

RETURN OF THE SCAPEGOAT

Sir,—One may remind Mr. Winchester that "one swallow does not make a summer," and that the anti-Jew policies both of Tsarist Russia and of the Soviet Union are unhappily an indelible part of history, ancient and modern. Neither on this point nor on any other is your correspondent susceptible of a change in mind. Presumably historical facts are after all, petty bourgeois, apparently even if true. Is truth itself a petty bourgeois fiction? I note that Mr. Winchester has not answered my challenge to name the authority for his allegation that "there has been since the Civil War (in America) only one Jew in the Senate." I presume there is no authority.

When Mr. Winchester speaks of our relations with the Maoris as involving "the most sordid robbery in history," he is not worth an answer. The Maoris were not unrepresented at the Coronation: they were included on the same footing as the pakeha New Zealander in the service units. This practical expression of equality should have rejoiced the heart of your correspondent. But no.

Mr. Winchester is a blind devotee of the "Third Rome," the vatican of which is the Kremlin. "The Soviet Union . . . a state where men can walk the earth as brothers, etc. . . (which) might well be emulated." Sir David Kelly, British Ambassador at Moscow (1949-1951), ought to know something about it. He points out in an article in the *Sunday Times* for February 15, 1953, that "there has never really been among Russians any 'colour-bar.' The Russian, who has Tartar blood, never did feel any 'Sahib-complex.'" So this is not a virtue peculiar to the Soviet-Russian. But what he does tell us is of the systematic and ruthless fashion in which the central Government of the U.S.S.R. has blotted out the original economic, religious and cultural ideas and institutions of the non-Russian peoples in the interest of a monolithic imperial state. He quotes as typical the Tadzhik Republic in Asia. He also mentions the uprooting of whole peoples and the deporting of them to destinations which are not advertised—the Chechens from near Tiflis, the Turks from the Crimea, Greeks from the Black Sea, and Germans (descended from the Russian Empress Catherine's prize colonists) from the Volga. Not exactly "brotherly," nor examples to be "emulated." The modern Russian appears to differ little from the Russian of Tsarist days.

In conclusion, I am unable to accept the pronouncement that what I stand for is "a matter of constant speculation in the daily press." I have not noticed that I have been so honoured. I won't embarrass Mr. Winchester by asking for proofs; there are none.

W. E. BARNARD (Tauranga).

THIRD THOUGHTS ON 3-D

Sir,—Mr. Miram's article is excellent in giving us clearly and compactly the fundamentals about our latest novelty. It is a pity that in literature and other arts there has been and is a concentration on thrills—as though life reached its sublime apex in a hysterical dither. A regular course of thrills and shocks is as unsuitable for the nervous system as a course of nothing but pickles, red peppers and champagne would be for the stomach. The raising of the thrill and shock potential of films strikes me as a distinct disservice to mankind.

Mr. Miram touches the crux of the matter when he says that 3-D is the film industry's reaction to television's reducing influence on film box office re-

LETTERS FROM LISTENERS

ceipts. As allegedly intelligent beings, ought we to let dollar-hunting buccaneers assail us with emotional monstrosities in the guise of entertainment? Man's acquisitive appetite—the lust for money—has throughout the ages wrought incalculable havoc in human affairs. Cash profits appear to be the criterion of judgment as to whether a thing is right. But it seems to be time to adopt some better standard for our entertainments; instead of gain, we might try the enrichment of life. The potentialities of 3-D in the realm of things that are lovely and of good report seem tremendous. "Screaming terror" and all such lunatic measures should be banned.

J. MALTON MURRAY (Oamaru).

THE KING'S ENGLISH

Sir,—“Standard VI” seems troubled by the new transitive verb “contact.” The NZBS, civil servants, also leading schoolmasters, he says, use it; a New Zealand judge, however, has expressed distaste for it. He himself seems disposed to side with his Honour.

So would conservative I at first have done. I think, however, that “contact” is here to stay; it has now been admitted to the goodly fellowship of the verbs because not a single one of them expressed just what “contact” does. We had to say: “make contact with,” or “get into touch with,” or “seek out and then interview,” or some other such product of the Circumlocution Office. The neat little graceful “contact” satisfactorily replaces all these phrases.

Who it was that in this century first verbalised the noun “contact” I do not know, but he was surely a minor verbal genius, for he gave us a new, short, graceful, useful transitive verb that does instead of three or four words. This is surely a noble reversal of our more usual way of going about things: making “try out” short for “try”; “give consideration to” short for “consider”; “job of work” as a very graceful abbreviation of “job.”

If your young correspondent should ever take up the fascinating study of words and their history, he will find many a “contact” in our language—cold-shouldered at first by conservatives and pedants, then tolerated de facto, and finally entering into the very stuff of the language.

F. K. TUCKER (Gisborne).

Sir,—In your issue of May 22 “Standard VI” expresses his concern at the use of the verb “contact.” With all due respect to the learned judge referred to, I suggest that “contact” should today be an accepted verb in our language. Objection has been taken on the grounds that “contact” as a verb is indefinite and that “write,” “telephone” or some other more specific word should be used. Granted in some circumstances, but where is the objection to the use of “contact” in lieu of the lengthier “communicate with?” The fact that “contact” is widely employed as a verb, formally as well as informally, suggests that objection to its use in this manner is too late and that full recognition should be accorded.

ENGLISH I, 1947 (Papakura).

Sir,—There certainly is confusion in the multiplicity of doctorates. A pretty well-known story tells of a call for a doctor to attend a glamorous film star on board ship, and a doctor of divinity being the first to reach her cabin. But there is

really no point in raising this issue in the present discussion. When a man is ill, “doctor” means a medical practitioner and no one else. If “No False Colours” says to a friend: “I’m going to see my doctor,” he knows perfectly well that the other will understand him; he won’t think of a dentist or a philosopher. I am sure your correspondent would not dream of saying: “I’m going to see my medical adviser.” If he did he would speak as a pedant, not as a man.

A.M. (Wellington).

THE KON-TIKI ARGUMENT

Sir,—“Viracocha” and “Doodlebug” have agreed to disagree, and the argument is apparently closed; but no one seems to have suggested what is to me the most likely explanation of the difficulty, namely, that both are right. The main stream of Polynesians must have come from the North-West; but why could not a lesser stream have come from the East? Signs of American influence are obvious on Easter Island, less so on the Marquesas, and still less so on Tonga and other islands further west; and the Maori is certainly not a pure race. Why not admit that several strains have met in the past in the Pacific and combined—as they are still doing?

J. H. HARVEY

(Ngongotaha).

(This correspondence is now closed.—Ed.)

DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

Sir,—In his last letter Mr. Scott no longer contends that the definition of the dictatorship of the proletariat has been distorted but tries to discredit his opposition in another way. Having mastered the intricacies of Communist theory, after many years of study, he concludes that Lenin's quotations refer to “a period prior to the establishment of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.” He omits to point out that the Marxist-Leninist theory, strategy and tactics, advocate and direct revolutionary struggle in all countries.

I have piles of Communist papers from various satellite countries. Communist leaders of these enslaved territories parrot at every opportunity quotations from Lenin and Stalin, and they reiterate exactly what Mr. Scott has stated on this point, i.e., that the dictatorship of the proletariat is only a temporary form of rule “during a transitional period.” But what can this signify? Nothing more or less than that Lenin's perverse words refer to a period prior to the establishment of Socialism, not alone in the U.S.S.R., but in all countries.

Let us now study what changes resulted from the establishment of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. In 1936 Stalin

Twenty-six Hours from July 21

INSTEAD of starting from 1, 2, 3 and 4ZB on June 9, June 23, July 7 and July 21 respectively, the new Gregory Keen serial “Twenty-six Hours” has been rescheduled and will now begin simultaneously from all ZB stations on Tuesday, July 21. In the interim, 1, 2 and 3ZB will broadcast “The Magic of Microgroove,” a programme consisting of new LP recordings. The change in schedule has been made to take advantage of the introduction of programme land lines linking the four centres. Broadcast times remain unchanged, and the serial will be heard at 8.30 p.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

proclaimed: “All exploiting classes have been eliminated. Soviet society has already succeeded in achieving the first (lower) phase of Communism-Socialism.” (*Leninism*, p. 569.) Commenting on the new Constitution, Stalin said: “I must admit that the draft of the new Constitution does preserve the regime of the dictatorship of the working class, just as it also preserves unchanged the present leading position of the Communist Party.” He goes on to say: “In the U.S.S.R. there are only two classes, the working class and the peasant class, whose interests are friendly (sic). Hence there is no ground in the U.S.S.R. for the existence of several parties, and, consequently, for freedom for these parties. In the U.S.S.R. there is ground only for one party, the Communist Party” (pages 578, 579 *ibid*).

We of today, after almost two decades of additional experience, must agree with those contemporary critics who alleged (in 1936) that the Draft Constitution did not change anything in the existing position in the U.S.S.R. The only change is in one word; the proletariat, having liquidated all other classes, becomes the working class. The dictatorship, after the establishment of Socialism, still removes all possibility of opposition by arresting, condemning and executing its opponents. Purges are conducted even in the ranks of the Communist Party and “any who do not conform are like grit in the wheels of the machine and have to be cleaned out.” The methods of fraud, terror and violence are still used.

Finally, the conclusion of Mr. Boswell that the Soviet people are to be led against the bourgeoisie of the non-Communist countries must be correct. If Mr. Scott sincerely doubts this he should study Communist theory even more closely. Lenin himself makes the point clear: “. . . The existence of Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable.” (Selected Works, Vol. VIII, p. 33.)

PADEREWSKI (Hamilton).

(Abridged.—Ed.)

THE NEW ZEALAND BAND

Sir,—I feel I must congratulate Mr. Owen Jensen on the way he spoke about our New Zealand band in his recent *Music Magazine*. There seems to be a definite “looking down” feeling about band music by the people who profess to be music-lovers. I hope Mr. Jensen's broadcast will make some of these people think about the subject, and realise that the bands do their best, and that the top men in brass playing are no doubt equal to their counterparts in other musical branches.

BRASSED OFF (Auckland).

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

J.H. (Wellington).—“Abenlied,” by R. Schumann.

Bias Begone (Wellington).—One small part—yes; but he is not a member of the company.

M. B. Harding (Christchurch).—Sorry. We have to rely on the information given us, and have no control over late amendments.

I.R.M.S. (Wellington).—There is no legal restriction of the kind you mention. This takes the point from the first part of your letter.