

Sir,—Is "Doodlebug" really serious when he describes Dr. Duff's review and his own echoing as calm appraisal? I have already countered several of the objections put forward in the original review and "Doodlebug's" letters, e.g., the bow-and-arrow argument for one. Do I win here by default? Is this scientific method, to ignore a successful demonstration and continue to introduce new objections, thoughtless ones?

Moa-hunter stone and bone artifacts, all that remain, their woodwork having vanished, show similarities with Kwa-kiuti culture elements. The same applies to many aspects and characteristics of Maori culture: there are similarities. But this proves nothing. It is when the number and quality of such similarities become striking that we are justified in assuming them to be more than accidental. With such evidence as Heyerdahl presents in his book, plus evidence of blood-group analysis (not yet mentioned in any New Zealand review, as far as I know), we may not be so very far from proof after all.

At the moment, however, we who try to keep an open mind, are merely examining the possibilities of a hitherto neglected place of origin for one element of the Polynesian racial complex, namely the North-West Coast of America, and all evidence must be examined, even the discovery of proto-Polynesian artifacts along the Southern Asian littoral, the possible migration-route to America and thence down to Hawaii—the green jade adze blade from China?

May I point out that I myself called Heyerdahl's contribution an hypothesis. By what process of reasoning does "Doodlebug" come to assume I accept Heyerdahl as an authority? No, I like Heyerdahl's reasoning better, that's all.

VIRACOA (Timaru).

EAST AND WEST

Sir,—Your correspondent "By Their Fruits" is quite entitled to his opinion that we should bear in mind a long list, which he details, of "crime (by Communist governments)" that cries to Heaven for vengeance. I do not question his right to believe, if he wants to, that strong emotions are an aid to clear thinking; but I doubt whether many will agree with him. We have a problem to solve: how to reconcile the East and the West without war; and we shall not solve it by titivating our emotions into the attitude of righteous indignation which in the past has so greatly contributed to the making of wars.

Does your correspondent seriously suggest that we should keep in mind the "crimes" he mentions and forget that a very similar list could be compiled of deeds that have been committed at one time or another within the territories of the British Empire? And what of the stark inhumanity of early capitalism that "cries for vengeance" from the pages of *Das Kapital*? Are we to overlook first causes and see only the hard attitudes and effects which they have so largely induced? In any case, what use is it to anyone if we shout like urchins: "Yah! Your face is dirtier than mine?"

We have a problem to solve. And I suggested that we start, with appropriate humility, from the fact of basic inconsistencies in the faiths of both the East and West. If neither side is standing firm on the faiths it professes, then small wonder that both feel insecure and strive so feverishly to build up the only defence they know.

We shall go forward from here not as nation-states or groups of nation-states but as individuals. The contribution of

LETTERS FROM LISTENERS

the West will be in the art and science of being an individual in spite of groups and in spite of systems. The leadership of the future will be composed of men and women able to stand as individuals in their own right, independently even from the faiths and attachments of their nation-groups and concerned only with man as man.

It goes without saying that this will be too much for most of us, at any rate until the new leadership has emerged clearly enough for the rest of us—in both the East and the West alike—to feel security in following it. But in this general direction there is a chance of a rational way forward without war. Whether we are prepared to take the chance depends on the depth of our longing for a future.

PETER MANN (Auckland).

STALIN: MAN AND LEADER

Sir,—Knowing from experience your insistence that correspondents to *The Listener* stick to the facts of the case, I suggest that the same attitude be applied to other contributors, such as "J.F.K." in his article, "Stalin — The Man and the Leader." I do not intend to comment on everything he writes, but one single instance will suffice to show that "J.F.K." like many other critics gets his information, not from reading the original, but from other individuals' versions of what Stalin was supposed to have written or said.

"J.F.K." mentions Stalin and the Antaeus legend. The article states, "Overlooking that Hercules in the end did kill Antaeus, Stalin argued: 'Antaeus is the Communist Party, the earth is the Russian or Soviet people; as long as the Party draws its strength from the people it is invincible...'"

Now what did Stalin really say? Here it is straight from his *Defects in Party Work*: "Yet he (Antaeus) had a vulnerable spot—the danger of being detached from the earth in some way or another. His enemies were aware of this weakness and watched for him. One day an enemy appeared who took advantage of this vulnerable spot and vanquished Antaeus. This was Hercules. How did Hercules vanquish Antaeus? He lifted him from the earth, kept him suspended in the air, prevented him from touching the earth and throttled him. I think that the Bolsheviks remind us of the hero of Greek mythology, Antaeus. They, like Antaeus, are strong because they maintain connection with their mother, the masses, who gave birth to them, suckled them and reared them. And as long as they maintain connection with their mother, with the people, they have every chance of remaining invincible. That is the clue to the invincibility of Bolshevik leadership."

I quote the above, because if "J.F.K." can't get a simple fact right, Heaven knows what the rest of his "facts" are like.

L. REID (Ōtauhu).

GUANACOS, CAMELS AND COWS

Sir,—What the buffalo was to the prairies of North America, the guanaco was to the pampas of the South. Technically, in classifying it as belonging to the camel family, "Sundowner" (*Listener*, March 27) may be quite correct, but in likening it to the camel Palgrave knew so well, the ship of the desert which in the past 40 years some New Zealanders have become familiar with, he once more shows he is discussing

something he knows nothing about. A wild llama is a fair description of this beast, for though its dominant characteristics are not so pronounced its kinship is obvious. Actually in looks and habits it is to a lay observer nearer to a deer than a camel. You can eat it if you are hungry enough, wrap its skin round you as a cloak if you are cold enough; but you cannot ride it, you cannot drive it. My recollection is that it evacuates in much the same way as any other grazing animal. If, however, it is correct that it leaves its dung in heaps like a haystack, then very definitely that is a habit that no practical farmer would wish to breed into our own domestic animals, for the first essential of good husbandry is the even distribution of animal droppings.

W. A. DRURY (Gisborne).

USE OF CHRISTIAN NAMES

Sir,—Your editorial on the use of Christian names serves to remind me that it is time our official usage of this term was revised. On official documents this term is indiscriminately used to designate names that are not Christian at all. We have people of many non-Christian religions who are obliged to use these forms wherein they are described as having Christian names when this is not correct. Rationalists and agnostics are also subjected to the same wrongful compulsion of having their first, or forenames, presumptuously and erroneously entered under the description of "Christian."

I feel sure that all fair-minded people will see the desirability of doing something to end the perpetuation of such an obvious inaccuracy.

W. J. WILLIAMSON (Christchurch).

SERIALS FOR WOMEN

Sir,—One cannot escape these dreadful sessions. Surely the menfolk responsible for programme organising in the YA and YC groups could spare those of us who would shelter from commercial standards? It is truly exasperating to find no shelter, and we plead here and now for protection from these nerve-shattering experiences.

GRACE DARLING (Stokés Valley).

THE BABY IN THE HOUSE

Sir,—Although the speaker in a recent programme from 3YA, "Foundations of Mental Health," is a doctor and psychiatrist of wide repute, he is not a mother. While respecting his views on practical nurture, and even conceding that in some respects they affected me, I was depressed at the possible results they might produce. In stating that the household should adapt itself to the needs of the baby, I wondered what sort of a wearisome muddle a young mother might land herself into. The behaviour of a young baby can at first be baffling, and defies interpretation from the angle of "needs" by the inexperienced. With no other guide than the desire to deny the child nothing, an over-anxious mother may easily end by upsetting him altogether. She will find herself trying first one method and then another, and her uncertainty and anxiety will communicate itself to the child and interrupt his natural ability to settle to a routine.

I want to make a plea here for the value of a routine—a carefully-planned, flexible, but consistently-followed routine. As a mother I am convinced that the real needs of a normal child can be met within its loose framework; that in

seeking to establish it with gentleness, patience, and perseverance in the earliest stages, the danger is lessened of misinterpreting the child's demands. I have known a child fed so often, and erratically, that she developed a chronic colic, and the complex results of her disturbed behaviour so dominated the household that the mother and everyone else became worn out. This was a conscientious attempt to follow such advice as the speaker gave.

By all means let us deny our children no love, but let us advance cautiously, and not throw overboard the valuable guides of the past 20 years' experience. Otherwise, though advancing theoretically, we will simply be reverting in practice to the trial and error of our grandmothers' days.

FESTINA LENTE (Christchurch).

"A SAILOR'S PRAYER"

Sir,—The publication of a poem such as Denis Glover's "Sailor's Prayer" can hardly be considered consistent with the principles of good taste or with the standard of *The Listener*. While the thoughts of the first verse are sincere and well-expressed, the second stanza is nothing but a pitiful and sacrilegious parody of a sacred subject. To utter the words "Sunday Church" in one breath and the word "Booze" in the next is to show a poor moral outlook indeed. To find these words published in *The Listener* is also distressing in the extreme.

I am prepared to accept *Coming Round the Bend* and other samples of Gloverian humour with tolerance, though the literary value and beauty of quotations in the mass is perhaps questionable. When, however, a poem such as "The Sailor's Prayer" is published in a periodical such as this it is time to query both the moral and the reading tastes of this "enlightened Christian country."

A correspondence on "Children Swearing" has just concluded in your columns. Perhaps another similar topic for discussion could have been "Adults Blaspheming."

May I suggest that, before Mr. Glover writes any further poems in a similar vein, he reads Exodus XX: 7.

SCRIBERE (Timaru).

(We suggest that our correspondent read Matthew IX: 10, 11, 12.—Ed.)

THE KING'S ENGLISH

Sir,—How can one expect the rank and file to use simple English when high officers do not? Referring in a broadcast to his illness, the late King George VI spoke of "my doctors." Referring recently to Mr. Anthony Eden's illness, the BBC spoke of his "medical advisers."

A.M. (Wellington).

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

Oh! *The City of It, Iago!* (Christchurch).—See last issue, page 7.

Anthony L. Burn (Wairoa).—No championship events were programmed.

Lila J. Ensor (Gisborne).—October 17; programme as planned includes Schubert's "Unfinished" as the major work.

M. Thomas (Wellington).—(1) Not included in any programme as at present planned, but may yet be. (2) Not returning.

Deafened (Manurewa).—Equipment is provided in the Broadcasting station control rooms for the measurement and adjustment of the volume of all programme items, and it is one of the duties of the technical officers to maintain an even volume level of transmission. However, in changing from one type of programme to another, and particularly from speech to music or vice versa, local conditions at the listener's end may contribute to an unbalance. Such factors can be a non-uniform overall frequency response of the receiving set, the amount of acoustic absorption in the room, and even the response of the listener's ear over the musical range.