

TALKS IN MAORI

Sir,—I am a constant listener to this Wednesday night programme, and I find the various talks both educational and entertaining. Many of the sessions include songs and chants which were sung on the marae in the olden days, and it is interesting to note that some of our present-day elders who had forgotten some of these old songs, rapidly regained interest on hearing them sung over the air, and vocally accompanied the guest speaker with his song. This not only creates interest among the elders, but with the young people as well, some of whom may not have heard the traditional Maori songs as they should be sung.

Unfortunately, there are some sessions on this programme where Pakeha tunes to present-day Maori action songs are used for a background to ancient Maori history. This not only mars these old sagas, but when action songs concerning an entirely different tribe are used, then the story is sadly mutilated. After all, "I love you a thousand ways" and many other popular songs are not included in *The Marriage of Figaro*. An example of this mutilation of old Maori stories was given on July 29.

In concluding, might I suggest that whenever one of the traditional stories is broadcast, and a song is to accompany it, the song should be a traditional one belonging to the story or the tribe concerned. The majority of Maori tribes in New Zealand have their genuine traditional songs. Let the present-day Maori action songs be sung for the stories of the present, and let not our old classics and this session be spoilt by speakers who are either "hoha" or lazy in collecting proper material.

TAMA NGAKAU MARIE (Waitara).

"JASMINE FARM"

Sir,—Though I deeply and sincerely regret unwittingly giving pain to Mr. and Mrs. Newton, in the words of the Good Book—"Can I not do what I will with mine own?" While I deplore the word "derelict" (which I did not use), how is Mr. Newton to know that, when the NZBS representatives came down, they did not find we had let the place become a total ruin, the Newtons not having seen the property for five years?

At no time did I say there was no garden, or make any comment on Mr. Newton, his wife's activities, his nicely-mannered children, or his animals. I realise that the Newtons have not heard the broadcasts themselves, or they would not have written so unkindly about one who has nothing but sympathy for a man so sick, together with grateful thanks to a generous country and a warm-hearted people among whom I have found a generous husband and a happy home.

NORAH B. ALLEWAY (Timaru).

PASTEURISATION

Sir,—Your correspondent E. Cain asks why it is necessary to boil pasteurised milk for infants if it has been rendered fit for human consumption. One may as well ask why boil water given to babies when our water supply is deemed fit to drink. Or why sterilise bottles and teats so carefully? Obviously the answer is that very young babies are tremendously susceptible to intestinal infections caused by germs which would never affect older children or adults.

I was unable to feed my first baby and she was brought up, not only on pasteurised milk, but dried pasteurised milk made up to the usual formula. She is now 20 months old and is drinking

LETTERS FROM LISTENERS

the bottled pasteurised milk as it comes. A healthier, happier child you could not wish to see. Since she was born she has suffered from only two slight colds. Her teeth have come through beautifully, with scarcely any trouble. She has always been the picture of health, with firm flesh and perfect colour. My eye is not blinded by mother-love. Rather the reverse—one tends to inspect one's own children closely. If she can do so well on pasteurised milk there cannot be very much wrong with it and one may as well take advantage of its greater safety.

WHY THE FUSS? (Wellington).

Sir,—Mrs. W. B. Crowley claims that in a recent broadcast debate on "Raw Versus Pasteurised Milk" she had "so much evidence to show why raw milk was so much better than pasteurised" that time was too short for her. Let anybody who is inclined to take Mrs. Crowley's word for her "evidence" turn to the best and fullest source of information, Professor Wilson's war-time report to the British Government. Let me set out a few facts.

(1) Wilson's report was an exhaustive survey of all the evidence. The conclusion was wholly in favour of general pasteurisation, because it has no nutritional disadvantage and because it is the only final and comprehensive safeguard against the many dangers of a raw milk supply.

(2) The *British Medical Journal*, editorially reviewing this book, entirely endorsed it and observed that opposition to pasteurisation, in the medical profession, was now confined to a small minority of odd men out.

(3) Wilson's report had been preceded by one made by the Imperial Bureau of Animal Nutrition. Its conclusions squared with Wilson's.

(4) In Christchurch, last year, the local branch of the British Medical Association resolved by 68 votes to one to issue a committee's report on the subject: it completely upheld pasteurisation.

(5) The British Ministries of Health, Food, and Agriculture and Fisheries, and a joint committee of the B.M.A. and the National Veterinary Medical Association, are agreed that the sharp decline in recent British tuberculosis notifications and non-pulmonary (bovine infection) mortality figures is due to herd-testing and the steady increase in pasteurisation.

(6) No outbreak of milk-borne disease has ever been traced to a pasteurised supply, treated by approved plant under approved conditions, with one very dubious exception. Innumerable outbreaks of milk-borne disease have been traced to raw milk supply, from tested as well as untested herds. New Zealand contributes many examples to the record.

(7) The Scandinavians, the Americans, the French, the Germans, and the Canadians, who all pasteurise wherever they can are not crazy; they know what they are doing, and why.

(8) Lord Bledisloe, who had long upheld herd-testing and culling and hygienic dairy and distribution routine as full and sufficient protection of the milk supply, said in the House of Lords a few years ago that he had changed his opinion. These measures were essential, but they were not enough; the last safeguard of pasteurisation would still be essential. And that is exactly what every informed advocate of pasteurisation holds: that it is not a substitute for other precautions, but an indispensable final one.

SUFFLAMINANDA EST (Wellington).

ACCREDITING DISCUSSED

Sir,—I have just listened to a most shocking display of bad forum manners. It was listed as a "discussion" on accrediting by a panel of educationists, and this made them all the more culpable. In many parts it was nothing but a free-for-all, with all speaking at once. There seemed to be no chairman; if there was, the listener couldn't find him, neither did we know who was who and whose views were which. There was constant interruption of a speaker as the others realised that their own particular

hobby horse was being threatened. It was just a hodge podge. The only woman, a parent supposedly seeking information, was completely submerged, and when she did timidly manage a question, was given scant courtesy. Any parents who listened in the hope of getting some constructive information must have been sadly disillusioned.

This subject is of vital importance to every New Zealander, and any panel members chosen would necessarily have strong views one way or the other on the controversy. Such a session should be firmly controlled by an impartial chairman, and should have no time limit, or at least be brought to a dignified and satisfactory ending. As it was it was hurriedly cut off, because "time was up," by some unknown voice that announced "at least we've heard all points of view." Seldom has there been such a misstatement.

NON LIBIT (Auckland).

THE HISS CASE

Sir,—Your reviewer of Earl Jowitt's *The Strange Case of Alger Hiss* calls it "a dispassionate book of comment," and says that "the commentator's credentials inspire confidence." Both these statements challenge a reply. Informed reviewers of the book nearly all attack it unmercifully. In particular *The Spectator's* American expert D. W. Brogan shows in an unanswerable article that the noble law Lord is but a babe in his conception of Communism, and that his whole book is based on the improbability of a man's allegiance being given to Moscow in preference to his own country. Furthermore, the author's comments on the evidence would at once suggest what is a fact, that he had in the course of his career little to do with the Criminal Courts. Such a book, attacking the decision of the courts of our friendliest nation, is to be regretted. Coming as it does from a source that inspires the uninformed with confidence, it is to be utterly deplored.

BARRISTER (Invercargill).

Sir,—In his review of *The Strange Case of Alger Hiss*, by the Earl Jowitt, your reviewer lays stress on the confidence inspired by the author's methods and credentials. *Time* magazine of May 25, 1953, reported that reviewers' copies of the American edition of this book and some 5000 copies already in book-stalls were recalled by the publishers. The firm's president stated that "a serious inadvertent factual error" had been discovered in the book, and admitted that most serious was Jowitt's "misunderstanding the complicated time sequence in Whittaker Chambers's book, *Witness* (and), a misinterpretation of the Hiss trial testimony." He promised the book would be published in the U.S.A. when these had been corrected.

It would seem from the report that the English edition is uncorrected since *Time* goes on to quote, from her review of the English edition in the London *Sunday Times*, Rebecca West's disapproving comments on Lord Jowitt's misunderstanding of the time of occurrence of certain events. I take this to be the "complicated time sequence" referred to above, but I would be interested to have confirmed my impression that the English edition is identical with that recalled in America.

D.E.H. (Dunedin).

Sir,—It was a pity that the reviewer of Lord Jowitt's book *The Strange Case of Alger Hiss* did not mention that it

has now been withdrawn from circulation because of inaccuracies. I presume that anyone chosen by you to review such a book would be aware of this. Among strongly critical reviews was one in the London *Times Literary Supplement* (May 15, 1953), a non-partisan appraisal of a disappointing book.

CONSTANT READER (Wellington).

(We have received no word from the publishers that the English edition has been withdrawn, and the book is at present on sale in New Zealand. According to *The Bookseller*, organ of the English book trade (issue of May 23), advance copies in the United States were called in because "some inferences drawn by Lord Jowitt from the evidence of Whittaker Chambers were not warranted by the facts, and because some misunderstandings of American legal practice had been spotted at the last minute." The book was to be published in the United States when Lord Jowitt had revised the relevant passages.—Ed.)

THE NEW ZEALAND PLAYERS

Sir,—Mr. Robert Young's letter of July 31 is both interesting and thought-provoking. Might it not be that the success of the Pinero farce depends largely on the ability of the players to portray the simpering artificiality and the striking of poses and attitudes typical of the period rather than the distinction between farce and comedy? The artists playing Salome and Sheba Jedd and Major Tarven succeeded admirably and amusingly in this respect, where other members of the company were less successful because of failure to recapture the atmosphere of a period which is, by comparison with modern outlook, highly unreal.

RITA ELDER (Oamaru).

INFANT MORTALITY

Sir,—I enjoyed the Southland housewife's talk on a recent Sunday night, and I compliment her upon it. I do not, however, like to hear errors of fact in any radio talks, and it is with this thought in mind that I ask you to correct her assertion that New Zealand has the lowest infant mortality rate in the world. I think I am correct in stating that New Zealand is third in this regard, and that two Scandinavian countries are first and second.

CORRECTION PLEASE (Feilding).

(According to the latest figures available from the Health Department, Sweden's infant mortality rate is lower than New Zealand's.—Ed.)

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

W. (Lower Hutt).—"Mood Sinister," by Clive Richardson, played by the Queen's Hall Orchestra.

Shona Sutherland (Christchurch).—They were Service recordings, not for sale. A.G.C. (Dunedin).—(1) No; (2) September 15, 16 and 17.

Linda Bennett (Papatotetoe).—The shorter Oxford records adaptation as a derivative form of adapt, just as adaptation is. Nothing to indicate that it is "a special radio word."

Watchmaker (Wellington).—The signals were eliminated after consultation with the Meteorological Department, the aim being to provide an adequate but not a duplicated service. Extraneous signals can be dangerous.

C.A.W. (Christchurch).—It is probably harder to set and maintain a high standard in this restricted field than in most others. Thanks for incisive comment.

G. Brown (Kaiangaroa Forest).—Decca recordings: standards, 1951; long playing, 1950. Edwin Leane (Auckland).—Can you have exaggerated a little the horrors of this experience? Inquiry suggests the possibility.

Digger (Kawhia).—Yours is an easy formula: out, what you don't like; in, what you do. Out, then, music and talks, "et cetera"; in, plays and variety. Suppose there were enough to fill without frequent repeats—there aren't—do you really suppose also that a day-by-day seven-to-nine routine of plays and variety would please all listeners, or many, or even you for long? At Kawhia you should be able to hear many stations well at night. Their programmes are set out here. Why not mix your own from the choices?