

million tons; and say at the low price of 16. at the pit's mouth, that represents 2700,000,000,000, a sum that surpasses many times the total reparation demanded.

Moreover, capacity to pay does not depend on material resources alone, but to a large extent on work and effort, that is on the potentiality of production. Armchair critics forget this and vitiate their whole argument. In their cursory glance they fail to distinguish between what I may call a dynamic Germany and a static Germany—a Germany in activity and a Germany at rest. If she will have recourse to taxation, such as is imposed, say, in England, and observe economy, and sets herself to work, she can very easily pay off the debt demanded. As it is she is paying her home debt. In 1914 the interest on this was 250 million marks, and in 1920 it jumped to 12,500 million marks. Should Germany first meet the demands of preferred creditors whose homes and wealth-producing resources were left intact, or make good the havoc done to innocent victims? In the Budget of 1920-1, a sum of 1,000 million marks was appropriated for the building of houses. The war did not destroy German houses; whilst in France thousands of human beings had to sleep under cardboard roofs. Again, the increase in the number of German officials is astounding, especially as the state has decreased in population and territory. In 1914 (before the war) there were 5,500 employees in the Imperial administrations; now there are 80,000, not including the industrial enterprises of the state, such as postal organisations and railways. In 1914 there were 168,000 employees in the post and telegraph services; to-day there are 420,000! If Germany is really so poor, why maintain so many officials? If she has really so few railway cars, why employ such an increased number of railwaymen? If she is really so impoverished, why increase the consumption of champagne from 6,000,000 bottles in 1914 to 10,000,000 bottles in 1920? If she is practically insolvent (as she pretends), why has she over 100 racing days in the Berlin racing season, when the totalizer turned over 440 million marks (as compared to 200 million marks of the previous season)? The fact is that Germany has been making use of all kinds of shifts, evasions, and subterfuges. A German report on the armistice negotiations states that the Germans sent to the Allies 1,886 notes and protests from November 13, 1918, to October 13, 1919. She is spending uselessly, recklessly, and extravagantly, and camouflaging her Budget in such a way as to arouse the sympathy of blind and simple people, who think their blindness and ignorance make them good Christians. Germany can pay, and she should be made to pay. Then she will learn that lawless and savage aggression is not a profitable enterprise. Those who don't care a fig for the sanctions of public opinion, pledged faith, and honor, generally do appreciate physical force and economic pressure.

The Treaty and the Future. Lastly, does the Treaty look to the future. There are some who think that the Peace Conference was merely a scramble, and that no attempt was made to come to a settlement in the interests of future peace. The Allies were determined to destroy the German military menace, to vindicate the sanctity of international engagements, and to defend democracy from the mailed fist of autocracy, to give freedom to various enslaved nationalities, to save France and Belgium from ruin, and all these things were accomplished, and are recorded in the Treaty. Were these worthy objects? regard was paid to the liberty and right of individuals, for in many cases the principle of self-determination by plebiscite was applied. To effect territorial restoration, to right secular wrongs done to weaker neighbors, to assert the claims of nationality, to consider the wishes of inhabitants (altogether unlike the Treaty of Vienna), and to establish a League of Nations instead of the old system of pre-balance of power—surely these are great and noble achievements. Where is the injustice? Despite the allegations of them who will not see, there is no Imperialism at all in the Treaty. For example, French claims to the Rhine frontier, which the earlier practice of victors might have justified, were rejected at the Conference. The restoration of Alsace-Lorraine is obviously not Imperialism; it is only a fair and rational reply to Bismarckism. The Treaty is just, and in a great many respects conspicuously generous. If the sum demanded appears to be large, it is because of the unparalleled havoc wrought deliberately by unrestrained invaders and lawless belligerents over and above the ordinary operations of warfare. The Treaty records the fall of the German Empire, and is a lesson to the world that it profits a nation nothing if it gains the whole world and loses its own soul in the process.

IS THE PEACE TREATY JUST?

In "The Daily Herald" of August 4 an article headed "Is the Peace Treaty Just?" (by "Veritas") was published. It dealt with two addresses delivered by Professor Phillipson in Adelaide recently. To that article Professor Phillipson has written a reply, the first portion of which will appear in "The Daily Herald" on Monday.

Herald 8/8/21

IS THE PEACE TREATY JUST?

PROFESSOR PHILLIPSON'S REPLY TO 'VERITAS'

PART I.

In your issue of August 4 you published an article signed "Veritas." I propose to reply, with your courteous leave, in two parts—the present portion dealing with matters immediately arising out of the article, the second part presenting a brief view of the most important points necessary to bear in mind for the purpose of solving the question at issue. In order that I may, as much as possible, avoid repetition, I ask my readers to read the present contribution along with my next, and both of them side by side with the article of "Veritas." For the sake of simplicity and ready reference I number my observations in to-day's contribution, and follow "Veritas" step by step, even at the expense of arrangement and convenience, so that all readers may readily draw their own conclusion.

1. The article is signed "Veritas." When the case is examined completely by those in possession of full knowledge of the relevant materials, they will conclude that the pseudonym or nom de plume were at all necessary a much more appropriate one would have been "Ignorantia" or "Malignitas," or "Mendacitas."
2. Anonymity. Considering the freedom of the press, this is not necessary nowadays, when a writer observes the rules of decency and fairness. I have myself attached my own name to some 13 or 14 published volumes (one of which was referred to by my assailant) and to I know not how many articles. In the present instance, when such an important question as the justice of the Peace Treaty is concerned and when the writer tries to compensate for his lack of ability by personal abuse, then to hide behind the veil of anonymity and in the dark to give stabs in the back is contrary to all rules of sportsmanship, and is indeed an act of cowardice and treachery.
3. The reputation of the University and of myself: Thank heaven, the reputation of the University and that of myself do not depend on the opinion of "Veritas." Of course, we are glad to have the good opinion of worthy people, and we are grateful for it; but we regard with mingled amusement and contempt the spiteful screedings of "Veritas"; and we are quite sure there must be very few men indeed of his kidney.
4. My address before the Chamber of Commerce: Every word uttered was sincere, straightforward, correct, and logical. My second contribution, which will be to a large extent an expansion of my address, will emphasise my conclusion more forcibly. As "Veritas" does not really touch the substantial facts and arguments I adduced, but for the most part falls into irrelevancies (so far as my address is concerned), his charge of illogicality, hypocrisy, etc., clearly proves that he does not know what it is to be logical and sincere.
5. The Fourteen Points: He bursts out in amazement at an alleged statement that the Treaty does not violate the 14 points. With a little more perception and fairness he might have ascertained that that was not my own statement. I stated that President Wilson himself said that the Treaty substantially observed his 14 points, as supplemented or modified by his later utterances and understanding with the Allies. What I did stress on was that the basis of the Treaty was avowedly the Armistice terms, and was so recognized by the enemy, who appealed for a cessation of hostilities. Had the enemies chosen to accept the 14 points when they were first

IS THE PEACE TREATY JUST?

From Professor COLEMAN PHILLIPSON:—"Facts" thinks that by dint of repetition he may establish his case. Assuming that I used every word as to "bargain-driving," "shiftness," "opportunism," &c., in the making of the Treaty, the terms imposed are not necessarily made unjust thereby. Let me give "Facts" one single illustration, which I hope will clear up his difficulty once for all:—If you inflict injuries on my person and property, and I ask you to make good the damage you have done me, that is justice; but if I ask you to pay less than the damage you have done me, that is generosity.

propounded, then they (or "Veritas") could have alleged bad faith on the part of the Allies, if a substantial departure from them had been made. But they elected to go on fighting for nearly a year after that, to complete their lawless and inhuman demolition and devastation; they realised then they could not win, so they thought their best policy was to continue their work conformably to programme so as to render the re-suscitation of the Allies as difficult as possible. Hence the different terms, which are consistent with the ideas of justice and fair play. I laid special stress on the fact that both Ludendorff and Hindenburg realised the nature of the terms transmitted to them by President Wilson before the fighting ceased. Therefore, when Germany and her associates laid down their arms, obviously they did so on the basis of the armistice terms, which clearly supplanted the 14 points. Thus, when "Veritas" shrieks out about the disregard of some of the 14 points he is only betraying his ignorance and obtuseness; he cannot possibly take in any impartial and level-headed reader.

6. Generosity and magnanimity of the Allies.—I said in my address that the terms imposed are more than just—they are even generous and magnanimous, and I say the same now. As I shall touch on this point in my next article I will only say now that when your assailant has wilfully done you damage, and you ask him to pay a sum equal to the amount of the damage, that is justice; but when you ask him to pay you much less than the damage, that is generosity and magnanimity. "Veritas" refers to a number of items in the account we ask Germany to meet, but it seems he has not the knowledge or the fairness to refer to the multitude of items in our own loss, which was due to the licentious conduct of the Germans. I am not forgetting the other enemies; but then we must not forget also that the Germans were the predominant element among our enemies, largely directed the operations of their associates, and prevented them from suing for peace before their ultimate joint appeal. Again, "Veritas" laments (perhaps with crocodile tears in his eyes) that the terms imposed mean "economic servitude" for Germany. Well, what if they do? That does not militate against justice. If a trespasser wilfully rushes on to the estate and dwelling of one of my readers, kills, burns, destroys, plunders, defiles what he can lay hands on, and then is ordered to pay a sum, let us say, of £1000, to make good the damage, or part of the damage done, does such an order become unjust simply because the murderer and destroyer means that that will mean economic servitude for him? Let him set to work, earn money and pay off the debt. I won't insult the intelligence of my readers by dwelling on this more in detail; they will surely appreciate the position, even though "Veritas" remains blind to it.

7. The Colonies.—In my address, as "Veritas" admits, I expressed compassion for Germany because she was totally deprived of her colonies, and I went on to refer to her atrocities in African colonies. "Veritas" reminds me of the cruelty of others also. But he forgets that in the present case Germany was on her trial, not Belgium. Here I will point out to the reader that before the armistice I did confidential work for the Imperial War Cabinet, and I had access to verified information gathered on the spot in the different German colonies in Africa. Now I admit that British administration, for example in

Africa, or elsewhere, may not have been always without a taint; but compared with the German it has been just and noble. I have seen many documents in which native chiefs begged the British (before whom the Germans fled) to remain, "for," they said, "while you are here we can win cases in the courts; before you came we couldn't. We are allowed to remain in our homes and use our land. Before we were interfered with; we are not now bound to forced labor. We are not now banished to death for the least complaint

against us." I cannot go fully into this dismal subject; but I recall to mind the numerous photographs I saw of native and defenceless men, women and children stripped naked, fastened to a block or to trees, and lashed to death, or maimed for life, for offences which my readers would think venial in extreme or not offences at all, and remember how I became physically sick and had to leave off work out for a turn in Whitehall Gardens. I will confess to my readers that when I reflected on such barbarous treatment and on the German confiscation of farms and the unconscionable exploitation of the native population generally, I muttered to myself, "To hell with such governors."

8. Sermon on the Mount.—"Veritas" then asks, with a sneer—of which any noodle is capable—whether the attitude of the Allies towards Germany is an application of the Sermon on the Mount. Could fatuity and irrelevance go further? Who in the world suggested for a moment that the treaty makers purposed or pretended to apply the Sermon on the Mount? Would the reader mentioned in paragraph 8 have applied the World "Veritas" apply it in such circumstances? Has he ever applied it in any circumstances? Does he, in fact, even understand its spirit and applicability? The negotiators met in Paris to do justice; they did not meet for the purpose of treating the malefactors better than their victims. Let us remember here the words of Shakespeare: "The devil can cite Scripture for his purpose."

9. Self-determination. "Veritas" says that my statement as to allowing individual liberty to the populations of disannexed or transferred territories is wrong; indeed, he says it is "a half-truth nearer to falsehood." It is necessary to remember that my statement referred to the practice generally, as introduced in many parts of Europe, and in other parts to be introduced eventually. What example does he bring forward to disprove my statement? He says that in one or two places the people were not allowed to vote by the ballot box, but were asked to vote openly. Even so, the promise to them is fulfilled, and in general is being handsomely carried out. Does "Veritas" know how the Germans, in this respect, treated the Alsace-Lorrainers in 1871 and later? He quotes from one of my works—a book on Alsace-Lorraine—and observes that in it I expressed myself to this effect: 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, &c. I ask the reader to mark the expression quoted. On page 318 of the book I referred to the plebiscite and expressed my belief that "if organised 'now' will result in favor of neutralised independence." Now the book was written early in 1918, which "Veritas" appears to have noticed; so that his misrepresentation is all the worse, and, indeed, I am bound to think it was made wilfully. He has not the common sense to see that the terms in many respects might have been different if Germany had submitted at the beginning of 1918 instead of at the end. He hasn't the common sense to see that even if my forecast was at the time an inspired one (which I don't claim), the majority of the people of Alsace-Lorraine might in that year have become more alienated from the Germans on account of the increasingly brutal measures adopted in those unhappy provinces. What will the reader's sportsmanlike sense feel about an opponent who not only brings forward irrelevancies, stultifies himself by a reasoning process, which is out of his depth, displays his ignorance as to the real basis of the treaty negotiations, and then, if you please resorts to downright misrepresentation in the hope, no doubt, that the deceived reader will not detect it.

10. Authorities cited. "Veritas" hopes to impress the reader by the citation of his authorities. I won't trouble the reader with the list, which includes Mr. Asquith's daughter; though it is a pay room could not be found also for his grand-daughter. I refer to one as being, perhaps, the best-known name, Dr. Dillon. Dr. Dillon is an Irishman, and re-