(continued from previous page)

points out that many of the people would have a much more clear and certain grasp of modern ideas were they explained in their own tongue. I feel that the number of these people is much greater than the Pakeha realise.

I join with Bishop Bennett in his praise of "Te Reo Irirangi," but I think also that it is fair criticism to say that Church of England news gets more than its fair share of that short 10 minutes. Of course this may be due to many causes-that particular Church may be more zealous in supplying news of its huis and other gatherings and so on; in which case good luck to it; but I have quite often counted four and five minutes of Anglican news.

"AROHA" (Wanganui).

ORCHESTRA AND SCHOOLS

Sir,-After listening to the excellent performances to school children in Wellington and Christchurch recently I suggest two points for earnest consideration. In the trip round the orchestra, would it not be better to have whole sections of instruments playing, instead of the demonstration by one single instrumentalist? It is the concerted sound of strings, wood-wind, etc. that needs to be impressed upon young listeners. We have had studio presentations by soloists for years. Now is the time to let them

hear the effect of the instruments played in the Baltic and Black Seas and as she together in various sections. Secondly, I hope the conductor does not allow the chances of speaking to young people to take up the study of an orchestral instrument to slip by. The advantages of learning while at school and possible careers open to efficient players should be mentioned. If the orchestra is to survive, it will need these future players.

CLAUDE BRUNSDEN (Timaru).

P.S.-In connection with publicity in the careers of the players, the man-inthe-street can name dozens of players in Rugby and cricket. How many could name the leading violinist of an organisation costing thousands of pounds?

TWO SIDES TO A CURTAIN

Sir,-Your issue of April 11 contains a BBC broadcast, under the above heading, by A. J. P. Taylor, in which he pictures Britain as a monster of iniquity persecuting a poor, peaceful, but a sadly misjudged and maligned Russia, Apparently he has quite forgotten that there is such a thing as two sides to a question as well as to a curtain. He accuses Britain of refusing to allow Russia control of the Straits (whatever that may mean). Can Mr. Taylor assure us that if Russia were to get such control she would not immediately limit the freedom of other nations as she has done

is trying to do on the Danube? He fails to understand that Britain stands for Freedom while Russia's aim is suppression of Freedom as it is understood by the British.

Again, he says, "We oppose the Yugoslav claims on Trieste!" He is quite right in supposing that this is in opposition to Russia, but what right has Russia to insist that Trieste be given to Yugoslavia? Italy, to whom it belonged, and Austria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. all of whom need it as a port, should be considered as well as Yugoslavia, which has already gained the near-by port of Pola as well as the whole eastern Adriatic coast. Can Mr. Taylor assure the Western World that Russia wants Trieste for a free Yugoslavia and not for herself through its agent, Tito?

In his next complaint that "we oppose the Bulgarian claims to an outlet to the Aegean Sea," he completely ignores the fact that Bulgaria fought for Germany against Russia, also that little Greece fought valiantly for the principles of freedom which Bulgaria did her best to destroy. Many think that the cession of a strip of Bulgarian territory to Greece would be a more equitable arrangement. Why does Russia oppose Britain in this? To agree to Russia's proposal would not benefit Bulgaria so much as it would give Russia a right-of-way to the

Mediterranean over which Bulgaria would have only nominal control.

Could Mr. Taylor explain why Britain's protest against the Rumanian elections should be interpreted as antagonism to Russia? Is it because Russia has complete control, through her secret police. over Rumania as she has over Poland's nominally free elections? In Poland, the new government under Russian tutelege, is planning to spend nearly three times as much on her secret police as she is on replacing her chief mainstay, agriculture. A similar position exists in Bulgaria, Rumania and Czechoslovakia, all of which enjoy the doubtful benefits of Russia's favour. Can he explain just why this horde of secret spies is necessary in a free country?

Russia, he says, is suspicious of us! Quite so, but for exactly the same reason that a boy caught stealing apples is suspicious of anyone approaching him. Under the thin excuse of war, Russia has stolen Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, a large part of Poland and parts of Eastern Asia and she is determined to keep tight political control of all parts of Europe and Asia over which her armies have passed. No wonder she is suspicious of the Western Powers, but only a very warped mind could bleme Britain for this suspicion.

> CONSIDER BOTH SIDES (Auckland).



