

RETURN OF THE SCAPEGOAT

Sir,—Mr. Scott accuses me of quoting at second-hand. The pamphlet *Foundation of Leninism*, from which my quotation was taken, was published in 1929 in my mother tongue as part of a larger volume entitled *Principles of Leninism*, and is available in English in a volume entitled *Leninism*, which is an authorised translation of the Russian *Problems of Leninism*. I need no instruction from Mr. Scott as to my sources.

He also claims that my omission of the phrase "of the proletariat . . ." vitally alters the meaning of the quotation "the dictatorship of the proletariat is the rule—unrestricted by law and based on force—of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie. . . ." I did not realise that there would be people in the free world who would consider that the approval of one class justifies the abandonment of law and the unrestricted use of force. But if this quotation is not sufficient for Mr. Scott, perhaps he will explain this one: "The scientific concept of dictatorship means nothing more or less than unrestricted power, absolutely unimpeded by laws or regulations and resting directly upon force. . . . Dictatorship means unlimited power, based on force and not on law." (Stalin, *Leninism*, p. 129).

As a district chairman of a democratic party which, in a semi-free election, obtained an overwhelming majority, I had personal experience of this force which liquidated all non-Communist parties, peasantry and even masses of reliable Communists. I await with interest evidence to show that when the proletariat is exercising its dictatorship it is only dictating to a "tiny minority." In fact, Stalin denounced the idea that "the proletariat cannot and ought not to seize power if it has not the majority in the country" by saying that "this absurd thesis cannot be justified either theoretically or practically." (*Theory and Practice of Leninism*, p. 23).

I am as interested as Mr. Scott in truth and "fair and accurate reporting," but I cannot help thinking that his show of interest in these things is only a smokescreen to cover his inability to refute the main contention: that the dictatorship of the proletariat is "state power based directly on force." (Stalin, *Leninism*, p. 139).

PADEREWSKI (Hamilton).

Sir,—Mr. Winchester strangely overlooks the world-publicised fact that in October last year a batch of notable Russian doctors (including a number of Jews) were arrested on the charge of murder and other malpractices, to the distress of Israel and Jewry throughout the world. Recently a like publicity was given to the release of the doctors since Malenkov replaced Stalin.

Your correspondent states that in the United States "there has been since the Civil War only one Jew in the Senate." One would like to know the authority for this statement. Mr. Winchester contrasts the Soviet Union, "a society where man is no longer the wolf to man," with the free world "so-called," which "needs a scapegoat and the whipping up of hatred and contempt for those of different nations, colours and beliefs," which "is part of its very being." This is indeed "spilling a bibful," but at least Mr. Winchester makes it plain where he stands. Your readers will have no difficulty in summing up the latter allegation, when applied to Great Britain and (save South Africa) to the Dominions, as utterly untrue. It would be "a bitter irony" if a New Zealander, who must

LETTERS FROM LISTENERS

have some knowledge of the relations between Pakeha and Maori, has made it. However, to correlate the exaltation of Soviet Russia with the blackguarding of the democracies (including one's own country), is an unskillful technique of which one wearies.

Mr. Scott in the same issue of *The Listener* is also interested in scapegoats, but is more canny than Mr. Winchester. The "masses" in New Zealand are never likely to sympathise with and support "the dictatorship of the proletariat . . . unrestricted by law and based on force." But Mr. Scott proceeds to point out that according to Stalin the dictatorship of the proletariat was "a democracy of a new type"—"a dictatorship (apparently Mr. Scott's words but Stalin's meaning) 'of the overwhelming majority over a tiny minority.' Why a dictatorship at all, 'unrestricted by law and based on force,' to govern a 'tiny minority?' Tiny minorities have frequently been liquidated under dictatorships whether of the Fascist or Communist variety. Perhaps this is one of the chief reasons for their existence.

W. E. BARNARD (Tauranga).

BACH B MINOR MASS

Sir,—Why must those who adhere to a doctrine of purism force it on works from periods where composers relied to a large extent on performers' discretion for interpretation and instrumental medium? The Christchurch performance of the Bach B Minor Mass on April 13 shows curious anomalies in its adherence and divergence from this commonly held approach to 17th and 18th Century composers' works. In the *Qui Sedes* we have a solo violin substitute for 'oboe d'amore in a part perfectly tailored for the modern oboe; two violins unison in lieu of the horn in *Quoniam tu solus sanctus*. In spite of these and other instrumental adaptations to local conditions the trumpet is allowed to make a fiasco of the *Gloria*. Instead of the triumphant heraldry of this wonderful assertion, we are treated to a woebegone brass, blurring its weary way just the odd octave below its appointed place.

Why not clarinet and flute, or perhaps E flat clarinet on its own? These instruments in their top register can be almost as brilliant as the Bach trumpet built to play these parts. The trouble is, no less a person than Toscanini has been bitten hard and often by the purist for his substitution of clarinet for trumpet when the occasion demanded, on the grounds that "Clarino" means "little trumpet" anyway. Surely a slight loss of tone colour is preferable to the ludicrous effect of placing such a strident entry below its supporting harmony.

We have not profited from the improvements to our woodwind and brass over the last two centuries if we display the lack of forethought and common-sense shown on this occasion.

R.S.T. (Raumati).

EAST AND WEST

Sir,—I agree with Mr. Peter Mann that one should reconcile East and West without war, and not allow emotions to influence judgments. But such a reconciliation is going to be difficult if the crimes of the Russian rulers continue. I did not mention earlier the breaches of treaties in regard to administration of ex-enemy countries, the enslavement of whole populations who want no part

of the Communist way of life, and the persecution of religion. Such crimes endanger the fabric of peace and are a threat to other Western nations. We could put up with the differences in philosophy but for the constant pressure of aggression. The Kremlin might be forgiven for dissembling its love for fellow man, but why does it always kick him downstairs?

BY THEIR FRUITS (Wellington).
(This correspondence is now closed.—Ed.)

CHILDREN IN HOSPITAL

Sir,—I have just listened to a discussion from 3YA on the visiting of children in hospital. In my opinion (I am a trained nurse) one cannot explain the routine of a children's ward. Some parents are very apprehensive of hospitals, they bring their children to be admitted, and that fear is conveyed to the child. The nurses reassure the children, and they settle, only to be disturbed by the parents during visiting hours. The very young child does not know why the mother has to go and leave it—more tears and more reassurance.

Then you always find the fond parent who visits his child post-operatively. Perhaps this child has had a tonsillectomy in the morning, and you have given him the prescribed penicillin and he is sleeping, but the parent must wake him up.

As for parents giving treatment, you could hardly expect a parent to sterilise a tray, draw up so many units of penicillin, and administer it at 6.0 p.m., 10.0 p.m., 2.0 a.m., 6.0 a.m.; it just wouldn't be practicable. If you have surgical cases, e.g., repair of hare-lip, your aim is to keep the child contented; an emotionally upset child is detrimental to that particular surgery.

I do not think that hospital visiting of children is a good thing; if their stay in hospital is short, there is surely no necessity to visit them. If the illness is chronic, once a week is sufficient, with a daily letter to a child old enough to read it, and a parcel of books and crayons. We don't mind scrubbing crayons off the cots; but, believe me, trying to pacify a wardful of crying children after visiting hours—perhaps the broadcasting station could go along and make a recording.

J. C. RALPH-SMITH
(Christchurch).

"THE STRUGGLE FOR EUROPE"

Sir,—I am sorry if Mr. Pilone thinks I overstated my case against Chester Wilmot. I simply found his line of talk too smugly nauseous in its assumption of the inevitability of wars, the divine right of generals and (conservative) politicians to run them according to their exclusive superior understanding, and the implied duty of all the rest of us to fight when and whom we are told without asking any awkward questions.

True enough, in the history that is dished up to us, generals and politicians play the principal roles. Quite often, however, their role in history is simply to demonstrate that without the support of the uncalculating millions they have no role in history.

There are plenty of examples of the working out of this thesis, but the case of the lamentable Chiang Kai-Shek is perhaps the nearest in time. Four years ago his armies numbering eight millions were in command of the most fertile and populous territory on earth, based solely among their own countrymen, yet

with access to foreign arsenals and fed with foreign money. Chiang was one of the worlds "Big Four"—no less. His opponents had a numerically inferior army, no credit abroad (not even in the Soviet Union—Stalin told Chou En-Lai to call it off as hopeless), and no foreign aid except what they took from their opponents.

Yet Chiang, because he was infatuated with his own historical role and condemned the inarticulate millions, lost the support of his own people; whereas his opponents had striven for years to win and hold it. In the upshot the eight million army melted away like the Persians at Salamis. The moral is, of course, lost on most of the other generals and politicians (and their propagandists). Some of them even imagine that it is possible for their crackpot hero to be rescued from oblivion and given a second tilt at the windmills!

H. W. YOUREN (Napier).

MALE AND FEMALE

Sir,—I feel I must bring to your notice an error made by the New Zealand Press and the NZBS: that of calling a lady commentator a "compère."

The feminine of "compère" is "commère," a term always used by the British Press and the BBC when referring to a lady commentator. As a commère, I find it irritating to say the least, to be given a masculine reference. As there are more and more women doing commentating, I feel this error should be corrected.

KAY BURLEY (Mt. Maunganui).

CRAZY HATS

Sir,—I was interested to read in a recent issue of *The Listener* of the crazy hats competition to be conducted by 2ZB. A good idea. Might I suggest that the New Zealand National Bands plumed helmet be entered? It could not fail to win.

THIRMS (New Plymouth).

A FISH COURSE

Sir,—I was amazed, nay, more than that (and I choose my words carefully), shocked, to see the cartoon on page 22 of your issue of April 10. I am horrified at the implication of the drawing. Not only does it appear on the page for cooks, casting a direct aspersion at their great art, but it takes up room that might well have been used for another recipe.

What is funny in this cartoon? Is it the "Special Today," the "(C) Punch," or the "Siggs"? Please, in future, print the answers to your jokes. If you must, print them upside down, underneath, and then we can discuss the problems they pose and check the results after. This will save you the trouble of reading such letters as this.

Perhaps it's Rudolph again or an off-mauve one; but whichever it happens to be, please relieve one who remains PUZZLED (Palmerston North).

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

Dorothy Beauchamp (Johnsonville).—Thanks. A justified reproach has been passed on.

Highbrow (Wanganui).—The series will be repeated.

Rosa Dartle (Epsom).—The information was given in our issue of April 10.

Florence Joyce Hill (Auckland).—No BBC production of *David Copperfield* is current. If you heard one "some years ago," rights in it would by now have expired.

F.S. (Auckland).—Not broadcast by NZBS. The station you mention is privately managed and certain policy limitations in religious broadcasting do not apply to it.