



FROM THE HOME FORUM

"Most Popular Preacher in Wellington"

To the Editor.

Sir,—I believe the Rev. Fielden Taylor is the best-known and most popular preacher in Wellington. Will you please inform me why he is not more often heard over the air? I feel certain that all "Diggers" at least would be pleased to hear him.—I am, etc.,

C. J. ANDREWS.

Tua Marina.

[The Rev. Fielden Taylor is heard as often on the air as any other clergyman. All preachers have to conform to a broadcasting rota drawn up by a special church committee.—Ed.]

Cultivating Fashionable Musical Fad

To the Editor

Sir,—It would seem to me that before rushing into print with scathing comments on the mentality of all those who enjoy the programmes of light music, comprised chiefly of jazz and crooning, some correspondents should stop and consider music in general. Music, as I understand it, is a mingling of notes and noises which, as a rule, react pleasantly on some chord in the mind of the listener. No doubt all of us at some time or other have heard Japanese or Chinese music and passed it off with comment after the style of "what an unearthly din." Yet the millions of people of those nationalities listen to it with as much appreciation as we do with ours.

While there are thousands of listeners who can and do appreciate "classical music," there are a large number who profess to do so, who are merely cultivating it as a fad in order to appear fashionable. The overwhelming majority in favour of the music of the "silly piffle" class would seem to indicate that it is more natural to be able to enjoy this type. Our system of trial by jury concedes the point that the opinion of many is superior and less likely to mistake than that of one.—I am, etc.

"LOVER OF PIFFLE."

Hamilton.

"Midday Recreation" From National Stations

To the Editor

Sir,—Just a line to say how much I enjoy the broadcasts from YA stations. During the Boer War the air was my midday meal. To-day it is my midday recreation.—I am, etc.,

WM. L. LONGLEY.

Ashburton.

Educational Value Of Verdict Series

To the Editor

Sir,—I consider the Broadcasting Board is missing a great opportunity for educating the many who listen in to use their discriminating faculties as future jurymen by not going further with the "We Await Your Verdict" items on the programmes. In the case of the first of these trials five people gave their verdict in favour of the plaintiff to every one in favour of the defendant. Now it would be of great educational value if two or more of the best of the letters from each side were read out by the announcer. As it is, the bare fact is stated that the plaintiff had an overwhelming majority of five to one in her favour, but no one knows how each side reasoned it out.

In the case mentioned above I gave a verdict for the defendant, and for the following reasons: The plaintiff showed to the defendant by her attitude in the dispute over the game of cards that she was extremely selfish and unsportsmanlike, and she left an unpleasant impression on her hostess as to her character; therefore when she later went to her room and found her bag with the money it contained had disappeared, and as she believed her recent visitor was the only one who had been in the room that evening other than herself, she quite naturally thinks such a person as this woman had shown herself to be that evening would be quite capable of succumbing to sudden temptation. She wishes to give her the benefit of the doubt, so rings her up to inquire of she has seen the bag when in the room. Her visitor of the previous evening immediately jumps to the conclusion that she is suspected of the theft and calls her late hostess all the nasty names she can think of. After this second exhibition of the lady's character the last doubt of the defendant disappears, and she at once lays information to the police, which leads to prosecution. Now, in all the above there need not be one scrap of malice, but only conviction, which was brought about by the plaintiff's own attitude at the game of cards and over the phone.

That above is how I reason out this case, but I would like to know how the other side come to their conclusion, because if I am wrong I would like to know why, and therefore, as a possible future jurymen, I would be educated by the reasons given on both sides in each case. I consider, sir, that these trials will give a splendid opportunity which should not be missed by the board.—I am, etc.,

W. E. GOULTER.

Rotorua.

Programmes Delayed By Artists' Slowness

To the Editor

Sir,—A little while ago a speaker suggested we should consider the programmes as a menu and select what we prefer from the fare provided. Quite a good suggestion, but he was reckoning without the board's stations. On several occasions I have attempted this, only to find the stations are not keeping to the programme times. Items that should be about ten or fifteen minutes apart at different stations are often on together. Speakers are repeatedly allowed to go over their time, and there seems to be no effort to catch up on the lost minutes.

On Saturday, February 16, the speaker from IYA was not finished until 9.29, and a record that should have been over at 8.59 was not finished until 9.33.

At 4YA on Monday, February 18, Mr. J. T. Paul didn't finish his talk until 9.26, causing another disarrangement of the items. I think it is discourteous of speakers to go over their time and keep other artists waiting. Surely the board can arrange a signal indicating that the speaker has two or three minutes to go. Allow them one minute's grace and then continue the programme.—I am, etc.,

COURTESY OF KINGS.

Dunedin.

Critical Letters Not Appreciated

To the Editor

Sir,—There is something that I think should not be printed in the "Radio Record," and that is the complaining and fault-finding letters sent in. It is disgraceful and wicked the way the announcers are criticised, and the programmes found fault with. The announcers do not suit one person, the programmes do not please another person, and so it goes on, until everything that is put over the air is displeasing someone. It seems to me that from the head of the Broadcasting Board down to the youngest child performer, all do the best within their power.

The criticising letters sent in are unjust to the ones who are doing their best to please everybody. If the dissatisfied ones do not like a certain announcer or a certain programme, why not tune in elsewhere? If they are unable to get an announcer or a programme to suit them, I would then advise them to keep their license fee in their pocket and their fault-finding with it.—I am, etc.,

MRS. TUT TUT.

Wellington.