

THE MANTLE OF POWER

Sir,—Your contributor to *Auckland Notebook* in the Spring Number of *The Listener* appears to think that teachers are a bad lot and that good-looking women-teachers should marry out as quickly as possible. But is G. leF. Y. willing to do his share of minding the young when the teaching profession packs up as he so obviously desires?

Some people, when bumped into by the backwards-walking young, don't glare as the young teacher did in Auckland. They swear. Is swearing better than glaring, or is the person bumped into supposed to apologise, nowadays, to the boy?

G. leF. Y. calls young teachers "boys" and "girls." Schoolboys he calls "men." Following this out logically, with the 20 years handicap which he admits to, he is a babe-in-arms. Is it really the teachers' fault that he feels so bad, or does he need the all-seeing eye himself? The real implications of the incident he relates are missing from his account of it.

ERLE ROSE (Wellington).

MARBLES BLINDLY ROLLING

Sir,—Mr. de la Mare's definition of the word "gamble" hardly covers its full scope. My dictionary tells me that to gamble is to play for money or property in games of chance or skill. With regard to the morality of such an undertaking, would Mr. de la Mare say that to "play the market" on the Stock Exchange is for one to lose any claim to be a Christian? Again, if two equally good chess players wagered £100 on the result of a game, would reason go overboard? Skill would be the dominating factor but the game none the less a gamble. Personally, I think most of our life on this earth is a gamble; some have all the good luck while others fight a hopeless battle against the turn of fortune's wheel. I am certainly not in favour of either man or woman gambling with money they cannot afford to lose. But the ethics vary according to circumstances. The parable of the Talents still holds good today; either freeze your assets in sterility or take a risk and make them twofold. It's all a gamble.

W. HOLMES (Palmerston North)

POLIO VACCINATION

Sir,—Dr. Turbott says, "As far as is known no doctor in New Zealand is opposed to the use of the Salk vaccine." Well, here's one at least who is, fiercely and implacably, of knowledge and understanding.

If the appearances sometimes called polio were "a disease," and if the primary cause were a virus or germ; and if the virus or germ attacked people from outside themselves, then attempts at immunisation by vaccination might be logical. But unfortunately for those most concerned, none of these is the case. "Polio" is merely one evidence and effect of a toxic-deficiency condition, due to vitamin and mineral deficiency and auto-intoxication. Trying to hide the evidence, without correcting the criminal or the crime, is what Dr. Turbott proposes to do.

As Sir Robert McCarrison demonstrated some thirty years ago, dogs deprived of vitamin B always become paralysed. Young growing animals need more vitamin B than adults. Effects of vitamin deficiency are always aggravated when the rest of the diet is badly unbalanced. Animals, and human beings, living on diets deficient in vitamin B may exist for years just above the level

LETTERS FROM LISTENERS

where paralysis occurs and be pushed below it by any accident, illness, or shock. And a virus is a degradation of protein, sometimes produced in the intestines of those living unhealthily, by the unhealthy condition.

Most New Zealanders are struggling to live dangerously short of minerals and vitamins, especially vitamin B, their badly unbalanced diets made worse still by consumption of enormous quantities of refined starch and sugar in cakes, sweets, coloured drinks, and ice cream; not to mention shiploads of poisonous vaccines and drugs. Tens of thousands are living, precariously, just above the level where paralysis occurs. (But it must not be supposed that the above is the only cause of polio; fear, poisoning by vaccines and drugs, and ergotised dairy products are others.)

Meanwhile, the public is ceaselessly deluged, by Dr. Turbott and the Department of Health, with bug, drug, and disease propaganda, the effect of which is to keep the people sick, afraid, and running to medical men; while those who try to enlighten are banned from the press and the air.

People, by wrong thinking and wrong feeding and habits, cause disease; disease, sometimes, gives rise to disease germs; and though appearances can often be modified, the uncomfortable consequences of unhealthy living cannot be prevented by artificial means. There is no need to try. Just refrain from causing unhealthy conditions. Abolish food refining; teach, enable, and encourage people to think and live healthily; and there will, almost immediately, be no more polio, diphtheria, or tuberculosis, and, very soon, hardly any disease at all; and certainly no more attempts at keeping God's marvellous children well by poisoning their blood streams with dirt grown on the kidneys of dead monkeys

ULRIC WILLIAMS
(Wanganui).

("This correspondent is the exception," said Dr. Turbott when this letter was shown to him. "He apparently differs from the rest of his colleagues in New Zealand. There is no point in debating his very personal views. Let us wait and see what happens as regards protection against paralysis after polio vaccination."—Ed.)

Sir,—If, as Dr. Turbott states, New Zealand doctors are in favour of the polio vaccination campaign, then they differ from the majority of doctors in England who are strongly opposed to mass vaccination. Also, a panel of doctors recently advised the West German Government against mass vaccination because they believe vaccinated children become carriers of the disease.

The English doctors' view is that the Ministry of Health is premature in launching a vaccination programme, that there has not been time for the vaccine to be proved either safe or effective, and that mass vaccination is a gross waste of public monies since so many already naturally immunised or unsusceptible people have to be inoculated to prevent one fatal or paralytic case. (McHammon, Br. Med. Jnl. 13/3/54, gives the figures 11,000 for 1 in an epidemic area and about 50,000 for 1 in a non-epidemic area.)

As far as W.H.O. sponsorship of polio vaccination is concerned, the right hand of this organisation apparently does not know what the left hand is doing. In every talk I have listened to on the advisability of having children vaccin-

ated, the statement has been made (it was also made by the M.O.H. on the panel previously mentioned) that immunisation has almost banished diphtheria from our midst; therefore one can expect the Salk vaccine to do the same for polio. Recently, however, Dr. Pascua, Chief Statistician to W.H.O., stated that immunisation could not be counted a major factor in the control of diphtheria because the disease has diminished equally in countries where immunisation is not practised!

MARY I. STROOBANT (Auckland).

(This letter was shown to Dr. Turbott, who replied as follows: "The correspondent's information does not tally with that which we have received. Immunisation has been potent in controlling diphtheria. During the last war Great Britain immunised very thoroughly against diphtheria. Hungary protected itself with a regularly pursued and widely accepted immunisation campaign. Germany, Sweden, Denmark, Norway and Finland did not bother about immunisation. While the war was on diphtheria flared up in Germany to the tune of a quarter of a million cases a year. The German armies carried this virulent diphtheria with them and neighbouring European countries had 150,000 deaths from this cause in the war years. Hungary escaped this European epidemic. So did Great Britain. The other countries between them had 600,000 cases a year. Norway and Sweden started immunisation in 1944, and in both countries cases fell away and epidemics stopped. There is world-wide acceptance nowadays of the value of immunisation against diphtheria."—Ed.)

WILDE IN AUSTRALIA

Sir,—Well, now we have it. An Australian Goon Show. I knew that it must come—they have been moving so indomitably in that direction; but they have surpassed all reasonable expectation with the perfect, the unadulterated, goonery of this the latest of the subgoon series known as Surf Radio Theatre.

Wilde wrote a novel about a fashionably beautiful young man called Dorian Gray, who fell in love, in the course of things, with a beautiful and talented young Shakesperian actress. They fall in love in spite of social barriers. The beautiful young man takes two of his fashionable friends to witness the talent and beauty of his love. Alas, new-found love has made the girl indifferent to the play; having come to feel the beauty of life itself, she suddenly finds acting a sad pretence, and so acts badly for the first time.

The reaction of one of Dorian's friends: "... one of the loveliest creatures that he had ever seen ... shy grace ... the voice was exquisite—but from the point of view of tone it was absolutely false." So. What do the Australians do? Fearing that the great colonial radio public may to some extent miss the nice distinction between an "exquisite, but false" tone and their own habitual unexquisite and false tones, they have the girl SING instead; and to make the distinction quite clear (the girl is Common, see, dear; actresses didn't have the cachet they have today: the guys, they're aristocracy, get it?) they have her sing in the voice of a dribbling village idiot, old style. An' ya know what they have her sing? A Shakesperian sonnet, maybe? Nah. They have her sing, in a sorta Aussie Cockney, "Goo-baie li'l yaller boid ... And that where Mr. Wilde had the "exquisite voice" speaking "Sweet, good-night/This bud of love by summer's ripening breath/may prove a beauteous flower when next we meet."

And there's the bit where Dorian has murdered a man, gets a friend to dispose of the body, looks into the

room which had held the body, and stutters, "Where—where—is the—the—THING?" Just like in a Karloff movie, see.

And instead of Lord Henry saying "She's very lovely ... she's beautiful," they get him to say, sorta snooty like, "a pretty enough little thing." An' all like that, see.

Now, let us not fail to credit others in the field—almost any Australian (and, be it boasted, New Zealand) rendition of an English society play is commendable goonery; but this! I'm afraid they've left us far behind.

I do, however, suggest to the persons who adapted the novel, that they have missed their most profitable vocation. Have done with these merely verbal caricatures and plunge into the rich visual field of the strip cartoon. Your metier, fellas. Why, you've got all of English literature before you yet. Think of Shakespeare, alone. And if you are really capable of maintaining the high-goon level of this latest sample of your work—why, men who knows (up portentous music, please), you may even attain the FILLUMS! HOLLYWOOD guys!

LOVE THAT SOAP (Auckland).

JAZZ IN NEW ZEALAND

Sir,—I have read with interest the numerous listeners' comments about musical taste as provoked by Mr. L. D. Austin. No longer should jazz enthusiasts be regarded by longhair critics as primitive freaks. Jazz is music of intellectual value which brings great pleasure to those lucky enough to possess the potential for understanding and appreciating Western modes with Negro rhythms.

Music appreciation is a faculty possessed by many in some classes, but few in all classes. As Highland pipe bands or Beethoven sonatas inspire those equipped with suitable mental receiving devices, so true imaginative jazz improvisation or orchestration creates in a jazz lover the satisfaction which Mr. Austin and his kind are so unlucky not to possess. Idiom is a force to be reckoned with, and the said correspondents are, I feel, musically incomplete if they fail to get the message in other fields besides the ones in which they so narrowly specialise.

Shouldn't we, who love an art-form other than theirs, be tolerated?

S. D. BUCHANAN (Ranfurly).

Sir,—Your correspondent Mr. L. D. Austin's action in condemning jazz and then withdrawing from combat may be likened to that of a boxer who throws in the towel before his opponent has entered the ring. Can it be that, like the boxer, Mr. Austin knows he is beaten before he starts? One is inclined to wonder

P. J. I. CROOKS
(Auckland).

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

David Jenkins (Marton): Afraid there is no serious alternative.

B. A. Holmes (Hamilton): Thanks. The opinion you express is of great interest to the Service; but the question is, of course, one of Government policy.

Pop (Wanganui): Thanks for an interesting exception to the usual (though infrequent) form of complaint, that the season is too early. The present time was fixed after weighing many considerations.

A. England (Christchurch): (1) "Miss out" in seeing, yes, but not in hearing. Time available enters into these arrangements; so does the question of halls available. (2) In 1954, South Island 11, North Island 10; 1955, South Island 8, North Island 8; 1956, South Island 4, North Island 19.