

## Storm Precautions

THE purpose of the International Monetary Conference, so far as these mysteries can be understood by men and women who have never had much money to play with, is to protect the world after the war from economic hurricanes. So the purpose of the pamphlet, *International Monetary Fund*, which the Government distributed to the booksellers last week, is to help ordinary men and women to understand and influence the decisions that will be made. So far nothing has been decided but the broad principles of approach. Experts have been at work for a couple of years or more clearing away the undergrowth and the thorns. They have not yet removed all the possibilities of conflict, but they have advanced to the point at which they can say, "Here are our broad aims and plans." Some of the principles they lay down, and the reasons by which they support them, are still obscure to non-technical minds, but the basic suggestion so far as New Zealand is concerned is the creation of an international fund to protect individual nations against post-war stresses and strains. It is not so much a question of insulation as of cushioning—giving nations time to adjust themselves to world disturbances "without resorting to measures destructive of national or international prosperity." When a farmer or a business man runs into rough weather he asks his bank to keep him going till the storm passes; and the bank does so, in its own interest as well as in his, if the security seems reasonable. It is now proposed that nations will be kept going in the same way, but of course "under adequate safeguards"; and one of the tasks of the Conference will be to arrange these safeguards, and agree about them. In the meantime the task of the New Zealand public is to understand what is going on—to grasp why the Conference has been called and what its decisions may mean in our own Dominion.

# LETTERS FROM LISTENERS

## "WE NEW ZEALANDERS"

Sir,—In his review of my inoffensive little book, *We New Zealanders*, F. L. Combs quotes me thus: "You (New Zealanders) need a good stiff kick in the pants to bring you round." What I actually said was this: "It is still possible for people who were born in New Zealand, and have never been out of the place except to go fishing in a dinghy, to become sentimental about 'Home'... If your home is 12,000 miles away from where you've spent all your life, then there's something wrong with you. You want a psychiatrist—or a good stiff kick in the pants to bring you round." There is a difference.

In having a piece of me in your last issue, Isobel Andrews says: "Our pack-cry on the football field probably does

THE details for 2YA's evening programme for this Wednesday, June 28, were given incorrectly in last week's issue. The programme should have shown an NBS Revue from an Air Force Station, extending from 7.30 p.m. to 8.58 p.m. The items shown at 7.45, 8.0, 8.9 and 8.36 p.m. are replaced by this revue.

come through a yattering mesh of false teeth; but we seem in spite of all this to have acquired some smattering of social conscience." This might be taken to imply that I said something about football or yattering meshes. On the contrary, I consider it something of a feat to have written a book about New Zealanders without once having mentioned football or false teeth, and I am not letting Mrs. Andrews or anybody else deprive me of the credit for it—A. R. D. FAIRBURN (New Lynn).

Sir,—I have read the contentious and rather foolish defence of A. R. D. Fairburn's book published in your June 16 issue. Also Isobel Andrews' scathing remarks and your review in recent issues. Then I read Fairburn's book myself, and must congratulate him for his uncompromising courage and clear vision. The fact that his essay has received such denunciation lends force to his statements. We don't like them, and are rushing to the rescue of our hurt pride. We could ignore him were his criticism unjustified. If a few more men had the intestinal fortitude—putting it nicely, to give us a good kick where it hurts, this smug little community might wake up. But I doubt it.

SAM RIX (Walton).

## THE MAN BORN TO BE KING

Sir,—I should like, through your columns, to express my appreciation of *The Man Born to be King*. In common with many Bible students, I had awaited this production with some anxiety, dreading lest the sacredness of the Gospel theme should be travestied and its message dimmed. I need not have been afraid. As far as I have heard this series, I have been impressed by its close adherence to the story as we read it in the Scriptures, the human touches filling in the background that a vivid imagination and knowledge of those times have hitherto provided for all who have taken the time and thought to acquaint themselves with this greatest of all dramas in the history of the world.

Here is an opportunity for those who already know the Bible story to be inspired afresh with the grandeur of its

message; and for those who are not so acquainted and have not troubled to take the longer route of disciplined Bible reading, to be gripped by the thought that there is a solution to the aspirations of mankind, to be found in the person and message of the Man born to be King.

The NBS is to be congratulated on having secured this splendid series of presentations for New Zealand listeners.

RONA M. SMEETON (Auckland).

Sir,—It is good to know that *The Man Born to be King* is now being broadcast from 1YA as well as from 2YA. I presume that it will then go on to the other main stations. I hope, too, that next time it will be broadcast at a later hour, preferably on a week night. In addition to its religious value, it must surely rank among the best cast and best produced plays that have been presented over the radio, and plays of such a standard and of such wide interest deserve to be given the best hours of broadcasting. The afternoon and early evening are not good hours for those who wish to give their attention to listening in, and who have young families.—JOHN D. HOGG (Waipiro Bay, Vicarage).

## "GOT"—CONSCIOUSNESS

Sir,—Your article on "got"—consciousness prompts me to send you this extract from "Saki" (H. H. Munro):

"I don't think any tragedy in literature that I have ever come across impressed me so much as the first one that I spelled out slowly for myself in words of three letters: the bad fox has got the red hen. There was something so dramatically complete about it; the badness of the fox, added to all the traditional guile of his race, seemed to heighten the horror of the hen's fate, and there was such a suggestion of masterful malice about the word 'got.' One felt that a countryside in arms would not get that hen away from the bad fox. They used to think me a slow dull reader for not getting on with my lesson, but I used to sit and picture to myself, the red hen, with its wings beating helplessly, screeching in terrified protest, or perhaps if he got it by the neck, with beak wide agape and silent, and eyes staring as it left the farmyard for ever."—NOT GOTLESS (Green Island).

## PRONUNCIATION

Sir,—I have noticed that there is a tendency on the part of NBS and BBC announcers to pronounce the days of the week as "Mondee, Tuesdee," and so on. This is anathema to most listeners and is on a par with "New Zilland" for New Zealand. Another mistreated word is target. Is it possible that radio announcers intend to thrust yet another dialect on the English-speaking world? Or is it that the standard of education is depressed on their account? There are many more examples of faulty pronunciations. I am not a pedant but a New Zealander with an average education who feels hotly about liberties taken with the most expressive of all languages. I have no grudge against announcers and I do not think that they would sleep uneasily if I had. They have a monotonous and arduous job. But carelessness in matters such as these should be avoided and the radio not allowed to promote errors of speech.

E.H. (Hastings).