



Some people never let their heads go for anything less than a lottery or two. And then again, nothing surprises others, our friend, for instance, who includes a crib over the next-door-fence as part of her "good-neighbour" policy! She knew all the answers . . . that

mother and child were feeling fine because they had PROTEX-ed themselves!

There is nothing more refreshing than your morning tub with PROTEX Soap. PROTEX makes the skin superbly clean, leaving it with the faint, fresh fragrance of the bush. PROTEX contains a

mild, efficient antiseptic, more effective than carbolic to guard against minor infection.



**SHE PROTEX-ed
HERSELF THIS-MORNING!**

PR3.6

COLGATE-PALMOLIVE LTD., PETONE

BROADCASTING AND PEACE

(continued from previous page)

air for us; like the man who gave us throughout the war our weekly tonic of sanity and hope and put heart into us to face another week. It is not enough that we know things; they must be made real to us so that they become part of our very being, an active faith to live by. The League of Nations never penetrated to the hearts of the people; it did little more than provide little coteries of intellectuals with subjects for discussion. The United Nations must do more if it is to succeed; for, in spite of its big stick in the shape of an armed force, its strength ultimately must be based on the common consciousness of peoples which alone can give force to the decisions of delegates. And that common consciousness is evolved by feeling perhaps more than by reasoning. At this moment the recent agonies of the war provide emotive driving force sufficient to give an initial impetus to the United Nations, but in a generation those agonies will be dim, and the younger folk will want something more to do than just listen passively to the deliberations of delegates at a remote assembly. United Nations is the word, not United Delegations. And the medium that has the power to unite nations, or disunite them if wrongly controlled, is broadcasting.

THE United Nations must not cease to exist in the minds of the people between meeting and meeting. The organisation must seize upon broadcasting with both hands, and establish a continuous intimacy with the popular mind, so that a new loyalty will grow up in our consciences—a loyalty to the world cause of which our national loyalties must become tributary parts, carrying with them emotional power for the well-being and peace of all men. The United Nations organisation will of course have its own transmitting station, but this will of necessity be very official and impersonal in character. It will need to be supported by the freer and more intimate efforts of the broadcasting institutions in all countries, to which it could supply material; and, just as in the Assembly of the United Nations a tradition of behaviour—a feeling, an atmosphere—is being built up and recognised as one of the outstandingly important factors contributing to its success, so, with the broadcasting institutions of the world, a tradition of international courtesy and helpfulness can be developed which will have more real power than any attempt at control of a negative character such as was tried by the League of Nations. It is realised that there is no possibility of effective outside control of either the transmitting or receiving of broadcasts—the war has taught us that—even if it were desirable, but there is greater power for good in the still small voice of recognised courtesies than in the brazen threats of force. A peace which is kept by the existence of a superior force must be a very insecure peace unless it is based on the goodwill of the peoples backing that force. Signatures to treaties and charters mean little to a nation that wants to go to war. What is needed is to bring to bear on people's minds and hearts the forces that make nations not want to go to war; and for this no agency has anything approaching the power of broadcasting. Signatories to charters are

governments, not peoples. But disturbances of the peace in the future are likely to arise in their early stages not so much from clashes between nations as from domestic clashes of ideologies within a single nation. The parties concerned will draw to themselves the support of other nations which will wittingly or unwittingly foment the trouble by powerful short-wave broadcasting till it spreads to other nations, and then the hope of action by the United Nations will be remote.

LAWS, treaties, charters, or any pacts written down in so many words, however backed by force, cannot precede but must necessarily follow in the wake of traditions or understandings of what are humanly regarded as decent behaviour, courtesy, fair-play and gentleness:

... Your gentleness shall force
More than your force move us to gentleness.

The problem becomes one of developing these traditions and understandings. This is a long sustained process, and the great emotional power of broadcasting must be brought to bear on the myriads of individual minds so that there may develop beneath the ideologies and political partisanship a feeling of our common humanity and a burning, active desire to be at peace with one another and help one another, however much we differ in ideas, and however mistaken we may think other people may be in their arguments. If broadcasting regards its job as solely concerned with the passing on of objective truth (if there is such a thing as objective truth where human relationships are concerned), it is shirking the duty to humanity which is peculiarly its own—the emotionalising of intellectual vision.

The controllers of broadcasting institutions must be leagued with the aspirations of the United Nations and must be continually moved to regard themselves directly or indirectly as servants of that organisation. A national broadcasting institution cannot live to itself alone. It knows no frontiers, and its decisions are imposed on neighbouring nations or on nations half the world away as much as on its own. An actual instance or two will make this clear. A certain sequence of events covering a few days was not broadcast on a certain country's network, in order not to interfere with the activities of the police in their tracking of a criminal; but the news sent by cable was broadcast from another country (which did not appreciate the reason for—or even know of—the desired silence) and received by listeners in the district in which the police were working. Another great national broadcasting institution recently decided that certain broadcasts should not be withheld in spite of their possible injurious effect on certain types of people. Whether that decision was right or wrong I do not question. But by making that decision for its own country, that institution denied any freedom of decision to the country over the border where its transmissions could be readily received.

There are an infinite number of issues and practices of a positive as well as of a negative character which should be the subject of discussion and understanding

(continued on next page)