2's lost to Olympians.

The Women's State Hockey Team was chosen last week, and we wish to congratulate Misses Pat Salter and Jocelyn Ray on their inclusion as Right Inner and Left Half-back respectively. The State team will play in Sydney a fortnight after the Inter-'Varsity matches.

moralised if given more leisure. Although Miss Wilton's picture of our highly civilised world with its betting shops, drink, pernicious novels and sexual immorality, was painted in the most forceful language, we feel that we cannot agree with her principle: "Make the cows work, work, work."

Miss B. Warhurst (Science) dealt with the labourer and showed how, if he knocked off an hour earlier, he would only get in the road of his wife's domestic arrangements and would be dismissed to the local "public house." Here he would meet the unemployed-who-won't-work-even-if-they-can, and he would just drift, drift, drift until by drink and gambling he had brought himself, his wife, and his family to the depths of degradation.

So truly dismal was the situation sketched by the Science team, that it was a welcome relief to hear the case put up by the opposition—Med. "Whether it's the weather or the price of wheat that goes wrong, the Government is blamed," said Miss Pritchard, when in reality the fault lies with the voters. Increased leisure means increased knowledge. Not until then can Australia hope to prosper under democracy. Again, it would mean to the millions of extra hands necessarily employed, a responsibility and meaning in life.

Miss Irvine had evidently spent quite a lot of time making a scientific research into the question "How do people spend their leisure?" Hobbies, especially gardening, were favoured, and Sewell's told her that their sales were usually doubled on Saturday mornings—seedlings and bulbs being in especial demand. She also stated that twice the number of people visited the Public Library on Saturdays and Sundays than do so on week days, but then spoil a perfectly good point by adding that the average number of visitors to the Library on ordinary days was only forty. Miss B. Phillips advocated more leisure so that people could indulge in more physical exercise, regretting the monotony of modern occupations.

Congratulations, Science!

FOOTBALL.

A'S CONTINUE RUN OF VICTORIES

The A's are indeed making a desperate attempt to gain inclusion in the final four. On Saturday we secured our third successive win, this time at the expense of Exeter.

At quarter time the scores were 1-3 all, but by half-time we managed to secure a handy lead of 17 points. The scores were: 'Varsity 3.10, Exeter 1.5.

The third quarter was definitely Exeter's. At one stage they played all over us to score three goals in succession. Thus at three-quarter time the scores were: 'Varsity 5.13, Exeter 5.8.

However, our men overwhelmed the opposition in the last quarter. Exeter managed to penetrate our back lines only once, when they scored a goal, otherwise this quarter was simply a walkover for 'Varsity, and our forwards proceeded to pile on 8.6.

Homburg, Stokes and Gratton, promoted from the B's, all played well.

Final scores: 'Varsity 13.19, Exeter 6.8.

Goalkickers: McBride and Page 3, Sangster 2, South, W. P. Goode, Betts, Homburg and Stokes.

Best players: Brown, Page, McFarlane, Masters, Anders, Ellx and Homburg.

On Saturday night the S.A. Carnival Team was picked and Ellx, McFarlane and Anders have been included. We extend our congratulations to these men.

Next Saturday the A team has a bye, and will play a match at Victor Harbour against Goolwa, who are at present top of the Great Southern Association. All players wishing to make the trip are asked to communicate with the Secretary.

RUGBY.

After beating up Woodville on Saturday and wiping the mud from their eyes, the A's found on arriving at the Cathedral, that North Adelaide had obligingly beaten Waratah. Under these circumstances 'Varsity moves to the top of the Premiership Table; which fulfils the prophesy of former weeks and looks good for the future.

Results: A's beat Woodville A, 14 to nil.

Scorers: Davey 2 tries, Fairweather and Reilly 1 each, Thompson converted 1.

The B's also had a game in the mud, from which they emerged dirtier and more victorious than the A's. Campbell, the champion sprinter, was playing his first game, and showed speed and promise. Final scores were 33 points to nil.

LACROSSE.

Successful Water Sports Meeting.

A Grade.—'Varsity, previously defeated by Port Adelaide, were expected to have their revenge on Saturday. This they did, but only just scraped home, winning in the end by one goal. This was a pleasant surprise to many members of the team, who thought they had been defeated by a small margin. 'Varsity 6, defeated Port Adelaide 5.

Goalthrowers: J. M. Bonnin, Nicholson each 2, Todd and M. F. Bonnin.

B Grade.—The match against North Adelaide, as was expected, resulted in a win for University. The combined effect of long onion-weed, pools of mud, sheets of down-pouring rain, and the backs trying to throw goals, resulted in a scramble from start to finish. 'Varsity 11, defeated North Adelaide 1.

Goalthrowers: Barnfield 5, Lemon 2, Snow, Osman, Menzies and Krantz.

Best players: Barnfield, Porter and Krantz.

CANADA—THE HALF-WAY HOUSE.

Speaking with an American twang and a fine oratorical style, the Rev. Dr. David Lang sketched a fascinating picture of Canada in the Kenzie Theatre during the lunch hour yesterday, in an address to a large gathering of professors and men and women students. He outlined the vast natural resources of Canada, amongst which are timber, cod-fishing, gold and coal.

Canadian scenery is the finest in the world, said Dr. Lang.

Canada, the speaker continued, was a virile country because its ancestry, like that of the Motherland, consisted of varying elements. There was the Scotchman, who kept the Sabbath and everything else he could lay his hands on; the Irishman who never knew what he wanted and wouldn't be satisfied till he had got it; the Welshman who prayed on his knees on Sunday



NEW STYLES and SHAPES in SPORTS HATS,

In shades of Green, Brown and Grey, 18/6 to 37/6.

New Heather Mixture HATS, in Green, Brown and Grey Shades. 27/6 to 37/6.

J. LEAVER, 46 King William Street.

and on his neighbours all the rest of the week; and the Englishman who worshipped the Bible, Beer and Beef. In addition, there were Frenchmen and peoples of 40 other different nations.

Canada was daughter in her mother's house, but mistress in her own. She loved independence, as Australia did. But she was a loyal supporter of the English Crown and the rest of the Empire.

Amongst many other interesting comments, and genuinely amusing jokes, Dr. Lang made two special points. He stressed the double importance of Canada to the Empire. First, it was a true half-way house between the Motherland and Australia, and Canada hopes that Australians will make it the connecting link.

Secondly, Canada, more than any other country, could interpret to the United States the rest of the English speaking peoples. Canada could do more than any other country towards uniting the United States of America with those people, and such a union was necessary for the preservation of world peace.

MEDICAL STUDENTS!

Inspect our Extensive Range of MICROSCOPES and ACCESSORIES HAEMACYTOMETERS HAEMOGLOBINOMETERS DISSECTING SETS, and all other Instruments necessary to the Student.

LAUBMAN & PANK (Scientific Instrument Department).

62 GAWLER PLACE.

Agents for the famous Leita Camera.

Shipping Newspapers (S.A.) Limited, 110-120 Currie Street, Adelaide.

CHARLES WELLS & CO.

CHEMISTS,

60 King William Street.

INVITE YOU TO CALL UPON THEM.

As a Tooth Powder they recommend SODOX—it WHITENS the teeth.

Adelaide's Oldest and Most Popular Residential Hotel,

WALSH'S ORIENTAL

Rundle Street, ADELAIDE.

Hot and Cold Water, Telephones in all Bedrooms. Bedrooms of luxe, with baths attached.

LUNCHEON A SPECIALTY.

TARIFF from 17/6 per day.

HERBERT R. WALSH, Proprietor.

The

ADELAIDE SPORTS DEPOT

The Best House for Cricket, Tennis, Football, Running Shoes, Golf and Games Requisites.

Paringa Buildings, Hindley Street.