

The Register April 22<sup>nd</sup> 1851.



# EMPIRE BONDS.

## British and German Imperialism.

"The watchword of German imperialism is domination." "The Germans describe England as a decadent people because they do not realize that in times of peace the bonds of empire are as light as air, but that in times of crisis they are as strong as iron bands." The above two sentences sum up Professor G. C. Henderson's second lecture on "The great European war," which was delivered before an audience, which included Lady Galway and the Chief Justice and Chancellor of the University (Sir Samuel Way), at the Town Hall on Tuesday. The professor's theme was a contrast of British and German imperialism. The reason Germany went to war, he said, was to get a "place in the sun." Many people sympathized with Germany, and he confessed that, considering her power and potential greatness, she had deserved it. But he was not so sure of it now.

### —A Mushroom Nation.—

Germany was a late-comer among the nations of the world. Britain and France had been nations for 600 or 700 years, while Germany had been a nation for 50 years. One reason why Germany had not become a nation until late was because the independent princes clung to their independence in defiance of the idea of unity. When Germany wished to realize her territorial ambition she found nearly all the available land on the face of the earth which was suitable for colonization already occupied by other nations. It was said she had her eye on South America, but the Munroe Doctrine stood in the way.

### —Two Empires.—

Germany had two Empire, or, rather, Imperial ambitions. One was to extend eastward and south-eastward, and in the time of Bismarck she developed an oceanic imperialistic ambition. Bismarck did not desire colonies or a navy, but Germany had acquired various parts of Africa, with a total area of eight times the size of Great Britain, besides small island possessions. But they were all in the tropics. Germany had succeeded to some extent with her colonies in the material and educational way. She had spent about £200,000,000 on those colonies, yet there were only 17,000 German colonists. Of these 2,500 were soldiers and 700 police. The uniform in those distant parts was as ubiquitous as in Berlin, and in this respect Treitschke considered the German colonization system had its greatest defect. The German who went from the Fatherland wanted more freedom than he had at home, and that probably explained why so many Germans chose to go, when they emigrated, to the United States or the British dominions.

### —Blood and Iron.—

What was left for Germany when she demanded a better place in the sun? There was only force left; to obtain by the sword what they could not get by diplomacy or colonization. If a world war was to be waged a fleet was necessary. In 1899 a naval programme was started, and in 1914 Germany was the second strongest naval power in the world, and in that period of 15 years the naval expenditure had amounted to £300,000,000. He was persuaded that that fleet was there for an aggressive purpose. One reason why he was persuaded of that was because of the discussion which took place not long before he left Berlin between Sir Edward Goschen (British Ambassador) and the German Chancellor. When the German Chancellor was bidding for British neutrality he guaranteed the integrity of France, but when pressed he said he could not give the same guarantee with respect to the French colonies. His view was strengthened by the negotiations between Germany and Sir Edward Grey, and he had come to the conclusion, after a considerable amount of deliberation, that that fleet ultimately was intended as a menace to Great Britain.



—A German Illusion—

It was necessary, also, to understand what had been the teaching of German militarists with respect to the British Empire. Treitschke taught that the British was a decadent nation, that her colonies, or many of them, were stolen from their original owners, and that it would be but a just act to turn the British out. "I think they must know by this time," continued the lecturer, "that the British Empire is not so decadent as they imagined it to be." (Applause.) Germany had been misled by certain prepossessions deeply rooted in their hearts and minds, and that had made it impossible for them to estimate aright what were the principles underlying the British Empire.

—The Case of India—

Bernhardi was amazed at the small garrison stationed in India, and he believed that, in the event of Great Britain being involved in war, the people of India would rise against her, and that a holy war would be proclaimed, from which Germany would reap the advantage. He wrote that in the event of war Great Britain would be unable to withdraw any of the garrison from India, yet a short time after the declaration of war 70,000 troops left that country to fight side by side with the Allies for the maintenance of the British Empire, while the provinces of India had expressed their willingness and readiness to defend the country in the interests of the Empire. (Applause.) He would not insult his audience by alluding to the contribution of the self-governing dominions, but he wished to state his belief that South Africa had given the finest tribute in the world to the British system of rule. (Applause.) Germany did not understand the British imperial idea, because they looked at it from the military point of view, which carried with it domination.

—Poland Under German Rule—

What were Germany's methods nearer home. He did not know Poland, but he had conversed with Poles at Oxford, and he had been told that Austria had been liberal to the people of that country, Germany had been most illiberal, and Russia had stood half-way between. Germany was the country they disliked most, because of the rigorous measures which had been enforced with the idea of assimilating the Poles or annihilating them politically. Germany had adopted a repressive attitude towards a nation with ideals and aspirations. She had endeavoured to deprive the Poles of their language and to expropriate them. How different from the British system of freedom! (Applause.) The reason Germany had failed to understand the British idea of imperialism was that she was imbued with the same spirit of militarism and conquest by force that characterized the Middle Ages.

—The Case of Belgium—

What about the German policy in Belgium? Surely there they had the contrast. The idea of Germany there was assimilation, or political annihilation. He believed if Belgium had been willing to go into the German Empire she would have been granted privileges such as Saxony enjoyed. But Belgium wanted her political independence—(applause)—and was honourably involved in the maintenance of that independence. (Renewed applause.) She stood out and defied the German authority, and what was the result? They all knew the result. The watchword of German imperialism, even when dealing with civilized races, was domination. What they wanted to do was to Germanize the world. It was the same uniform and uniformity again—the military bias.

—The Contrast—

What about British imperialism? Did England want to Anglicize Australia? They knew she did not. They were loyal subjects of King George—(applause)—but almost since the foundation of the State they had had representative and responsible self-government. (Applause.) And they were glad to help Great Britain now. (Applause.) The Germans had described England as a decadent people, because they did not realize that in times of peace the bonds of Empire were as light as air, but that in times of crisis they were as strong as iron bands. (Applause.)



100

*The Advertiser*  
*April 26<sup>th</sup> 1915*

## VIEWS AND COMMENTS.

### THE DENTISTS ACT.

From "Charles Nowling":—"The dental case brought before the court at Port Augusta is another evidence of the Dental Act being useless. I have frequently pointed this out. Well might Sir John Downer remark in the Council, when it was proposed again to patch up a bad Act—'What is wanted is a new Act altogether; the present Act is incomprehensible.' In the case in question, the Dental Board prosecuted the defendant, who advertised himself as a 'specialist.' The board contended that the defendant, 'not possessing any qualifications entitling him to practice, or hold himself out as a specialist in dentistry,' had no right to practice. Section 9 of the Dentists Act Amendment Act denies the right to any unregistered person, by sign or nameplate, by handbills, letter paper, or billhead, to display the name or title of dentist, dental surgeon, or surgeon dentist, mechanical dentist, or dental practitioner. Yet because of the flaws in the Act it has never been put into force. There can be no possible doubt of the intention of the Act to protect the public from persons unqualified to do dental work. The presiding S.M. is reported to have said, 'I feel that he simply advertises he is a very clever man. If he simply says "I am a specialist in the work I do," that is all right. But if he says "I am a specialist," he is claiming a title to which he is not entitled.' In dismissing the case, the S.M. said the question the court had to consider was whether the word 'specialist,' as used by the defendant, referred to himself or his work? If the former, it was an offence against the Statute; if the latter, there was no offence. What can any sane person make out of an argument of this kind? The very word 'specialist' means one who devotes himself to some special branch of knowledge. The defendant set forth in his advertisement that he was a 'specialist' in artificial teeth, painless extractions, gold crowns, fillings, &c.; yet in spite of this, as the case is reported in 'The Advertiser,' the court had come to the conclusion that the defendant referred only to himself and not to his work.' Surely it ought to be plain to anyone that the business of the court was to determine whether the defendant possessed the qualifications to practice dentistry, and not to quibble over the word 'specialist,' which by no canons of reasoning could possibly refer to the man himself. Any unqualified person can practice dentistry in South Australia, and there are lot of them at it. They pay no fees and defy the Act, and the court seems to be on their side. Now, the registered dentists have to pay annual fees, which are ten times in excess of what they are in some places where dental matters are properly regulated, by a board of dentists, not men outside the profession, as here. Again, a graduate holding the highest degrees obtainable in a reputable college of dentistry, desiring to practice in South Australia, is subjected to an obsolete examination, and charged £12 12/ for it. The whole business is calculated to deter the efficient man from coming here, and hand dentistry over to the quacks."

At Christ Church, North Adelaide, on Sunday morning the rector, Rev. G. H. Jose, M.A., in an eloquent sermon on the text "He is not God of the dead, but of the living," touchingly referred to the death of Dr. William Barlow, C.M.G., who had been a parishioner and office-bearer of the church for the past 40 years. Special mention was also made of several relations of members of the congregation who had given their lives in the service of their country. A number of the members of Lodge St. Alban and other prominent Freemasons were present. The University of Adelaide was represented by the registrar, Mr. C. R. Hodge.