

should lock it up in an iron box to protect it from the heretical light and heat of the sun and the seed-destroying processes of the earth. But this is what ecclesiastical bigots do with the precious spiritual seeds with which they claim to have been entrusted. They seem to forget that the universal principle of natural law, spiritual as well as physical, is growth. Heresy, though often mistaken, is never a sin. The sin unparadonable is stagnation.

* *

Progress in Japan.

Highly significant is the fact which Henry George, Jr., brings out in his interesting interview at Tokio with the great Japanese democrat, Count Okuma. Progress in Japan has developed there the same phenomena as to land values that accompany it everywhere. What is quite as significant is the still more remarkable fact that this great Asiatic democrat is oblivious to the injustice of the private appropriations of those values. Here is the earth which no man made; here are social centers upon the earth which no individual produces or maintains, but which are simply phenomena of civilization; here is a constantly increasing value which attaches to the earth at these points in consequence of the social growth and improvement that center there. Yet intelligent and otherwise moral men see no inequity in allowing a few individuals to treat those values as their own. Though we cast aside all considerations of the unjust inequalities of opportunity and of wealth thereby produced, how shall we explain this moral insanity?

* *

Presidential Veracity.

When a conflict of veracity arises between the President and a private citizen, the country believes the President, no matter who the private citizen be nor how confirmatory his proofs; for the sentiment that the king can do no wrong survives. It was so when President Roosevelt charged Mr. Whitney with falsifying. With a second such conflict the country argues upon the probabilities. This was so when President Roosevelt gave his version of the Tillman-Chandler episode. A third such conflict occurring, it staggers the country with a horrible doubt. This is its attitude toward the President's connection with the Storer affair. Some say it takes a fourth conflict to put a President's word at discount and discredit him alike in all future and all preceding conflicts of veracity. Some say it takes five. But the long line of newspaper correspondents

who have suffered from interviewing experiences with Mr. Roosevelt must begin to feel that the day of their vindication is not far away.

* *

Jerome's Explanations.

The statement of District Attorney Jerome's position, which appears in the *Times Magazine* for January, may satisfy the public, but it wouldn't satisfy them if they were like the business man who wants results from his employes and not excuses. Jerome's excuses for not prosecuting men prominent in the financial world for stealing trust funds for campaign contributions are plausible enough as excuses, but Mr. Jerome would hardly have made them had the thieves been labor agitators, instead of financiers. Imagine, for instance, his refraining from prosecuting Sam Parks, the labor boodler, on the ground that Parks had acted "on the advice of counsel." Or, imagine his refraining from prosecuting a criminal labor conspiracy because the conspiracy was organized without the expression of a criminal purpose by anyone in criminal language. From this very magazine statement of Jerome's case, a friendly statement, it is evident that in Mr. Jerome's eye there are social classes which, for substantially the same conduct, must be handled differently by the criminal law.

* *

Grand Juries.

Everywhere the grand jury system comes under criticism. The evils of it are felt most in large cities, but they are present in all places. Mayor Dunne of Chicago has characterized them as having outgrown their usefulness, and this is probably the truest possible characterization. The grand jury originated as a popular body to protect men in person, property and reputation from baseless accusations by appointees of the king. Instead of being charged with the function of hunting down crime, they were charged with the function of distinguishing probable cases of crime from mendacious persecutions. This is the reason the old grand juries heard only evidence for the prosecution. Their object was to determine the prosecutor's good faith and the value of his evidence in establishing a prima facie case. For the same reason, its sessions were secret. But with the process of time, the grand jury has evolved into a very different institution. No longer standing between mendacious persecutors and their victims, it becomes their pliant instrument for the very kind of persecution it was established to prevent; and its secrecy, no longer a reasonable precaution in the