

LUNCH-TIME CONCERTS

Sir.—In a recent issue you reported that Mr. Warwick Braithwaite said in an interview that he knew of no lunch-time concerts in London, but I would like to tell you of the City Music Society.

This Society was formed by music lovers after the midday concerts at the Royal Exchange had to be discontinued owing to the danger of flying bombs. It has grown from a small group to a flourishing society which arranges lunch-time concerts every Tuesday, except for short breaks during holidays. The concerts were originally given at the Concert Hall of the Guildhall School of Music, and several of the halls of the City Livery Companies, but now are held at the Bishopsgate Institute near Liverpool Street Station. Very well-known artists have performed, including Colin Horsley, Denis Matthews, Louis Kentner, among the pianists; and the concerts are greatly appreciated by City workers who cannot always get to the West End for evening concerts and recitals.

Occasionally a talk or lecture on music is given and I have had the pleasure of hearing, among others, Boyd Neel, Eric Harrison and Gerald Moore. Lesser-known and younger artists are also given the experience of appearing in public, and several have benefited by the publicity afforded.

In addition to the lunch-time concerts others are occasionally arranged for the early evening at the Hall of the Goldsmiths and Silversmiths Company in the City.

EDITH D. CARTER
(Mt. Maunganui).

CHILDREN IN HOSPITAL

Sir.—In Britain today, at the more up-to-date hospitals, the parent-child link is felt to be so important that, in spite of some practical difficulties, daily visiting is now made the rule instead of an exception. I learnt this from the March, 1953, issue of an English periodical. I am in whole-hearted agreement, and if one of my own young children had to be in hospital I would hope very much to be allowed to visit him each day.

In the publication mentioned above, one Hospital Matron was quoted as saying: "In our hospital the parents are allowed to see their children last thing every evening. When we first started daily visiting I used to pace the corridors after the parents had gone, wondering if we would be able to continue, because the crying of some of the children was difficult to endure and I felt we would never settle them down for the night. We now accept this upheaval after visiting hours, and although it does make more work for the nursing staff, the children do settle down again very quickly. We find that the visits of intelligent and co-operative parents help both us and the child. When ward sisters complain that there is a rush to get the ward ready for visiting, I tell them, 'Don't get the ward ready; let the parents help you when they arrive. They will feel they are doing something for the child and the child then associates them with the routine of the hospital.'"

A children's physician said: "It is wise and kind to visit babies and children under five daily." This specialist also said that the Royal Infirmary, Newcastle, has found daily visiting practicable over 10 years' experience. This hospital, on the suggestion of Sir James

LETTERS FROM LISTENERS

Spence, was one of the first to advocate daily visits to children in hospital.

It was reported by the Minister of Health in Britain that, of 1300 hospitals, 300 had permanent arrangements for children to be visited by their parents daily. It is evident, then, that even if there are difficulties to be overcome, in Britain anyway, those in charge of hospitals are realising that daily visiting by parents is of great benefit to the child. And the sick child, after all, is the one to be considered.

E. J. ENNOR (Epsom).

(Abridged.—Ed.)

Sir.—A small child has little idea of time, so that mother's assurance that she will come "next Sunday" seems to mean she won't come for an eternity, if at all. Most of them, however, can understand "tomorrow," and when they find that she really does come every day, they don't feel that she is deserting them. Also nurse's "Mummy coming soon" will satisfy them, provided she really does come.

I well remember hearing for days on end the despairing "Mummy, oh, Mummy," of a tiny toddler in hospital, quiet only when sheer exhaustion brought troubled sleep. Also there was a three-year-old who shared a ward with me in a small hospital, a brave and merry little soul, whose silent moments of fretting and half whispered "when can I go home" when alone, were rarely if ever noticed by the three different sets of over-worked staff, and whose rather vague symptoms persisted week after week. No array of medical degrees would convince a mother that in such cases the child's progress isn't hindered. We all know who the small child wants (and needs) when in trouble, and it seems to me that there are few cases when anyone has any legal or moral (or medical) right to forbid his mother to an under-five.

Everyone realises there are serious difficulties, as in any worth-while task, but there is an old story about wills and ways that applies to this as to other problems. A willingness to co-operate is needed from both sides, not an arbitrary enforcement of a rule by one. There must be cases, especially where shock is involved, when enforced separation from a mother endangers a child's very life. Hysterical mothers aren't so very numerous, and would be much less so if they knew they could see the child again tomorrow, and that calling them in didn't mean the illness had taken a critical turn.

WHERE THERE'S A WILL
(Opotiki).

EXPLORING NEW ZEALAND

Sir.—"Cantnel" makes three points about my feature from 2YC. He writes: "Brunner and Heaphy were not within miles of Farewell." Here "Cantnel" is wrong: Brunner, Heaphy and E. Kehu were at Cape Farewell on March 26, 1846, and crossed West Wanganui two days later. Further, "Cantnel" writes: "There is no need to call it Lake Rotorua." The standard Survey Department maps do not regard "Lake" as redundant and I took their "Lake Rotorua" as my authority. Finally, "Cantnel" writes: "When Brunner was on the summit of Victoria Range, surely he could not see over the main range to view the foothills bordering the Canterbury Plains; the Spenser Mountains would be too high to see over." I solved this topographical point by climbing on the

Spenser Range. So far as I can tell, Brunner looked from the Victoria Range S.E. over the low break in the main range now known as the Lewis Pass, and so to tussock hills above Waiau tributaries that fringe the Canterbury Plains.

JOHN PASCOE (Wellington).

STRATFORD SHAKESPEARE

Sir.—Miss Judith Terry (*Listener*, May 8) says that she thinks the coming of Sir Laurence Olivier to New Zealand made history, but that the Stratford-upon-Avon Company's visit did not. That may be her opinion, but please remember that a lot of us younger people who were old enough to appreciate the Stratford Company's performances did not see Olivier's company. For many of us, therefore, if not for older people, the coming of the Stratford Company was a great event in theatrical history.

How could Miss Jefford, as Desdemona, be "playing herself into the scene" when she was dead"? It wouldn't matter what she was really thinking then—to the audience she was just dead, and that was that. As a final point, I don't see how anyone could possibly liken Anthony Quayle's performance of Falstaff to a Santa Claus.

BARBARA EWING (Wellington).

DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

Sir.—Mr. Scott says my recent letter does not contribute to the serious study of the Marxist theory of the state. I had no intention of doing so. I merely allowed Lenin, Stalin, and Vyshinsky to speak for themselves and would not presume to know, better than they did, what they meant. He says I wrenched quotations from their context. I did not. Indeed, Sir, you were so generous as to afford me half a page of your valuable space so that I might be able to avoid doing just that.

In his penultimate paragraph Mr. Scott accuses me of having ideas which I certainly did not claim to have. I did not say "the Soviet people are to be led against the bourgeoisie of the capitalist countries." I quoted Vyshinsky, whom Mr. Scott chooses to ignore, and summarised his expressed ideas. Is there still a bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union? If there be not, where is the justification for even Mr. Scott's *dictatorship of the proletariat* in that country?

Mr. Scott evidently realises there is neither Communism nor Socialism in the Soviet Union, for he writes that all that Lenin and Stalin said of the need of the dictatorship of the proletariat is applicable to the transition state from capitalism to socialism. In this he is right, for in the Soviet Union today we find nothing but state capitalism, controlled, during my years of residence there, by Stalin, and today by a directorate of five men headed by Malenkov. The millions express themselves by voting, with one name on the ballot paper, for the members of the Supreme Soviet which sits for a fortnight a year. This institution is elected, on the principle of Hobson's choice, ostensibly to direct, in a fortnight, the affairs of "tens of millions of people who will introduce socialism when they have learned to do everything for themselves," as Mr. Scott quotes Lenin.

It is worth while to quote from Mr. Scott's letter this sentence: "Allow me

to quote the classic definition of Lenin which has been used many times by Stalin: 'the Dictatorship of the Proletariat is a special form of class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the toilers, and the numerous non-proletarian strata of the toilers, the small proprietors, the petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, etc., or the majority of these—.' " Quite! Does not this admit that the *dictatorship of the proletariat* is a dictatorship of the proletariat? "Who is the potter, pray, and who the pot?"

I had, and have, no wish to enter into a controversy with Mr. Scott on the merits or demerits of either Marxism or Stalinism. I wrote to give the opinions expressed lucidly by Lenin, Stalin and Vyshinsky on the connotation of the term *dictatorship of the proletariat*. I stand by what I wrote, but because of my intrusion into a controversy I feel that courtesy compels me to answer him—hence this letter.

CHAS. W. BOSWELL (Auckland).

Sir.—In your issue of May 8 "G.G." quotes Paul Blanshard as follows: "Actually, Karl Marx used the phrase, 'dictatorship of the proletariat' only once in his whole writings." This statement is incorrect. Marx mentioned the dictatorship of the proletariat in 1850 in *Class Struggles in France*, chap. III. In 1852 see *The Correspondence of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels*, Martin Lawrence, London, 1934, page 57. Again in 1875 see *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, Martin Lawrence, London, 1933, page 44.

Friedrich Engels also uses the phrase on at least two occasions in 1891.

W. R. CARSON (Huntly).

FOREIGN MATTER

Sir.—Certain English literary weeklies have developed an irritating habit of flavoured their articles with French and other foreign phrases, some of which must be meaningless to most of their readers. A writer of standing twice used a phrase which I could not find in a good French dictionary. I am led by the appearance of the expression *poète maudit*, in "M.K.J.'s" excellent review of James Baxter's poems, to say I hope that this habit will not take root here. I know what *maudit* means literally, but what exactly is *poète maudit*, and how does the expression apply to Mr. Baxter? Maybe I should know, but I have been reading criticism for many years, and do not remember coming upon the phrase before. I doubt if two per cent of *The Listener's* readers are wiser for having read it, and I suggest it is a good rule in writing never to write above the heads of your readers.

SMOOTH PASSAGE (Wellington).

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

Egor Blimey.—You have not given your address.

Interested (Wellington).—Twenty-one, including the conductor.

Interested Listener (Wellington).—The station is privately owned.

Peter Mann (Auckland).—Would prefer to keep to the point under discussion.

Margaret Byers (Lower Hutt).—It was claimed only that early diagnosis by means of the machine was followed by ordinary treatment, successfully.