inexperience, declares *ex cathedra* that such a claim is arrogant and presumptuous and 'ill-advised.' We are all more or less acquainted with the joy-giving race of those who

> 'Know more of any trade b' a hint
> Than those that have been brought up in't.'

The workaday world, however, treats them as it treats the Malaprops—namely, as one of the unconscious humors of life ,as one of the patches of local color in a dull, drab world. 'Even the youngest of us may make mistakes.' And the youthful Managing Editor of the *New Zealand Times* may not, after all, know more about the duties of the sacred ministry 'than those that have been brought up in't'—despite his dictatorial dogmatism as to their relations to the matters of faith and morals which are directly and immediately within their domain. They know the ground whereon they stand. And they will continue their ancient and honored—though (in the mind of the Wellington Managing Editor) arrogant and presumptuous and ill-advised—function of 'counselling' their flocks against undesirable literature, whether that takes the shape of the 'penny dreadful,' or the 'shilling shocker,' or the fleshly sty-philosophy of a Zola, or newspaper attacks on Christian faith and feeling couched in the language of the street-corner. We rather think, too, that the arrogant and presumptuous and 'ill-advised' law of libel and the Offensive Publications Act will combine to prevent the *New Zealand Times* following to its logical issue the new code of journalistic ethics formulated by its Managing Editor. Nay, we even think that the *New Zealand Times* will contrive to exercise in the future the arrogant and presumptuous and 'ill-advised' liberty which it denies to the Christian Church, but which itself has abundantly followed in the past in its editorial and book-notices columns —namely, the liberty of 'counselling' its readers as to the sort of literature which they should or should not admit into their homes. Consistency is called by some people a jewel—possibly because of its rarity among them.

*

2. Another of the philosophic gems of the Managing Editor's last communication is the 'principle' that no one (especially the clergy) is justified in 'counselling' others as to what is to be accepted as 'true' or rejected as 'false.' 'Such presumption,' says the Managing Editor, must be 'met with stern resentment,' for people must be left serenely 'to think and act for themselves.' Our prison population will rejoice with an exceeding great joy in the New Gospel thus preached to the world by the Managing Editor of the *New Zealand Times*. Christ and His Apostles, likewise His Church down through the course of the ages, have been exhorting people to accept what they held to be true and to reject what they held to be false; and the sacred message that they gave created the Christian home and civilised savage and barbarian nations, and transformed the world. But, according to the New Morality of the Wellington *Times*, this was all a huge blunder, an 'ill-advised' folly, an act of 'presumption' to be 'met with stern resentment' —for people must not be 'counselled' as 'what they shall accept or reject as true or false'; on the contrary, they must be left entirely to their own wits (or lack of wits), 'to think and act for themselves.' Christian and non-Christian clergy must therefore be gagged; State and other teachers must be hung on a sour apple-tree; the *New Zealand Times* and all our newspapers must be criss-crossed with the cat-o'-nine-tails for daring to suggest what is the 'true' and what the 'false' view on Dominion finance, on the freehold v. leasehold agony, and so on—in fact, the clamorous advocate of 'freedom of the press' pleads clamorously for the extinction of the last spark of that freedom. But that is not all. The burglars, forgers, and manslayers in the Wellington prison must be forthwith liberated as the innocent victims of an 'ill-advised' arrogance and 'presumption' which should be 'met with stern resentment.' Our criminal code must be entirely amended, for it is, root and branch, opposed to the new Philosophy of Youth. Yon beetle-browed burglar holds as 'true' the doctrine that he is entitled to the cash in the safe of the Wellington *Times*. He is, of course, moreover, entitled to 'think and act for himself.' And, no doubt, the Managing Editor will, with smiling courtesies, ask him to be pleased to help himself. That colonial Bill Sikes is firmly convinced of his true right to plant a twelve-inch blade between the sixth and seventh ribs of his Nancy. And, of course, he is quite entitled not alone to 'think,' but likewise to 'act' as he pleases. And so on as regards the forger, the garroter, the magsman, and the rest. Such is the New Gospel—Broad Arrow Brand. The Managing Editor may, of course, plead that he does not really mean all this. But his words plainly do. And Managing Editors should have enough sense and education to mean what they say and say what they mean—even fourth-standard schoolboys are supposed to be capable of this small feat. O'Connell examined his conscience whenever the London *Times* wrote a word of commendation of him. Father Hickson may well rejoice that he has not succeeded in winning the commendation of the *New Zealand Times*, under the New Dispensation of the Broad Arrow.

*

3. Here is another of the sweeping *dicta* of the new code of journalistic morality: 'The practice of modern journalism is to give *the freest play* to individual opinions in signed articles *on any subject*.' There are sundry permutations and combinations of this idea. Here are two: 'The newspaper which is capable of the greatest service to the community is that which freely opens its columns to *a free expression of public opinion on all subjects*'; and again: '*No* man who has the courage of his convictions should be denied the expression of them in the public press.' (The italics are ours). There are a few remarks to make in connection with this section of the new Broad Arrow Ethics: (1) The Catholic and other clergy are denied the freedom of thought and action which (by necessary implication) is granted to the criminal classes. (2) If 'the *freest* play' of expression is permissible in a newspaper '*on all subjects*' and '*on any subject*,' and if it is deniable to '*no* person,' by what right do our laws of libel restrict such freedom? By what right does our criminal law prosecute—and successfully prosecute—certain journals that act upon this supposed right and fine or imprison not merely their publishers, but even their vendors? And if universal freedom of expression belongs by right to the press, by what right does the moral sense of the community restrict it by barring (as it does) certain rather 'free' gutter-rags out of every decent home and hand? And if such unlimited freedom is a sacred right of the press, what justification is to be offered for our laws against slander? Moreover, if such freedom (or rather license) is allowed to the pen, why not to the tongue? Why close the drawing-room of the decent rich, or the parlor or kitchen of the decent poor, against degenerates whose tongues are laden with the foulness of the damned? Why prosecute the hoodlum for bawling out at ladies and children 'obscene language in a public place'? Are not these lewd fellows of the baser sort also protected by the sheltering cloak of the Managing Editor's Sacred 'Right' 'to think and act for themselves' as they please, irrespective of the rights and feelings of others, for no such limitation or restriction is even suggested?

*

There are probably few people as good as their good principles or as bad as their bad. We acquit the Managing Editor of the *New Zealand Times* of a conscious and deliberate exposition of the Broad Arrow Code of Ethics which lies plain and clear upon the surface of his letter of February 1. But we acquit his heart only at the expense of his head. He has fallen into a familiar quicksand that besets young and uneducated writers: he has neglected his categories, and indulged in broad and sweeping assertion where large classes of restrictions are demanded of him. And—again after the fashion of such writers —he has taken care of the sounds and let the sense take care of itself: he has failed to realise the full force and logical content of his thundering sentences. Age and reading and experience will, we hope, mellow in his case the mental rawness of his present ideas and the enthusiastic positiveness of his present speech. He will then learn that (in the words of the non-Catholic philosopher Thomas Hill Green) 'the good will is free, not the bad'; that true liberty is (in Coleridge's words) 'a universal license to do good'; that (as Boetius said twelve centuries ago) 'to be obedient to justice is the very height of liberty.' All these ideas of liberty are crystallised in various degrees in the laws and social usages of every civilised land. True, unfit members must be tolerated in every community, and the law should not force people to do all that they ought in reason and conscience to do; for moral duties involve interior dispositions, which the law cannot enforce; and legal compulsion, if carried beyond the proper bounds, might induce atrophy of moral dispositions. The civil law imposes, for the public good, large classes of restrictions upon freedom of speech and pen. Other and further restrictions are imposed by the 'social virtue,' by the moral sense of the community, and regard for its best interests. It is not easy, if it is possible, to lay down broad and general rules covering the whole of this vexed question of freedom of expression. Sane and sober argument we can understand; but it may safely be said here that it is not 'playing the game' to yell either on street-corner or in the columns of a newspaper in a Christian community, such coarse verbal outrages upon Christian sentiment, such vulgar abuse and innuendo, as those which aroused the just and indignant protest of Father Hickson. Such unprovoked and blatant offence would not be tolerated for a moment in any mixed social gathering; and it is none the less offensive because

J. TAIT, Monumental Sculptor 273 Cashel Street W., Christchurch. { Just over Bridge and opposite Drill Shed. } Manufacturer and Importer of Every Description of Headstones, Cross Monuments, etc., in Granite, Marble and other stones.