

THE INTERVENTION

Sir,—In the *Lookout* broadcast of Saturday, January 19, Mr. L. F. Rudd referred to what he called "the indirect lesson of the Suez affair" and "the lesson for the British Empire." When he spoke of the Anglo-French operation he called it "our combined forces."

The lesson Mr. Rudd would have "us" learn from Suez is that the operations would have "succeeded" if planning, timing and military preparations had been more skilfully carried out. To reinforce his contention, he described 200,000 Italians captured in the desert during World War II as being "better soldiers than the Egyptians are or ever will be."

I listened patiently for some expression of regret or contrition—or even of doubt—at Britain's aggression in Suez, but there was none. The speaker felt no guilt at what Britain and France had done, in spite of world-wide condemnation by the overwhelming majority of free countries; and what was worse to me as a New Zealander, he not only felt no remorse at New Zealand's support for Britain's act, but so identified this country's aims with those of Britain that he could speak of . . . "our combined forces."

I was immediately reminded of the Germans I had met who had said, "We would have won the war if Hitler had not attacked Russia, or, if we had invaded England in 1942." There was the same absence of any feeling of guilt for crimes committed.

Speakers like Mr. Rudd (and they are only too common on *Lookout*) represent only a section of public opinion in this country but can do us untold harm among our Asian neighbours. It is time someone told Mr. Rudd that the British Empire has long since become the Commonwealth, and that English invasion forces are not necessarily "ours."

The views of far too many clear-thinking New Zealanders are ignored by the NZBS in its choice of *Lookout* speakers and far too much time is given to the editors of conservative newspapers. Let us have more trade-unionists, school teachers, and speakers from (say) the World Federalist movement, the Rationalist Association and various University groups, and less of those whose outmoded doctrines are liable to undo much of the good we have achieved by our part in the Colombo Plan.

O. E. MIDDLETON (Patumahoe).

THE REVOLT IN HUNGARY

Sir,—In his reply to my letter on the Hungarian revolt, S. W. Scott like many late life converts, political or religious, has gone from one extreme to the other. He now believes that the Russians are completely wrong and that the Hungarian rebels are completely right.

It would be most surprising if this conflict is quite as Hollywood as all that. There are always two sides to any question, unfortunately we seldom get the chance to examine the facts until the events are long over. Mr. Scott has followed the usual practice of accepting the facts which support his belief and rejecting the others.

He tells us, for instance, that it is impossible for any quantity of arms to get into Hungary from the west, because border control, by the army presumably, is too good. But he then asks us to believe that this same army gave its arms away to the rebels, since "almost to a man" it supported their cause! He can hardly have it both ways.

The exact part played by radio propaganda is of course very difficult to

LETTERS FROM LISTENERS

assess, but those people who have poured many millions into this work must feel that they are getting some return. As for radio propaganda being "decisive," well that is Mr. Scott's idea, not mine, but it is plain that he has little idea of the vigour or extent of these transmissions. No one doubts that economic forces played a major part in the revolt, but the Hungarians are surely not so simple that they got themselves killed merely to make indignation in the west. To any reasonable outside observer it was patently obvious that they had no chance against the Red Army, without outside help. Or are we to believe that Moscow organised the revolt as a sort of training exercise, or as an excuse to indulge in a blood purge?

In asking me to examine the facts more clearly Mr. Scott really means that I should accept the particular set of facts he uses to bolster his beliefs, and reject all others. It's fairly plain that even if he has changed his opinions he has stuck to his dialectical method.

Finally, with an extraordinary assumption of infallibility Mr. Scott says that he has taken off his political blinkers, and asks me to do the same. To me it seems that he has merely changed them for a pair of a different colour.

STUDENT (Wellington).

THE MIDDLE EAST

Sir,—In his *Lookout* talk, January 19, Mr. L. F. Rudd said Mr. Dulles had made it clear that there was no room for the co-operation of Britain and France in the Eisenhower Plan. Cable news reported that Mr. Dulles, admitting Britain and France had not been consulted, also said: "I cannot think of anything that would more surely turn the area over to international Communism than for us to go there hand in hand with Britain and France." This is a startlingly fatuous declaration. It means that two important allies are thrown overboard by the United States in an attempt to curry favour with an Egyptian Hitler who is no more trustworthy than the German one. Nasser has published in black and white his dream of being head of an Arab bloc in power, sitting pretty at the "cross-roads of the world," with Muslims exercising "power without limit." He has brazenly and for long defied the United Nations and got away with it. And his strewing of some fifty ships to block the canal (when a tenth of that would have done the job) is an example of either blind stupidity or wilful aggression.

A series of relatively toothless generalisations, plus a plan to use a mixture of bribery and threat, are a poor substitute for a three-power agreement and declared policy for the Middle East. The United States, Britain and France hand in hand, is a combination far more likely to check or prevent Soviet aggression, than a solo adventure by the United States which is not different in motive from that of Britain and France, viz., the protection of interests.

Some of the pressure being put on Israel should be applied to Nasser to compel him to pledge unqualified freedom of navigation through the canal. Any policy that leaves the canal under Egyptian sovereignty or control means a continuance of trouble. Egypt should not be allowed to use it as a weapon in an anti-Jewish vendetta. It should be placed under an international authority,

administering it independently of Egypt while giving Egypt its due share of income therefrom.

J. MALTON MURRAY (Oamaru).

ENEMY OF FREEDOM

Sir,—Mr. N. E. Downey is surely wrong in thinking that Communism thrives in "run to seed liberalism," whatever that may be. No liberal country that is a free country, educated to responsibility and abhorrent of tyranny, has ever gone Communist of its own free will. It is because McCarthy attempted to destroy these safeguards, and so nearly succeeded, as I watched at first hand for two sad years, that he was so dangerous.

It is not the economic creed of Communism that we should hate; much of that has been adopted by all countries, including America. It is the hateful incidental evils with which it has always so far been accompanied. And the evils of McCarthyism were so similar: the rule of fear, the anonymous accuser, combination of prosecutor with both jury and judge, the extra-legal penalty, abrogation of right of appeal, religious bias in selection of victims, and so on. What is the difference except in degree? One poison is not an antidote to another.

These evils are as old as history and the struggle against them may be unending. What is so important is that we should recognise them and fight them wherever they appear and under whatever name, rather than merely attempt to replace one kind of tyranny with another.

G. I. HITCHCOX
(Petone).

Sir,—I must voice protest against your correspondent, E. S. Downey, who condemns your support of Ship's satire on McCarthyism. If a people were to give continued support to investigators such as McCarthy, they would soon find that the liberty and peace of mind they were trying to protect was being swallowed whole by the very instrument set up to give this protection. I do believe that it was on this realisation that feeling on the part of the American people brought about McCarthy's downfall. Surely the argument is not against anti-Communism, but against elements in which budding dictators are given free rein to terrorise society. I put to Mr. Downey that a rule of McCarthyism would be as bad a medicine to have forced down one's throat as a rule of those types who invariably dominate Communism. In fact, I have a sneaking suspicion that, just like The Colonel's lady and Judy O'Grady—

Krushchev and McCarthy,
Are sisters under the skin.

R. S. RADFORD (Palmerston North).

VICTORIA AND TADMOR

Sir,—This concerns two (repeated) errors in spelling in various issues of the *Listener*. (1) The name of a 16th Century composer, Vittoria, whose delightful music is on the air this (Saturday) evening. In a number of issues of your journal the name is spelt erroneously "Victoria," and the announcer, unfortunately, has just repeated the error. (2) This relates to that interesting talk a few weeks ago dealing with the Tadmor Valley, when the *Listener* published the name "Tadmor Valley" incorrectly, from time to time. My activities in Nelson (1919-1921) frequently concerned the Tadmor Valley farmers, and contiguous areas of Matariki, Sherry

River and Korere, where there were a number of returned servicemen. On page 667 of the *New Zealand Guide*, Mr. E. S. Dollimore, F.R.G.S., states that the name is derived from the Biblical Tadmor, built by Solomon "in the wilderness," in allusion to the isolation of the settlement in its beginnings. As the talk indicated, the district is a place of small farmers: now with the memory of a closed railway which has served their transport needs since 1910.

W. H. WARREN (Timaru).

(We bow to Tadmor, but not to Vittoria. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Music* uses Vittoria (he was born at Avila, Old Castle), and explains that the "common Italianisation of his name (Vittoria) comes from his spending in Rome about 30 years of the earlier part of his life."—Ed.)

THE DUCHESS OF WINDSOR

Sir,—From time to time I am surprised at the ignorance or lack of general knowledge displayed by radio commentators, but today during *Book Shop* I received one of my greatest shocks. It was to hear G. C. A. Wall refer to the writer of *The Heart has its Reasons* as Her Royal Highness, the Duchess of Windsor! Surely he was aware of the fact that in 1937 the late King had been advised by both British and Dominion Prime Ministers that he must limit the title, style and attribute of Royal Highness to his brother alone. For to quote the Duchess: "The title was to be withheld from me and from the issue, if any, of our marriage. David would henceforth be known as His Royal Highness and Duke of Windsor, and I would be the Duchess of Windsor." Can you wonder at my surprise?

AUDREY J. LASH (Hastings).

(Yes. A great many other people would have been equally ignorant. So much depends on what one has been reading lately.—Ed.)

MEN'S HAIR

Sir,—If your correspondents chose to study hatless mankind in the mass, they would find that 90 per cent of men without hats have poor heads of hair. In Wellington, the prevalence of windy conditions offers some excuse for the hatless; but they should do as I do—wear a cap.

Another reason for incipient baldness in men is the pernicious custom of premature hair-cutting in early boyhood. To ensure good growth in later life, a boy's hair should not be cut until his third or fourth year; infringement of this rule is barbarous.

L. D. AUSTIN
(Wellington).

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

Toscanini Fan (Linden): You would perhaps not have made so stiff a breeze about it if you had stopped to think that the immediate tribute of that programme need not stand in the way of a fuller, duly publicised memorial programme later. You will be able to hear such a programme and will find it, in your vivid phrase, "as satisfying as a good feed," we hope.

R. P. Quinn (Taite): Thank you. Will pass on your request.

J.A.C. (Dunedin): They are printed as supplied.

Opus 1 (Wellington): The selection is made carefully and under expert advice. Thanks for suggestion.

D. Gillies (Dunedin): Regret information not available.

A True Scot (Hawera): For the last five years 2YA has presented a Burns Night programme; other stations have been less regular. In 1955, for instance, 1YA, 3YA, and 1XH, as well as 2YA, celebrated the occasion; last year 2YA did so alone. This year January 25 fell on a Friday, when 2YA had fixed commitments it could not set aside. What could be done, therefore, was done in the "Gathering of the Clans" programme the evening before.