

HOW THINGS BEGAN

Sir,—Reverting to the subject of self-contradiction, Father Duggan now tells us (*Listener*, January 20) that one of the propositions which he describes in his book as self-contradictory is only "mediately" so, i.e., that not it, but its combination with the admission of some other proposition, is self-contradictory, or rather would be self-contradictory—for the philosophers with whom he is arguing at this point do not make the admission in question. This novel extension of the notion of self-contradiction would make it applicable to any proposition which a man believes to be false on any grounds whatever. Thus since I believe that God does not turn stones into statues (without human agency), I may call it "mediately" self-contradictory to say that He does, since it would be "immediately" self-contradictory to say that He both does and does not (i.e., sometimes does and never does). But I can hardly imagine anyone who holds that God does turn stones into statues being much moved by this consideration, nor can I see that he logically ought to be.

Father Duggan also tells us now that the statement that a change may be causeless is "self-contradictory, if you admit that a change must have a cause." If this is another "mediate" self-contradiction, i.e., if Father Duggan merely means that a man would contradict himself if he admitted that every change must have a cause and at the same time denied it, I agree. But this is much less than what he maintains both in his book and in his first letter, namely, that a man contradicts himself when he simply does not admit that every change must have a cause. However, I agree with this, too, if the word "change" is being used, as Father Duggan now tells us he is using it, in such a sense that "being caused" is part of its meaning (though how he differentiates a "change" in this sense of his from an "effect," he declines to inform us). Certainly anything that is caused is caused, and certainly this cannot be denied without self-contradiction. But this is more than is generally meant by "change." When a thing has a certain quality (or relation to other things) at one time, and lacks it (perhaps having some other instead) at another, or has more or less of some quality at one time than at another, or exists at one time but not at another—in all these cases (my list is substantially Aristotle's) there is what would generally be called "change," whether these alterations have causes or not. And a man may hold without self-contradiction (though I do not say that he may hold truly) that some of them have not. The truism that any of them that have causes have causes, which we now learn is all that Father Duggan means by "Every change has a cause," has simply no bearing on the point. (To appeal to it would be like arguing that it is self-contradictory to say that some men are not married, because it is self-contradictory to deny that all married men are married.)

ARTHUR N. PRIOR
(Christchurch).

A WORLD OF THEIR OWN?

Sir,—Could you suggest to the *Look-out* commentators that some of their listeners would like to hear a criticism of the farce being staged at present by the United Nations Central Organisation? A short while back its members determined that Jerusalem, "shall be" an International City, when anybody with the least sense of reality could have

LETTERS FROM LISTENERS

told them that Israel would have none of it. And now the nominee of the displaced Chinese Government is the chairman of the month! Is it just bad stage management, or are these members living in a world of their own as did the diplomats of the period between the two world wars?

JOSEPH B. G. SMITH (Auckland).

"I SAW IN MY DREAM"

Sir,—The alteration of a word in my review of *I Saw In My Dream* has altered my meaning: I referred to "the second section" (not "edition") of the novel, in which the chief character's name is changed, the first part being a direct reprint of *When the Wind Blows*.

DAVID HALL (Dunedin).

HOUSEWIVES ARE HUMAN

Sir,—In her letter of December 16, Ruth France seems to have in mind the discussion by the Women's Panel of a question that I submitted regarding the formation of a women's party to provide members of Parliament to represent women only. She states that there is a movement on foot among women's organisations to bring this about, but so far as I know this is not so. When I submitted the question to the panel I was acting entirely on my own account. I am not a member of any women's organisations, and the idea of a women's party in Parliament came to me out of the blue whilst listening to Parliament one morning. It seemed to me that our democratically elected members of Parliament are so hopelessly and muddle-headedly male that nothing in the way of progress can be expected from them. "These men," I thought, "have no ideas to sell, and no currency with which to buy ideas from others!" Their pompous utterances were filled with the masculine refusal to face up to facts.

It seemed to me then, and it still seems to me in spite of Ruth France's plaintive animadversions, that what this country needs is a women's party devoted to gaining a majority of elected representatives in Parliament so that the inglorious muddle made by a hundred years of man-rule could be cleaned up by the application of feminine shrewdness and clear-headedness. Where men blunder and bludgeon their way round the outskirts of a problem until they find themselves quite unintentionally involved in a strike or a war, women

cut cleanly to the heart of the problem with a ruthlessness that comes with the ability to recognise essential factors. It is from fear of this ability that men have attempted to hold women in subjection throughout recorded time and have been reluctant even in recent times to allow the so-called privileges of democracy to them. Some women make a show of pleading for equality with men as human beings, and imagine that by this means they are raising the status of women; but in reality they are simply pleading for the continued subjection of women. They do not realise that men have always been ready to grant equality to women as human beings—provided the women did not seek equality as legislators, judiciaries, and administrators.

It is exactly this withheld equality that the world needs, for without it I see no hope that the ramping nation states, jingling with the sentimental trappings of honour, sovereignty, and commercial advantage that men have decked them out in, may be curbed away from war and broken to the plough of world federation. Women have the power to subdue the pride of the nation states, because women do not believe in the things the nation states stand for. These things come from the childish imaginings of men, the vast majority of whom still want to play at soldiers or be king of the castle right on into senility. And in this you will find the reason for men's fear of women's ability to recognise essential factors in a given situation; they are afraid of having their toys smashed. What is needed, as another New Zealand object-lesson to the world, is a party of independent women and a woman prime minister.

AGNES R. McLEOD (Johnsonville).
(Abridged.—Ed.)

THE HUNGRY GRAMOPHIL

Sir,—I would like to support "Gramophil's" plea, in your issue of January 13, for the best recordings. I suppose that the less satisfactory records, having been bought, must sometimes be used, but I have long noticed that the most satisfying records of this or that piece seem to get shelved—perhaps on the Gresham law that the bad records drive out the good!

Much the most gripping playing of Liszt's Campanella is Levitsky's, yet I've not heard it in ten years of radio listening. Isador Goodman's, the one we usually get, is poor by comparison—

dead, in fact. Easily the best record I know of the *Enigma Variations* is that made by Elgar himself on his seventieth birthday. That of Sir Adrian Boult, the one we seem always to receive, is not nearly as arresting as the one conducted by the composer.

I would not advocate shelving all except the best performances, but I do at least stand for all being brought out in turn, so that we may see what each conductor or performer makes of the score. So, too, with plays and readings. At least, don't banish the best.

F. K. TUCKER (Gisborne).

MUSICAL EXTREMISTS

Sir,—If L. D. Austin could use his influence to provide a cart-load of manure for my garden—whatever the smell!—either dumped outside the front gate, or preferably taken round the back in sacks, I would be the first to admit that at last one of his letters had served some practical use.

H.J.F. (Wellington).

BOWLING RESULTS

Sir,—Can you tell me who decides that the New Zealand Bowling Association may have only a few minutes each evening to broadcast the results of the day's play?

It seems most unjust that results of racing, cricket, tennis and other sports should be repeated *ad nauseam* throughout the programme, while relatives and friends of bowlers taking part in the tournament have great difficulty in distinguishing the names of successful competitors, owing to the speed the announcer is obliged to use in order to complete his list in the required six minutes or so.

KITTY (Christchurch).

(Similar arrangements made last year proved satisfactory to bowlers generally.—Ed.)

TREATMENT OF STRANGERS

Sir,—Visitors to our shores comment on the hospitality offered to them, or the lack of it; and both are correct. I have lived long in New Zealand, and I had one long spell in England. In both countries one will meet most kind hospitality, and also that reserve or shyness which does not readily open out to anyone. We read that it is the same in lots of other lands.

PAUA (Auckland).

THE KAFKA PROBLEM

Sir,—In a recent ZB Book Review, J. C. Reid, speaking of "The Kafka Problem," referred to Franz Kafka twice as "the Czech writer." Kafka was born in 1883 in Prague, which was Austrian then, and died in 1924, only six years after the establishment of the Czech Republic. All his works, to the best of my knowledge, were written in German and not in Czech, and it is quite possible that he did not know Czech very well. We cannot expect exactness in Quiz answers: but in a literary review we should get reliable information.

CRITIC (Wellington).

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

J.B.G.S. (Auckland).—Have passed on your suggestion.

Passed (Hawera).—We agree. A change will be made.

Ivory Tower (Christchurch).—The term "ivory tower" was invented by Flaubert. He used it in a letter written in 1852.

GUIDE TO GAMES LISTENING

DURING the past week there has been an extension in the coverage allotted by the NZBS to Empire Games broadcasts. A brief guide for listeners is included below, but complete details of the broadcasts can be found in the programme pages of this issue.

COMMENTARIES (YA stations linked):

10.0 a.m. Cycling (Monday). (Subsidiary stations until after Devotional Service.)
11.30 a.m. Rowing (Monday).
1.30-5.0 p.m. Athletics (Sat., Tues., Thurs., Sat.); Rowing (Mon.); Swimming (Wed., Fri.). (approx.)
7.30-10.30 p.m. Swimming (Sat., Mon.); Wrestling (Sat., Mon., Tues.); Boxing (Wed., Thurs., Fri.); Cycling (Tues., Thurs., Sat.).

SUMMARIES (YA and YZ stations):

7.18 a.m. Previous evening's results, and preview of coming day's highlights.
11.0 a.m. Progress results of morning's events (YA stations only). (approx.)
12.33 p.m. Morning events.
6.40-7.0 p.m. Morning and afternoon results, with edited highlights.
11.15 p.m. Complete day's results.

Results of diving, fencing, weight-lifting, lawn bowls and water polo will be interspersed among the commentaries in the afternoons and evenings. Stations 1XH, 1XN, 2XA, 2XG, 2XP, 2XN, 3XC, and 2ZA will remain on the air to broadcast the final summary of results each day at 11.15 p.m. The opening and closing ceremonies, at 1.30 p.m. on Saturday, February 4, and 10.0 p.m. on Saturday, February 11, will be broadcast by the YA and YZ stations.