

has to offer, but there is nothing in Oxford to compare with the "Backs" at Cambridge. There has been a sort of unenviable rivalry between these two ancient universities—not so much in the line of their several studies as in their claim upon popular estimation. I trust I am not a traitor to my kind foster-mother if I say that I should have preferred, had the choice been given me, to have entered at Oxford. There were many of my old schoolfellows at some of the colleges, and (as the masters at our school had all been Oxford men) the studies pursued at the school had been largely conditioned by that fact, and I should have found myself more at home at Oxford for those reasons than I felt myself to be at the sister university. As everybody knows, Cambridge has long been known as a great seat of mathematical study, and to some extent the exact sciences dominated the whole field of university activities. Studies of other kinds than mathematical were affected by this predominance. Cambridge has, of course, no cause to be ashamed of her classical scholars—she has produced some of the very greatest—but, speaking "by and large," the excellence has been chiefly manifested in critical and exact scholarship and in meticulous and precise research. These are qualities of invaluable importance, but is it unfair to opine that this direction has been taken through the overwhelming devotion of the university

through so many generations to "the cross, grained muses of the cube and square." On the other hand, it would appear that at Oxford there has been a broader and more generous culture, based upon a wide and full—if not, indeed, careful and precise—reading of the ancient Greek and Latin writers. Philosophy, rather than science, seems to distinguish the studies promoted at Oxford University.

—Great Personalities.—
It may be argued that a larger number of those qualified to move in the broad fields of rule and government hail from Oxford than from any other quarter. Peel and Gladstone of a bygone generation, and (coming to our own times) Bryce, Curzon, and Milner were all educated at Oxford. If this contrast between these two renowned universities is warranted, it seems almost inexplicable that nearly all our greatest poets are claimed by Cambridge, Oxford being almost unrepresented by those of the first rank; those who might be disposed to question that superiority of Cambridge will find their answer in a charming little essay in Augustine Birrell's "Obiter Dicta." One who should happen to be familiar with only universities in Australia may be surprised to learn that all the undergraduate members at both Oxford and Cambridge are resident, either in the several colleges, or in licensed lodging houses, the restraint and discipline in both being the same. The growth of the colleges has had the unexpected result that the university rather ministers to them than they to the university. It may be that in the far-off time, when the universities of Australia shall have developed so far as to be the focus of a large number of rich and prosperous colleges, the same result will be found here; but there seems little likelihood at present of that forecast; for, although Melbourne and Sydney possess affiliated colleges, established by religious denominations, these provide for only a small percentage of those who are students at these universities, while Adelaide, at present, possesses no colleges at all. This is a fact to be greatly regretted, for those who have had the good fortune to have been educated at a university which provides residence will admit that the most valuable part of that education was that which came to them almost imperceptibly from mingling with all sorts and conditions of young and ardent companions, and the consequent interchange of thought and opinion. "The proper study of mankind is man," and in this way one had many and varied opportunities of learning the lesson. It is my hope, as it has long been my dream, that I may live to see a commencement made, either by the religious bodies, to found residential colleges under the auspices of the University of Adelaide, or—falling them—that there may be found sufficient public spirit, or that some wealthy benefactor may recognise the call to supply that in which our University is palpably deficient, and because of which deficiency we lose, or run the risk of losing, the very best of our most promising young, especially those who are seeking to qualify themselves for the more learned professions. At Cambridge the ordinary undergraduate is brought into little direct personal relation with the university. He has to pass the matriculation, the previous examination, and the final, and he may feel it to be to his advantage to attend some of the professional lectures; but the actual teaching is mainly given, and well given, by lecturers in each particular college. There is, however, I am given to understand, a growing tendency for some of the smaller colleges to form themselves into groups for lectures in some of the subjects of study. In the sixties each college kept itself severely aloof from its neighbour, and provided lectures for its own men in nearly every subject, and was praised or blamed for its own successes or failures in the various honour lists of the university.

IS THE PEACE TREATY JUST?

From H. S. TAYLOR, Renmark:—If the peace settlement is of so just and generous a nature as Professor Phillipson and yourself claim, I ask why Mr. Lloyd George, who signed it on behalf of Great Britain, was lately moved to speak of it as a cruel "treaty;" why General Smuts, who signed it on behalf of South Africa, said at the time, "There are territorial settlements which will need revision. There are punishments fore-shadowed over most of which a calmer mood may yet prefer to pass the sponge of oblivion. There are indemnities stipulated which cannot be exacted without grave injury to industrial revival in Europe, and which it will be to the interest of all to render more tolerable and moderate;" or why he has since written of the Treaty as "haggard and unlovely; with features distorted with hatred, greed, and selfishness;" or why the same great warrior and statesman should say, "The Paris Peace lost an opportunity as unique as the great war itself. In destroying the moral idealism born of the sacrifices of the war it did almost as much as the war itself in shattering the structure of Western civilisation." Perhaps also you can explain why General Sir Ian Hamilton should write of Versailles as "the sorriest of sequels" to such a victory—"Fatal Versailles! Not one line in your Treaty to stand for the kindnesses of England not one word to bring back some memory of the generosity of her sons;" or why General Gough should say, "We hoped to establish justice, fair dealing between nations, and the honest keeping of promises. The Peace Treaty has done nothing of the kind." It is not necessary to go to the Continent of Europe to learn of the condemnation of the Treaty. Mr. J. Maynard Keynes, who was the official representative of the British Treasury at the Paris Peace Conference (until he withdrew in despair) writes ("The Economic Consequences of the Peace") of its "destructive significance," condemns it strongly on economic grounds, and says of it, "There are few episodes in history which posterity will have less reason to condone—a war ostensibly waged in defence of the sanctity of international engagements ending in a definite breach of one of the most sacred possible of such engagements on the part of the victorious champions of these ideals." Again, "There can have been few negotiations in history so consocted, so miserable, so utterly unsatisfactory to all parties. I doubt if anyone who took much part in that debate can look back on it without shame." Dr. Dillon ("The Peace Conference") says, "Whatever the tests one applies to the work of the Conference—ethical, social, or political—they reveal it as a factor eminently calculated to sap high interests, to weaken the moral nerve of the present generation, to fan the flames of national and racial hatred. Truth, justice, equity, and liberty have been twisted and pressed into the service of economic-political boards. In a word, Prussians, instead of being destroyed, has been openly adopted by its ostensible enemies, and the huge sacrifices offered up by the heroic armies of the foremost nations are being misused to give one-half of the world just cause to rise up against the other half." Mr. Frederic Harrison, one of the oldest if not the oldest of England's living publicists, writes of the treaty as a "far-rage of grandiose impracticabilities;" Sir Thomas Baring—the man who engineered the Anglo-French Entente—writes of the "wicked solemn pledges of a treaty universally condemned." Finally, to cut short this chapter of quotations, as late as April of this year the treaty has been condemned in a manifesto issued by a hundred European writers and publicists (including amongst the English signatories Lord Henry Bentinck, Earl Parmoor, General Gough, and J. A. Hobson, and among the French Henri Barbusse and Jean Louquet). In it they claim that the treaty is not in accord with the pre-armistice pledges of the Allies, and say, "It has done nothing to check the drift of Central Europe into famine and revolution. The revision of the Versailles Treaty, in the light of modern international thought, of the pre-armistice utterances of President Wilson, culminating in the Fourteen Points, and even in the earlier utterances of the Entente statesmen themselves, is imperative." May I suggest that it concerns us not at all to know whether the treaty is better or worse than a German-made treaty would have been. What does, or should, concern us is to know, first, whether it is in accord with the principles in defence of which we entered the war; secondly, whether it is in accord with the solemn pledges of the Allies on the

IS THE PEACE TREATY JUST?

From "FACTS"—May I be permitted to reply to Professor Phillipson? I apologise to him for having been unable to distinguish between the aims of his two addresses, and am grateful to him for his explanation, which, however, is more emotional than logical, and more earsoo; than convincing. On May 12, he now says, he dealt with the process of making the Treaty, on July 29, with the finished product. I still wish to know: the "process," which was characterised by "haggling and bargaining," by the presence of "bargain drivers," "old" and "wily," "uninformed on vital points"; one of whom regarded the conference as a lot of pigs, was possessed of an acid tongue, was cynical and hating; the other of whom the professor spoke of as a "quick-change artist" (and remarked that there was a line beyond which changing from day to day becomes "shiftiness") dominated by "opportunism." I wish to know if his "process," admittedly involving a clash of ideals with hard facts (and secret treaties) can by a three-months' warring of a magic wand be turned into a "product" characterised by magnanimity, generosity, and the spirit of highest justice? Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles? Can you dissociate so easily process and product? I would, remind the learned professor that on May 12 he did more than refer to the process, as the following press reports will testify:—"The Peace Treaty was, said the lecturer, in spite of its defects, a great piece of work. Nearly all President Wilson's 14 points went by the board—they were scarcely discussed, let alone forming the basis of the Treaty. If only a more rational attitude had been adopted towards Russia, and the territorial arrangements had been carried out by a fairer method and on a humbler basis; if the negotiators had cast aside their old alliances, instead of setting up another Triple Alliance; and if there had been a larger share of knowledge among the delegates, the Treaty might have been a better one. I hope I may be forgiven for my ignorance, impertinence, and misconceptions when I set this statement alongside the Chamber of Commerce speech and say that I find the two inconsistent. Concerning the 14 points, the professor will remember that the Allies accepted 12 of the 14 points as the basis of peace negotiations. (I believe, although I was not in Paris, that "negotiations" were at a minimum.) I would ask if the Treaty at all approximates to those 12 points, whether, for example, there were no economic barriers set up by the Treaty, or whether there was an impartial examination of colonial claims, or whether a real League of Nations was set up. The Treaty, I am told, is just, because it punishes those who broke the laws of God and man; the Treaty, I assume, therefore, was in accordance with those same laws. Now, in the first place, I will be grateful if the professor will inform me what is the law of God in matters pertaining to meting out justice. Is it "I am a jealous God, Who visits the sins, &c.," or the "loving, Heavenly Father," who through His Son bade us love our enemies? In the second place I believe that an indispensable condition of justice is the existence of a neutral body to try claims between contending parties. That condition was missing from the Peace Conference, for the Allies were at once interested parties and judges in the same cause. The Germans had no voice in drawing up the original terms at all; they accepted the final draft under protest and threat. Now, the Germans have again and again demanded an impartial commission to enquire into "the guilt for beginning the war, the guilt for continuing the war, the guilt for the atrocities for which all the belligerent nations reproach each other." These are the words of Prince Max of Baden, and while the Allies refuse such investigation (for the challenge from German representatives still stands) they can hardly approach even the standard of Professor Phillipson's definition of "justice." To each one his due sounds well enough in principle, but who is to do the deciding?

LIQUID AIR.
Before a large and interested gathering Professor Kerr-Graft on Friday repeated his demonstration of the properties of liquid air at the Prince of Wales Theatre, Adelaide University. After explaining the process of liquefying air, he showed the remarkable effect it had when such things as flowers, a rubber ball, paraffin wax, steel, and an egg shell were immersed in it. The flowers and ball became brittle and were easily crushed into fragments. The paraffin wax and egg shell became luminous on being exposed to a strong light. The lecture was made the more interesting by the humorous touches given by the professor.

THE PEACE TREATY

ITS JUSTICE DEMONSTRATED

NO REVENGE OR VINDICTIVENESS.

(By Professor COLEMAN PHILLIPSON.)

In setting forth the following brief observations, let me at once assure the reader that it is far from my intention to fan the flames of hate and enmity. We want universal peace and friendship. We want real reconciliation, which depends on certain indispensable conditions precedent, namely regret for wrongs committed, confession of guilt, and restitution. Is sincere reconciliation with the Germans possible so long as their only regret is for failure, their only admission is of mistakes, and their present disposition is to evade reparation?

The critics of the Versailles Treaty, who proclaim that it is a Carthaginian peace, a plot of the Great Powers among the Allies to wipe out Germany, who say that it is an embodiment of Imperialism, that it is a work of bad faith and injustice, are hysterical and irresponsible persons, who are stupefied by a mixture of crass ignorance and flatterulent sentimentalism. These assailants complain that the framers of the Treaty did not act in a truly Christian manner. The Allies never pretended that they met in order to turn the other cheek to a lawless enemy. They met in a conference to right great wrongs and to erect a new structure of international society on a better basis than had existed before. The cant of these critics is more conspicuous than their grasp of men and affairs, and of the complicated character of international relations and conflicting claims and interests. There is a profound gulf between their vague imaginings and reality; they have stultified themselves to such an extent that in their unctuous pity for the guilty criminals they have altogether lost sight of the innocent victims. This is indeed an amazing reversal of the order of nature and of the universal dictates of justice, equity, and fair play.

Shifts and Subterfuges.

One can understand the shifts and subterfuges and squealing of Germans, whose sinister designs have been frustrated; in a man of British or Allied blood it is either insanity or treachery, because it encourages the former destroyers and devastators to disregard their solemn undertaking. Even such a book as "The Economic Consequences of the Peace" is vitiated by a strange bias or kink in the brain of its author, who presents figures of a one-sided character, which perhaps impress the ordinary reader, but which cannot stand examination by those who know the facts on both sides. Is it possible to arrive at a just decision when material evidence is suppressed and statistics are insidiously worked up by one who adopts the attitude of a party pleader? For example, much is made in this book of the hardships of Germany in being called upon to deliver so many cattle; but nothing is said about the cattle stolen from France. By what strange mental process does a critic jump to the conclusion that men such as Mr. Lloyd George and M. Clemenceau were insincere schemers, because they were not fools and were able and adroit negotiators? In any event, we have to remember that if there are some who think the terms of the Treaty too hard on Germany, there are millions and millions of Frenchmen—not to mention multitudes in other countries—who complain that the terms are far too inadequate, and will never make good more than a small fraction of the loss deliberately inflicted on civilians and their property.

The Treaty and Present Troubles.

There are those who point to the present troubles in the world and lay the blame on the Treaty and its framers. Could blindness and stupidity go further? The existing troubles, hardships, and confusion in various parts of the world are due to the war, and not to the peace; and the war was wilfully thrust on the world by the Germans and Austrians. The effects of a widespread and unparalleled cataclysm cannot be remedied in a day, nor in a year.