

FORESTRY FOR RETURNED SOLDIERS.

Speaking on Saturday of the progress of repatriation activities, the Minister for Home and Territories (Mr. Glynn) said the Minister for Repatriation (Mr. Millen) was getting the administration under way. "Good work has already been done," proceeded Mr. Glynn, "by the committee and trustees appointed under the Act. Sir Langdon Bonython is one of the trustees. As it is desired to employ some of the men at afforestation, I have secured the services of two specialists—Mr. Campbell (who has done such excellent work in connection with the tree planting of Melbourne) and Mr. Johnson (a forestry expert of the Victorian Government). Both these gentlemen will go to Canberra to see what is possible there. I have had a good many recommendations, not all in concert, concerning the possibilities of tree planting in the Federal Capital area, but one has to be careful in connection with expenditure nowadays. The effectiveness of the expenditure, as well as the present employment of the returned soldiers, must be taken into account. I hope to have a report on this matter in a fortnight or three weeks' time."

LOUBET THE ADVENTURER.

An interesting sidelight is thrown by a cable message from our London correspondent on the activities of the bogus doctor Paul Rene Loubet, who committed suicide in Melbourne last week. Loubet, the cable states, by means of false diplomas, acted as locum tenens for doctors in a number of English towns. He obtained a lieutenancy in the Army Medical Service, and acted as a medical officer in various units, until he was found out, court-martialled, cashiered, and sent to France in 1915. He joined the French Army, but was discharged as an undesirable. He then went to Melbourne.

Rev. Sinclair, the visiting social reformer, lectured in the Trades Hall on Tuesday evening on "The Coming Problems." There was a large audience, and Mr. J. F. Hills occupied the chair.

The speaker dealt at length with the White Australia policy. It depended for its success, he said, upon what other countries, as well as Australia, thought of it. No nation could to-day decide upon its own policy. The Labor Party had neglected to lay the facts before the world, and to-day it was too late. Radicals in England were quite antagonistic to a white Australia, and it was the fault of the Laborites of Australia. The same thing applied to the Radicals throughout Europe. They did not have such a problem themselves, and could not understand it. Australia had never taken any trouble to make it plain why the policy was adopted. He believed at the end of the war all such matters would have to be referred to an international body. President Wilson had already made suggestions, which were more than suggestions, along that line to the British Government. He went on to discuss the Labor College, which was dealt with in "The Daily Herald" that morning. The present educational system gave working class boys and girls' brains a twist. Workers must beware of many things—the press, the education system, and the University. The last-mentioned particularly needed watching. The Workers' Educational Association was the particular organisation which was being used to twist the workers out of their class. The workers apparently welcomed the university. For heaven's sake, do not let such men dominate the working class. There must be no fraternising with the University, for it was an enemy. It was the educational wing of the Chambers of Commerce, the Stock Exchanges, and the press. The early impressions were the things which stuck fast. They must beware of the jingo and capitalist sentiment which was promulgated. The Imperial sentiment was forced into the children's minds, and Australia was kept out. The child ought to be saved from jingoistic imperialism, which it did not understand. The Labor Party might vary the winning of elections with the watching of the education system. The Labor College endeavored to impart the truth to those who attended and aimed at giving a working class education.

They all realised that the world was in a terrible state. Where could they strike first? None of them could tell. There were suburbs of people who knew nothing of working class affairs. The first thing was to remedy that state of affairs and to help them to see the light. The proletariat must be taught that there were great things to be done; new principles to be asserted; justice to be put in the place of injustice, and truth in the place of untruth. An ignorant proletariat would remain in chains. It must be given real facts

of life. Winning sections must be subordinated to true working class education.

There was a discussion at the termination of the lecture.

EDUCATION REFORM.

LOCAL PROVINCES EACH WITH A UNIVERSITY.

Lord Haldane, presiding at an educational conference at Oxford, outlined a scheme of reform based on the principle of education. That principle was the secret of the smoothness with which our great armies had worked on plans already prepared before the war.

Resolution is our first duty, he said. We must be prepared to spend all our resources—if necessary to learn to live on 6d. a day—rather than be defeated in the struggle for life and freedom. (Cheers.) Everyone's first duty is to concentrate mind and soul upon victory. But an educational conference is a duty only second in importance. To take full advantage of this tremendous opportunity we must think out in advance what we mean to do. Make education your foundation and social problems will solve themselves. An educated man does not take starvation wages or live in a slum, or does not give himself up to strong drink—not as a rule. Education destroys class barriers, imparting a sense of equality, and allocates men and women to their proper spheres in life. It makes labor interesting and brings out the higher spiritual qualities in man and woman.

He suggested that England should be divided up into from seven to 10 great educational provinces—Wales as one, Greater London as another, Lancashire as a third. He would have a council, with representatives of the university. Each province would have its administrative council, with representatives of the university, of the local educational authorities, with the best men in the district selected, with the elementary, secondary, and technical school teachers represented. That council would consider local schemes, the allocation of schools and scholars, the distribution under a unified system of grants, the question of salaries and pensions, and the distribution of teachers. This would leave the Board of Education free to exercise the higher direction and to inspect. In education as at the War Office, the thinking department must be free from the work of administration.

"Peace will come some time; it will very likely come suddenly; and the risk that we run is that before that peace comes we shall not have thought out how to deal with the great problems that will be upon us."

Daily Herald B. 10.14

VICTORIAN TUTORIAL CLASSES.

Provision is made in the State estimates in Victoria to increase the Government grant from £300 to £1000, and there is an understanding that the amount will in subsequent years be enlarged to £1500. The principal object of the increased grant is to enable a director of tutorial classes to be appointed. The selection for this appointment rests with Melbourne University Council, and the Minister of Education stated last evening that he had written to the council authorising it to appoint a director at £800 a year. It is stated in certain quarters that the appointment will likely fall to Mr. Meredith Atkinson, of Sydney University.

THE PRICE MEMORIAL OVAL.

Daily Herald 13.10.14

DR. HARGREAVES' LECTURE.

"In Wednesday's issue of 'The Daily Herald' mention is made under the heading 'Science and Industry,' of a lecture delivered at the University by me on 'Chemical Research in Relation to Industry,'" writes the Director of Chemistry (Dr. W. A. Hargreaves). "While appreciating your attention to that important subject, I would point out that an error occurs in the paragraph referred to. It is stated, inter alia:—'He gave the Government credit for having established the Department of Industry in 1915, but he would like to point out that industrial research was a matter for the Federal Government, and not for the State. Examination of the bulletins issued by the Federal Department showed that the subjects dealt with were of far more importance to the State than to the Commonwealth as a whole.' That should read as follows:—'He gave the Government credit for having established the Department of Chemistry in 1915, and, although the opinion was held by some that industrial research was a matter for the Federal Government, and not for the State, examination of the bulletins issued by the Department of Chemistry showed that the subjects dealt with were of far more importance to the State than to the Commonwealth as a whole.'" We regret the inaccurate phrase, which misrepresented the opinion of Dr. Hargreaves. His department is a valuable one, and can be of much assistance to Australia, and in justice to its chief we publish the correction, which was due to condensation made necessary by pressure on space. The department is to be commended for the work it has done in the comparatively brief period since its inception, and if manufacturers will profit by its researches they will be saved much unnecessary experiment.

Daily Herald 13.10.14

WORKERS' EDUCATION

AN OPEN LETTER.

TO THE REV. F. SINCLAIRE, M.A.

Reverend Sir—I have not the honor of knowing you personally, but I feel confident that in many essentials you and I are kindred spirits. Like yourself, I feel that "only by calm and reflective reasoning can the bottom dog hope to emerge from the fog of doubts"—("Daily Herald," October 9)—or, in fact, from anything but bottom-dogdom. With you I am convinced that "winning elections must be subordinated to true working-class education"—("Daily Herald," October 11)—and, finally, I, too shrink from publicity, and can only be induced by frequent promptings to come out of my shell—"Daily Herald," October 9). But we differ in one important respect. I am quite willing to wish your Labor College every possible luck, though I regard its propagandist basis as a faulty one for real educational work. You, on the other hand, with the intolerance of the Inquisition, the language of the Athanasian Creed, and the methods of a commercial traveller, can only push your own firm by hurling epithets at the one with which I am connected—the W.E.A. You are not the first person to indulge in that pastime in Adela. You had your forerunner—"W. G."—who, after several tilts at the W.E.A., announced his retirement from the encounter, and then began all over again under a non-de-plume.

You seem to have—shall I say?—a grudge against the university and the W.E.A. If universities are the abodes of the damned, if every person inside them has sold his soul to wealth, if the teachers twist men's minds as badly as you suggest, then why do you still flaunt the badge of your own damnation—your degree? Why do you employ as your colleagues at the Labor College two university men—Messrs. Blackburn and Baracchi, the former of whom is doubly vile, according to you, in that he is a B.A. and LL.B., and also a member of Parliament?

You warned your listeners on Tuesday evening to beware of the university and the W.E.A.; in fact, of the whole educational system. Most people will endorse your strictures on jingoistic teaching in the schools, but your prattle about the W.E.A.'s efforts to "twist the workers out of their class" can only be attributed to ignorance of the W.E.A. or to the commercial traveller instinct. For your benefit, therefore, may I state briefly the W.E.A. method, which is largely also the university method? The W.E.A. is simply an organising body. It exists to bring together men and women of all shades of thought on a common meeting ground. If you visited any of its classes you would agree that it succeeded in getting people of very differing opinions together. Does your Labor College do that? Don't you find your students nearly all of the same economic faith? The discussions must be very one-sided. An educational organising body need possess no brand of economic faith any more than it need sympathise with Charles I. or believe that Bacon was Shakespeare. It isn't out to push any one dogma. But it is out to provide facilities whereby all dogmas can be brought under survey, criticism, and development. It does not propagate Socialism or Syndicalism. But it does provide classes in which these two ideas can be dealt with as parts of the whole problem of economics. Further, it places its teachers under no obligation to urge or denounce any particular school of thought. But it does try to secure as tutors men who have specialised on some branch of knowledge, who read what is written on all sides of economic problems, who try to keep themselves up to date, and who, whatever their personal opinions may be, have the intellectual bones, to tell their students that there are two or more theories on a subject, two points of view, two sides to most cases. There lies the whole difference between our method and yours. You declare there is only one side—the Socialist—but we, while putting the Socialist point of view—and the W.E.A. tutor knows his Marx probably as well as yourself or "Marxian"—tell our classes that there is diversity of opinion in the Socialist movement itself, and that many perfectly honest intellects have anti-Socialist views. You, I suppose, would preach the labor theory of value; so do we; but we put rival theories alongside it. You would say, I suppose, with Marx, that depressions in trade were due to the small share of wealth received by labor; we put that theory forward along with other theories, and then see which

the his boy with the facts. If at the end of such a course of study a man goes away a Socialist, it is because he believes that the Socialist theories are better than the others; if he goes away an anti-Socialist it is because he thinks that the Socialist has failed to prove his case. In short, our tutors strive to "twist" man's minds so that they are willing to examine and weigh opposing theories before coming to conclusions. A fair frame of mind, willing to look at the other fellow's point of view—that is the aim of the tutorial class. Yet for pursuing this method of getting at the truth we are branded the enemy of the working classes, and "for heaven's sake" must not be allowed to dominate the wage-earners. "There must be no fraternizing with the university, for it is an enemy." Doesn't it look poor nonsense when you see it in black and white? The real position is this, so far as tutorial class tutors are concerned. Most of them are men born of working-class parents, and their chief aim in life is to be of some service to the class from which they have sprung. They realize that the next 20 years are going to be full of difficulties for the wage-earners, but at the same time are full of infinite possibilities, provided the workers generally know what they want, and want something which is really worth having. Empty denunciations of capitalism lead nowhere, and produce the same emotional exhaustion as comes from denouncing the Germans. Many different ideas are in the air, but the wage-earner, with his nose down to the grindstone most of the day, has little time to hunt out these ideas or regard them critically. The tutorial class tutor, therefore, makes it his business to collect these ideas, and put them before his students for the purpose of examination and criticism. But he does not allow the attractiveness of a theory or proposal to dull his critical faculties, and tries to present his case so that his hearers can see the pros and cons.

Goodbye and good luck to your Labor College. But try to infuse into it a little charity and tolerance for those who are every whit as sincere and earnest as yourself. Do not assume for yourself the monopoly of social zeal and enthusiasm; don't forget that there are no definitely settled theories in economics yet; give your students Gide, Bernstein, Tausig, Serel, and Marshall as well as Marx. And, lastly, if society does divide into two classes only—angel and devil—it is always worth while trying to understand the devil's point of view.—Your friend the enemy.

HERBERT HEATON.

University, Adelaide.

Daily Herald 15.10.14

WORKERS' EDUCATION

AN OPEN LETTER

TO PROFESSOR HERBERT HEATON, M.A.

Learned Sir—I have not the honor of knowing you personally, but I feel confident that in many essentials we are not very kindred spirits. Otherwise we should hardly come to such divergent conclusions with regard to the attitudes, motives, and actions of the outspoken, and very earnest clergyman who has recently been lecturing in our city.

In his addresses, which were packed with facts and illustrations, and which exhibited a very great concern for the interests of the masses, you apparently see little but—to use your own words—"indulging in a pastime," "hurling epithets," "prattle," and "empty denunciations;" and, in spite of the brotherly and professedly charitable words of your opening sentences in Saturday's "Daily Herald," you are sufficiently unbrotherly and uncharitable towards Mr. Sinclair to impute to him a "grudge against the university and the Workers' Educational Association."

Neither by telling a man that he has a sore head, nor by inferring that he is a "bone head" or empty head, do you answer his arduous or vindicate either university education or the W.E.A., which, as you imply, follows faithfully in its footsteps.

Again, learned sir, you have, I assume, studied logic years ago at college, and so I think it is only fair for me to begin by asking you to give the figure and the mood of the following syllogism, which summarises your reasoning in the second paragraph of your letter.

1. Major premise—Sinclair has graduated at a university and seen university life from the inside.

2. Minor premise—Sinclair condemns university education.

3. Conclusion—Sinclair is talking through his hat.

How the conclusion follows from the