

WHOSE WITNESS?

Sir,—David Hall's review of *Witness* warns of the danger that because the book is brilliantly written it "will make one accept anything Chambers asserts as truth" and continues that it is a question of whether it "succeeds in making what he would like to be true . . . come true for us." This implies that some of what Chambers says is not true. Is Mr. Hall providing an example of this when he writes, "After all Hiss went to jail for perjury not treason?" Is he suggesting that although the books calls Hiss a traitor he was not a traitor? There is more in the book than brilliant writing which convinces a reader that Hiss was a traitor and the fact that he was not tried for treason does not prove he was not a traitor.

The reviewer continues, "Most of us . . . find it easier to believe that Hiss was a Communist who tried to lie his way out of his youthful peccadillos rather than that he remained, in sympathy and in action, an adherent of Communism up to the present." Presumably this is another example of something Chambers would like to be true. I, for one, do not find it easier to believe Mr. Hall's version. Hiss went to extraordinary lengths to lie his way out of a peccadillo and Chambers makes a strong case for allegations of treason which are neither peccadillos nor youthful.

We are warned not to overlook the historical fact of the almighty campaign to smear Dean Acheson and the Democratic Party, but the smear campaign of the Hiss supporters against Chambers demands our attention too.

Mr. Hall does not do Chambers justice by comparing him with Trotsky and Kirvitsky when commenting on Chambers's fear of Communist violence. Mr. Hall should remember that Chambers cites examples of minor figures who suffered violence.

I note with interest Mr. Hall's view that the book shows Chambers as "scarcely a stable personality." This is a mild version of a view of Chambers made use of ad nauseam by Hiss's lawyers at the trial. Was it not his stability which enabled Chambers to survive his home life, the confusion and bankruptcy of the depression and liberalism in politics, the extreme solution Communism, until he became a witness? In my view Mr. Hall, like many others, by conceding Chambers his sincerity damns him with faint praise. This book says you must take sides, make up your mind, and many of us would prefer the ideas, implications and warnings contained in this book to be watered down and explained away.

M.F.M. (Hamilton).

"THE WARDEN"

Sir,—In *The Listener* for November 13, among some interesting comment on Anthony Trollope's *The Warden*, it is stated that the local (Barchester) newspaper *Jupiter* took part in the controversy regarding the wardenship of Hiram's Hospital. This must be a slip of memory on the part of the commentator, for it is clear from the opening paragraphs of chapter 14 of *The Warden* that *The Jupiter* was a London newspaper. This can be confirmed from the *Autobiography*, where in chapter 15 Trollope says, "For I had introduced one Tom Towers as being potent among the contributors to *The Jupiter*, under which name I did certainly allude to *The Times*." *The Times* itself had no doubt about the matter, and in an article on *The Warden* and Barchester Towers had taken Trollope to task for

LETTERS FROM LISTENERS

indulging in personalities regarding some editor or manager of the paper. Trollope declares "I had not even heard the name of any gentleman connected with the *Times* newspaper and could not have intended to represent any individual by Tom Towers. As I had created an archdeacon, so I had created a journalist."

This creative power evidently gave Trollope much satisfaction, and in speaking of the archdeacon he says "My archdeacon . . . was I think the simple result of an effort of moral consciousness—and lo! an archdeacon was produced who has been declared by competent authorities to be a real archdeacon down to the very ground. And yet as far as I can remember I had not then even spoken to an archdeacon."

R. L. ANDREW (Wellington).

"LILLIBURLERO"

Sir,—Henry Purcell's indifference to politics is the reason given by "M.K.J." in *Radio Review* for disconnecting Purcell with anything so out of character as the composition "Lilliburlero." Perhaps the assertion that sheer desperation induced the script-writer to credit Purcell with "the tune that whistled James II out of three kingdoms"—the tune, mark you—is a little misplaced.

Arthur Bryant, writing in the third volume of Pepys's biography *The Saviour of the Navy* (page 200, the year 1688) says, "Half the nation was whistling 'Lilliburlero,' the scurrilous anti-papist doggerel which the Whig Lord Wharton—Swift's universal villain—had set to one of Purcell's irresistible airs." Now I presume Arthur Bryant has not been rash enough to make a statement which the critics could gleefully point to as an inaccuracy. Apparently "M.K.J." in criticising the script-writer, has been too eager to pounce on this seeming error.

B. J. STEVENSON (Hokianga).

MODERN ART

Sir,—I was interested in the letter signed Margaret McGregor, on the above subject, because as she hails from Dunedin she ought to know quite well that I have no grudge against the 20th or any other century in matters of art. Surely my quarter-century-old column in the *Evening Star* of Dunedin supplies evidence of this.

My criticism of Frances Hodgkins's work referred solely to her draughtsmanship, or lack of it. No amount of juggling with colour can hide poor drawing. Modern painters—not all, thank goodness, but many of them—like a few modern sculptors, would have us believe that black is white, and that grotesque distortion represents nobility of outline. The intelligent observer is not to be fooled. I have no time for the merely "pretty-pretty," but even that is preferable to artistic sciolism.

L. D. AUSTIN (Wellington).

MACHINES AND PEOPLE

Sir,—Mr. J. K. Baxter's quotation of Lewis Mumford's comments on our obsessions prompts me to suggest that every new machine invented means more human slavery. Theoretically machines lighten human labour, even to the extent of inducing the unwelcome leisure of unemployment. But any Sunday morning one can see thousands of human slaves washing, polishing and tinkering with their mechanical masters. In immense buildings on land and in the

bowels of ships at sea, enormous numbers of human slaves sit up all night cossetting and coaxing mechanical gods. At countless wheels and levers, slaves guide the motions of mechanical monsters, and a momentary lack of devotion may bring appalling disaster. It is part of our inexplicable misuse of our talents and their fruits.

In his *Conduct of Life* Mumford says: "The new age will begin when a sufficient number of men and women in every land and culture take upon themselves the burden men once sought to transfer to an emperor, a Messiah, a dictator, single God-like man. . . . If each one of us accepts this desperate condition for survival, that which seems a threat to man's further development will be transformed into a dynamic opportunity." Other persons, organisations or supernatural forces cannot hand man a new age on a platter; he must do the job of re-creation himself, and begin with himself. As Mumford later says: "If most of us realised early enough, the fact that we have only one life to lead, and that every moment of it that escapes reflection is irretrievable, we should live, it differently." We might even cultivate "the daily practice of love and friendship" instead of the acquisitive appetite. In a universe coldly indifferent to us and our affairs, we have in fact to create and re-create our own world, for, as Mumford also says: "God himself has become more of a problem than the problems his existence would solve." Dwelling on a hypothetical hereafter in which we shall enjoy compensations and consolation for our self-created miseries in this one, benumbs the power to make this life better worth living.

J. MALTON MURRAY (Oamaru).

MUSICIANS' UNION

Sir,—In a recent issue of *The Listener*, Denis Glover in "Round the Bend" appears to criticise the Musicians' Union for the title: "New Zealand Musicians' Industrial Union of Workers." His criticism was quite good-humoured, probably just a passing thought on his part; but for the benefit of readers who may have thought "he has something there," I would like to answer his question.

He asks: "Why not Industrial Union of Players?" He may have struck nearer home by quoting the Journalists' Industrial Union of Workers, and asking, "Why not Industrial Union of Writers?" The answer in each case would be the same. Such a wording would debar both unions from participation in conciliation and arbitration. The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1925 recognises only two types of unions, industrial unions of employers, and industrial unions of workers, and all employees' unions must include the word "workers" in their titles in order to be registered under the Act. Thus, all such unions are industrial unions of workers.

In any case, we look upon Musicians' Union members as workers. Apart from their being legally registered as workers under the Act, they are employed under an award, and work specified hours for an employer at specified rates of pay. If the title is still thought to be a bit of a mouthful, some readers may feel inclined to blame the Act for requiring it, but first we must remember that it simplifies the Act to group unions together as employers on the one hand, and workers on the other. Secondly, the Act has been frequently amended since

1925, by successive governments, without any change or challenge to this provision, which would seem to indicate that it works very well.

Finally, may I say that it is easy to criticise something that strikes the eye, without looking for the reason behind it. If we look, there is usually a reason for most things. A. L. PETERSON, President, N.Z. Musicians' I.U. of W.

MUSIC IN SCHOOLS

Sir,—In your issue of October 2, Mr. Arthur Jacobs referred to some aspects of the music in this College. While he made some complimentary remarks concerning our music he did create a quite erroneous impression concerning composers used. He suggested that "far too much of it is by New Zealand composers of only local importance, and by other composers who do not matter a scrap." "Children should be brought as much as possible into contact with the great composers."

The following is an alphabetical list of composers represented in our work and Festival programmes, choral or instrumental, or both, over a period of years: Avison, J. C. Bach, J. S. Bach, Bantock, Beethoven, Bizet, Brent Smith, Frank Bridge, Hubert Clifford, Walford Davies, Elgar, Franck, Balfour Gardiner, Edward German, Gluck, Gossec, Grainger, Gretry, Grieg, Handel, Haydn, Holst, John Ireland, Gordon Jacob, Mendelssohn, Mozart, Parry, Purcell, Quilter, Saint-Saens, Schubert, Schumann, Cyril Scott, Sibelius, Stanford, Sullivan, Coleridge Taylor, R. S. Thatcher, Thiman, Vaughan Williams, Wagner, Weber, Charles Wood, Thomas Wood.

Mr. Jacobs did less than justice to the New Zealand composers, whose work we are honoured to use. Some of these composers have reputations extending overseas, and have been recognised as outstanding leaders in the music life of New Zealand. To some of them New Zealand schools owe a debt which can never be repaid. J. V. BURTON, Principal and Secretary, King Edward Technical College, Dunedin.

ART IN NEW ZEALAND

Sir,—I beg to differ with Dr. Sutch when he says that Wellington has had a good year of art exhibitions, while entirely agreeing with his remarks about the British Council, Architectural Centre, and the Hodgkins exhibition, all of which were highlights of the year. The standard of New Zealand work at local exhibitions is depressingly low and shows no improvement over the years, and until a Society of Artists is formed this state of affairs is likely to continue. While admitting that British Council standards are high I feel that the disparity between that standard and the work produced here is much too great. HELEN STEWART (Lowry Bay).

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

R.E.B. (Kaukapakapa).—Sorry; too long to print without abridgment.

E. G. Theomin (Dunedin).—The Auckland programme should have ended by 9.0 p.m. Though it had not, unfortunately, the line in use to relay it had to be cleared punctually for the next programme to be carried by it.

S. Y. Hilder (Hamilton).—The words you quote are used to introduce either a programme for which those stations are linked by land-line, or a programme for which each of the stations uses recordings. In the latter circumstances, though the programme is scheduled for the same time at each station, synchronisation is not perfect, since slight variations in timing occur when stations are presenting their own programmes without having to come into a link at a specified time.