

LIEDER RECITALS

Sir,—I have often wondered whether the Broadcasting Service's practice of discouraging local vocalists from singing well known classical songs is wise, but after having heard a recent studio recital of Schubert Lieder I am convinced that their policy is well founded. The main fault of this recital was the lack of sympathy between singer and accompanist, with the result that neither could give a finished performance.

In Lieder, the piano part is an integral portion of the song and not just an "accompaniment" in the conventional sense of the word—indeed it should be the basis of the whole musical structure. In the cited case, the fault probably lay neither with the singer, nor with the pianist, as the time allowed for studio recital rehearsals is usually inadequate.

The solution would seem to lie in two directions. If the singer decides to sing Lieder, he must either have many rehearsals with the studio accompanist, which may be difficult to arrange; or else secure the services of a competent outside accompanist and broadcast with him, rather than with the official studio accompanist. These are the only ways in which local singers can hope to give us satisfying and polished performances of the recorded versions we hear. Alternatively, if the authorities consider that neither of these suggestions is practicable, let us hear more of the very fine Schubert, Schumann and Brahms Lieder available to us, on record. But let these be made into complete programmes, and not, as so often is now the case, scattered throughout "dinner music" programmes.

MURRAY JENKIN (Auckland).

(1. The practice of the Broadcasting Service is not correctly defined in this correspondent's negative formula. Much is done to encourage well-equipped singers to prepare lieder and other classical programmes, and to rehearse them with correspondingly well-equipped accompanists. On the other hand, ill-equipped singers are certainly not encouraged to prepare programmes in which they must fail; and if they offer them, the offer is unacceptable. 2. What is meant by the time "allowed" for studio rehearsal and by its being "usually inadequate" is not clear; but it is enough to say that there is no arbitrary rule about it. Singers are not obliged to work with studio accompanists, if they prefer to work with other acceptably competent accompanists of their own choice. 3. In one recent period of four weeks the four YC stations presented about 40 evening programmes of lieder. None of these was planted among dinner music, and no such programme ordinarily is. Three out of five of these programmes were by New Zealand artists or recorded in NZBS studios. The longest of the 40 programmes was 30 minutes; but there is no rule or prejudice against longer ones, which have been presented and will be again, as occasion serves.—Ed.)

RACE RELATIONS IN NEW ZEALAND

Sir,—The relationship between Maori and Pakeha is not frequently enough a matter of comment, and it is therefore all the more gratifying to see *The Listener* giving prominence to it. For those not actually engaged in study of the Maori the most common report concerns the criminal. This in itself is an indication of how badly he is adapting himself to the European community—or perhaps how little the European community is allowing the Maori to adapt himself. Dr. Winiata, Mr. Ritchie and Professor Piddington are all obviously aware that the situation is not as desirable as it might be. The Maori may not want to be wholly Europeanised, but let us also face the situation where most Pakehas would resent his demanding the social, cultural and economic equality that is the principle of the Welfare State.

In the state which he has reached in transit from his Stone Age tribal culture

LETTERS FROM LISTENERS

there is obvious confusion of values. A segregation or conscious effort to preserve what is left of his culture will not help him to solve the conflict. Historically, peoples that are overrun in such numbers by a later aggressive culture as to become a minority group do not survive as an intact culture unit. I cannot help agreeing with Mr. Ritchie that some at least "of the finer esoteric products of the Maori past (will achieve) their place functionally," but that the resultant society will be European. This is not a matter of ethnocentricity but one of cultural process.

Dr. Winiata himself understands the situation when he refers to "an illusion that they count for something in New Zealand society, that their supposed and real rights are being preserved, that their culture is being held intact, and that they are being heard as a group in the councils of the nation." And again when he mentions "the confined scope

More letters from listeners will be found this week on page 24

... for talented Maoris," and the fact that the Maori is being kept "out of the main stream of things in a place the Pakeha thinks the Maori should occupy in the community."

The dual system may indeed be a safety valve, but I would consider that if there is need of a safety valve there is also need of a drastic and truthful study of the conditions that make that valve necessary.

I do not deny that there "will be a distinct Maori section of the population in New Zealand for many years to come," or that "for purposes of full social and psychological satisfaction the Maori group offers (and in fact, gives) far more than the Pakeha side." The Maori is an alien in Pakeha society and naturally gets more pleasure from his own group, especially since the community belongingness of the marae has survived to a large degree. But I doubt very much the success of such confinement "by being a good Maori" in solving the wider problem of the interaction of the two peoples. In the results of Mr. Ritchie's community studies might be found a more realistic solution. His advice to Dr. Winiata, far from being presumptuous, might well prove to be wise in prophecy. It is unlikely that the Maori will be assigned a status superior to the low one he now occupies unless he is successful within the European culture boundaries.

MARIE RAE (Christchurch).

Sir,—It is difficult to understand exactly what Professor Piddington means, but I gather from his letter that he considers the Maoris' "legitimate cultural aspirations" are being "frustrated." Probably this statement would mystify the average Maori as much as it does me. Where the Maori receives special treatment, he appears to be favoured. It seems to me that the only real point at issue is whether, in so far as such matters can be affected by government action, it will be better for the country to gradually abolish the present special position of the Maoris, or to maintain and stress the differences—for example by sending a Maori representation to the Coronation.

There are countries like South Africa where a policy of segregation is necessary. In New Zealand, a small country, where assimilation is possible, it is foolish to attempt to foster a separate

racial group. To adopt Professor Piddington's simile of steam escaping from a safety valve, he seems mainly intent on increasing the pressure of steam.

A. DE VILLIERS (Auckland).

Sir,—Mr. Ritchie was quite right. Dr. Winiata said nothing new. His historical sketch of the development of the present stabilising devices in Maori-Pakeha relationships may be found in obscure official documents. But these facts are not revealed in the orthodox histories. To have done so would have earned the brand of sedition. Some pakeha writers like I. L. G. Sutherland, Miller, Norman Smith, Sinclair and Dick Scott have only recently given the hidden facts to the world, and incidentally repeated what was held and accepted as the true version of New Zealand history for very many years among the Maori people.

What was new was Dr. Winiata's interpretation of the changing functions conveniently attributed by the pakeha and the Maori to the specialised agencies that form the stabilising devices in New Zealand society. His hypotheses are worthy of serious consideration.

JAMES P. KOHU (Tauranga).

ANNA RUSSELL

Sir,—I was shocked, nay horrified, to discover that a third-rate satirist such as Anna Russell could fill the Auckland Town Hall when such notable celebrities as Nat "King" Cole and the Ink Spots could not arouse the interest of even the smallest percentage of the music-loving public. Such crude examples of satire as drawing a comparison between the Andrews Sisters and the Rhine Maidens leave me disgusted. Personally, I have a most profound respect and admiration for the integrity and artistry of the Andrews Sisters! This affection is heightened by the fact that I was privileged to be present at a concert given by these artists in New York in the early part of this century. What a thrilling emotional experience that was! I feel it my bounden duty, Sir, to warn you that if your paper continues publishing this satirist (it was not unexpected that Sebastian would style her "parodist without peer") you will find it divorced from all true music lovers.

BABY AUSTIN (Auckland).

TAVERNS IN THE TOWNS

Sir,—Readers usually have reason to be proud of *The New Zealand Listener*, and especially of the high standard of the editorials. The recent "Living With the Bomb" was a spring of hope and sanity in our desert of fear and unreason.

It is therefore disappointing to find the April 7 editorial, "Tavern Talk," devoted to a rather unfair complaint against another editor. *The Outlook* paragraph quoted there with so much displeasure does not précis an earlier *Listener* article, but merely refers to it as "asking for 10 o'clock closing." That would probably seem a fair description to most readers, whether opponents or supporters. The fact that a specific closing time was not previously mentioned does not justify a charge of misrepresentation. In this context, "10 o'clock closing" means simply the evening sale of liquor, and that is what "Taverns in the Towns" still seems to me to advocate.

The alternative précis given in the second paragraph of "Tavern Talk" would not do as a basis for discussion, as the key word, "reform," has no agreed

meaning. To one side it means progress toward universal total abstinence. To the other side it apparently means progress toward universal moderate drinking.

M.A. (Palmerston North).

Sir,—I am sorry that, in my comments column in the *Outlook*, I misinterpreted your article; and, particularly, that I took, from the context in which you used "reform," that you meant it in the current cant sense—i.e., as a euphemism for "extended hours." But if your article didn't mean what I took it to mean, what did it mean? Since your correspondents (mis)understood it as I did, could you spare space to tell us? A.M.R. (Christchurch).

The context in which we used "reform" included a plain statement that extended hours would be useless without improvements in the conditions for serving liquor. A.M.R. ignored this, together with much else: he still ignores it.—Ed.)

THE ROOT OF THE MATTER

Sir,—Mr. J. Malton Murray says: "I would first observe that you cannot remove faith from any mind." Would he affirm that mind is will and understanding, or love and wisdom? In God love and wisdom are perfect; in mankind imperfect, capable of perversion, also, fortunately, of conversion by repentance, what Jesus called being born again—a "must."

Mr. Murray wrote recently in *The Listener*: "I am as God made me." This discloses a false idea of himself, for God is still making him. So we can hope for him a better future than he appears to foresee. He reminds one of Robert Ingersoll, who said, "There is no darkness but ignorance," overlooking the darkness of error, a much more serious thing, and the chief ground of human suffering. Can Mr. Murray answer Pilate's question, "What is truth?" Perhaps he will discover faith and truth to be the same thing. In the N.T. faith is from the Greek "pistis," meaning steadfast. The life of Jesus gives us the supreme example of steadfastness, of faith. He is the truth, the faithful witness, as He said "to this end was I born." Others have trodden this ground before Mr. Murray and have found religious faith, the perception of truth and the acknowledgement of the Lord in His Word as their Daily Bread. Tolerance is shown supremely in the life of Jesus, however Christians have fallen short of their Master's example. He is, of course, the Light of the World—the Light which is Truth, Truth which is faith. Swendenborg put it thus: "Faith is the truth we believe from the Lord." A careful reading of the Lord's parable of the house on the rock and the house on the sand (Matt. 7) should help.

ROBERT J. STRONG (Auckland).

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

Fear First (Johnsonville): It has appeared elsewhere.

Wolbourn (New Plymouth): If you would precisely illustrate the tendency you describe, it would be possible to inquire into the alleged breach of the Service rule against profanity. In the incident you specify, an international cricketer was quoted; the quotation has been recalled; and it seems excessively severe to condemn it.

(Mrs.) G. C. Reakes (Levin): Many thanks Will pass on your request.

R. (Tauranga): You have misread it. The reviewer was not stating his own opinions, but was explaining that they had been held by previous biographers. And he made it quite clear that these opinions were refuted in the book under review.

(Mrs.) R. Jones (Blenheim): See page 6. Professor A. J. Noawl (Napier): Would have liked to use it, but it had to be held for lack of space, and the article which provoked it is now becoming remote.