

MARBLES BLINDLY ROLLING

Sir,—In your leading article of August 31 you refer, in general, to the effects, financial and otherwise, of the gambling habit. You leave untouched the more fundamental question, namely: is gambling right or wrong in ethical theory? May I suggest that the matter is worthy of discussion in your columns? Assuming that gambling may be defined as "the disposal of property by stake or wager by some method in which chance is the determining element," can it be said to be morally right? This will, of course, depend upon the ascertainment of some moral standard. If your standard is "reason," for example, gambling is clearly wrong, because the toss of a coin throws reason overboard. Perhaps some of your readers disagree with the definition or the standard. Rowntree and Lavers (*English Life and Leisure*) say that no Christian can be a gambler.

F. A. DE LA MARE (Eastbourne).

MOTHERS AT WORK

Sir,—I agree with your correspondents who commended a recent panel on their realistic approach to the problem of mothers at work. The discussion convinced me that economic necessity will continue to drive many mothers to work in spite of all protests that their place is in the home. Yet the plight of children of absentee parents, before and after school and in holidays, has been revealed by recent investigation to be in many cases no less real. How can the two sides of the problem be reconciled? Basil Henriques, an experienced social worker in England, suggests in his book *The Home Menders* that the only solution lies in enforced regulation of the hours worked by the mother of young children. He refers to the time last century when factory-owners fought the abolition of child labour on the grounds that it was indispensable to industry—and yet in time they adjusted themselves to do without it. Opposition to mothers working only in school hours, and to legislation preventing their employment beyond those times, would, he states, be similarly overcome if it could be effectively shown that the nation depends on more security in the home.

M.J.B. (Christchurch)

JAZZ IN NEW ZEALAND

Sir,—Varian J. Wilson's letter was the limit. Your correspondent obviously knows nothing about classical music, therefore he should not be so foolish as to show his ignorance to everyone. As for comments such as: "the four YC stations grinding out glutinous gloom," "hackneyed classical deadbeats," etc., I have never heard of anything more incorrect or in worse taste.

If Varian J. Wilson prefers jazz, then that's all right; but there's no need to write offensive things about classical music as well.

D. CLARK (Christchurch).

Sir,—It is time the older generation realised that modern music is here to stay. In reply to T.R.N. of Wellington and other enemies of contemporary music, I would like to say that, although more variety in musical programmes would be welcomed by many people, modern music and jazz are not the evils some people persuade themselves into thinking they are. Older people are liable to forget that contemporary music, as well as poetry, art, architecture and furniture have been formed from the qualities which were thought worth preserving from before World War I. These contain the new ideas of freedom of subject, style and form. Architecture and furniture of contemporary design

LETTERS FROM LISTENERS

have been accepted, as they have proved to be practical; but the less tangible arts have been criticised and rejected by many. It is time that older people realised that it is just as impossible to move backwards successfully in musical form as it is to use outdated forms of government. New ideals cannot be ignored. This has been proved time and time again, so give the younger generation their turn.

M.H. (Auckland).

Sir,—Last letter I wrote you was based on Mr. L. D. Austin, condemning him for his statements on jazz. This time I write commending the NZBS for what it is doing for jazz. I think that for those who do not own Hi Fi and player units to play their own discs, the Broadcasting Service does just about as good a job. Broadmindedness is very apparent, though one thing annoys me. Before a disc is played, I like to hear who is playing—the artists, etc. This is done for "Pop" discs; why not for real music?

More classical and orchestral music is played—obviously; but I wonder how many honest admirers of this art form there really are? The upper classes and pretentious upper classes make all-out advances after the arts—music being a predominant one. To be left out from these is to be out of the circle. There exists in jazz, also, a class such as this. They do not really like or attempt to appreciate the music, but to keep in the many varied cliques one must show a front.

The height of enjoyment in jazz music is no less than in classical. Psychologically, there is no testing scale for enjoyment in those who really enjoy classical music, and those who really enjoy real jazz music. Neither of the two types of individual has any right to run down the other. Both are art forms—perhaps different; both contain musical instruments; all musicians require the necessary art and ability to play. So a person enjoys something good, clean, and perhaps even informative. Who is the person to run this down?

RICHARD PARIS (Wellington).

PURCHASING POWER

Sir,—In the discussion between Mr. R. O. C. Marks and Mr. F. W. Holmes (*Question Mark*, August 30) both speakers treated the subject as a political policy, and left Social Credit, as propounded by its author, fairly severely alone. I can force myself to pass over points evaded by both speakers, but as Mr. Holmes is a lecturer in economics I cannot ignore three unscientific assertions he made.

Mr. Holmes stated that purchasing power can be cancelled in only three ways, of which spending was not one. Purchasing power, the only valuable property money has, is that attribute which enables the holder of money to obtain value without giving up value;—all he gives up is the money. If I have £1 and I want to buy from Mr. Holmes something of value, say a set of economics lecture notes worth £1, Mr. Holmes can only get my £1 by buying from me every farthing's worth of purchasing power there is in it. When he gives me full value he cancels my purchasing power. It's true he then has £1, but he wouldn't have had that if he hadn't himself imparted new purchasing power to it by trading value for the money.

Secondly Mr. Holmes asserted that a certain sum of money (£90 million I think it was) would be spent more than

once in a year, and would therefore have greater purchasing power. The sum spoken of was money which would as a matter of course pass to industry in exchange for goods and services. If we assume that industry is able to put that same money back into circulation by using it for working expenses, the £90 million is soon back in the hands of consumers. But alas, Sir, those consumers haven't got one pennyworth of extra purchasing power out of it, because they have had to sell £90 million worth of labour. So they spend it on further products of industry. But does industry get any purchasing power for nothing? Oh no, the consumers aren't foolish enough to give the money away either, but on the contrary they demand £90 million worth of value.

Mr. Holmes then abandons the something-for-nothing philosophy which so ill becomes a lecturer in economics. This time he makes a much more becoming allegation, namely that there is no discrepancy between consumer incomes and prices. Consider a block of capital assets put into commission N pricing cycles ago and now fully depreciated. The only consumer incomes distributed by any capital processes in the present cycle will be the expenditure, on new capital, of money collected during the past N cycles to make good depreciation and set up a new investment. Prices charged to consumers by industry are loaded in the current cycle with depreciation on the whole of the previously existing assets, plus those just put in commission,—i.e. the full amount of the payout to consumers; and plus money for investment in future cycles (including an Nth of the increase in investment planned to take place in N cycles time). For Mr Holmes's allegation to work out, it would be necessary to make good depreciation and add all additional capital assets in dribs and drabs at the same rate as depreciation, and step by step with the charging of investment into prices. Not something-for-nothing this time, but just as impracticable.

K. O'BRIEN (Hastings)

ON THE SEVENTH DAY

Sir,—Mr. P. J. Alley's conclusion that Sunday observance is silly is perfectly logical if one accepts the premise that God has died, or that He never existed, in which case, of course, religious principle ceases to have any value as a motivating power.

Besides those who disparage Sunday observance for agnostic reasons there are many, I believe, who regard the matter as of merely religio-academic interest, when—like many other concerns which have their basis in religious belief—it is primarily of social importance. Addison, whose *Spectator* essays were written with the purpose of social (not religious) reform, wrote: "If keeping holy the seventh day were only a human institution, it would be the best method that could have been thought of for polishing and civilising of mankind. Sunday clears away the rust of the whole week." And Macaulay commented: "That day is not lost. While industry is suspended, while the plough lies in the furrow, while the Exchange is silent, while no smoke ascends from the factory, a process is going on quite as important to the wealth of nations as any process which is performed on more busy days. Man, the machine of machines, the machine compared with

which all the contrivances of the Watts and the Arkwrights are worthless, is repairing and winding up, so that he returns to his labours on the Monday with clearer intellect, with livelier spirits, with renewed corporal vigour."

According to the French atheist, Voltaire, England's greatness rested on her observance of Sunday. By abandoning it we are losing one of the most valuable shaping forces of our national character.

D. A. HOGG (Te Awamutu).

(This correspondence is now closed.—Ed.)

THE SULLEN BELL

Sir,—Mr. David Hall's review of Dan Davin's *The Sullen Bell* strives to be fair, but unconcealed irritation clouds for once his judgment. To damn the novel because "no religion is mentioned" is naive, and ignores the author's compassionate insight into the troubled lives of a group of New Zealanders in a real situation (not "a goldfish bowl"). Mr. Hall's chatter about "goodies" and "bad New Zealanders" is childish. Most of the characters are a subtle blend of good and bad qualities, manners and humours. Of course they are not all lovable. But then Mr. Davin is not a sentimentalist.

JOHN MILLER (Wellington)

CRICKET SUMMARIES

Sir,—Apparently "Civis" of Wanganui is no cricket lover. Neither am I for that matter, but I like to keep abreast with current topics even to a cricket summary.

"Civis" further states that the time taken for the cricket summaries was from 7.18 a.m. to 7.30 a.m. This is incorrect. During the final test match I took careful note of the time each day as follows:—

August 24: 7.18 to 7.24 a.m.
August 25: 7.18 to 7.25 a.m.
August 26: 7.18 to 7.23 a.m.
August 28: No play to record
August 29: 7.18 to 7.27 a.m. (final day)

I can only suggest that if "Civis" is so afraid of missing the time for six or seven minutes, in future, when there are commentaries or otherwise, he buys a reliable watch and switches off YA stations. I shall continue to listen and appreciate the service.

UNSELFISH (Auckland)

ARRIVAL OF SPRING

Sir,—The Listener has just arrived with its pages by Spring contributors—their springs a trifle rusty and disillusioned. They should be here this afternoon; it is truly Spring. The birds are singing, the violets fragrant; there is blossom in abundance and a joyous blue sky and sun. Who says we don't have Spring? I did not realise yesterday what I know today; the day the children go back to school after their winter holiday is the first day of Spring. Now I must pick some impudent mint to go with our first spring "lamb," pseudo potatoes and last year's frozen peas.

SEASONING (Rotorua)

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

E.A.E. (Dunedin): Enigma Variations (Elgar).

Mary (Wellington): (1) Who are not "given the chance"? The chance is there, open to anybody who shows the qualifications. (2) The engagement of touring professionals extends the range of voices and talents and of plays performable. (3) Of 75 listed, 25 are New Zealand-born; 35 are born overseas, including many long resident in New Zealand, and some used for French, German and other foreign accents; and 15, ~~instruments~~ not presently available. (4) Nothing is the matter with "natural voices," if their quality is naturally good and they are naturally well used.