

violate a law for which they have no respect. They excuse theft and robbery, not only as practiced in Russia on a large scale, but as practiced by criminals in all countries, by the argument that the law against theft and robbery is not enforced because it cannot be enforced and that it cannot be enforced because it ought not to have been passed. Is it possible that the bootlegger has converted some of our most respectable people to the criminal's philosophy?

Every one has the right in this country to speak his mind, so long as in doing that he does not invade the rights of others; but every one also must be ready to take the consequences of speaking his mind and not complain if the mind that he reveals strikes some of his fellow-beings as not a trustworthy guide on questions of public or private morals. Some of Dr. Butler's supporters have complained because Dr. Butler's speech has elicited from certain sources the comment that what he has said shows that he is not a suitable head of a great university and they have denounced such an opinion as an invasion of the right of free speech. Many of these same supporters of Dr. Butler would be among the very first to seek his removal if, instead of arguing ardently against the prohibitory law, he had argued against the laws maintaining the right of property. What has aroused criticism of Dr. Butler is, not that he opposes prohibition, but that he has seemed to place his opposition on grounds which are destructive of all law.

A Cable from Japan

VISCOUNT KENTARO KANEKO has long been familiar with American life. He has been in intimate touch with American statesmen. He is one of the liberal-minded leaders of Japan who understand much of the difficulty which has risen from Japanese immigration into this country.

We publish a recent cable from Viscount Kaneko to Harold T. Pulsifer, President of The Outlook Company:

I deeply regret that discriminatory clause in Immigration Bill passed in Congress. Should it be enacted will do great damage to peaceful relation between Japan and America. I am more convinced of necessity to have joint commission, my article on which you published last September. America Japan question now agitating on both sides of Pacific. Should be taken out of politics and referred to such commission, whose thorough investigation and impartial consideration are

only way to find sound settlement satisfactory to two countries. I ask you to exert your influence to have it established.

KANEKO.

In the article to which Viscount Kaneko refers (The Outlook for September 12, 1923) he says: "I have come to the conclusion that the appointment of a joint high commission by the two Governments is the only hopeful method of solving these complicated and difficult questions between Japan and the United States. For the appointment of such a high commission the diplomatic history of America furnishes abundant precedent." The precedents which Viscount Kaneko cites relate to the Alabama claims, the fisheries dispute with Canada, the coastal trade on the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes, and the northwestern boundary dispute.

While there is some similarity between these international difficulties and those which confront America and Japan, the present situation differs in one very marked respect. The disputes with Great Britain were on purely international matters. The situation which causes unhappiness for Japan is one which deals with a purely domestic policy. Would Viscount Kaneko, for instance, be willing to submit to a joint high commission the question as to the conditions under which Chinese immigrants would be permitted to enter Japan? We are certainly under the belief that Japan would not be willing to arbitrate her own exclusion policy towards China, and Japan is entirely right in her position in this matter.

The Outlook ardently hopes that Congress will follow the advice of the President and postpone final action on the exclusion clause of the Immigration Law until after there has been time to replace the gentlemen's agreement with a definite treaty. Such a treaty could be absolutely reciprocal in terms, a fact which would certainly acknowledge that equality which Japan feels has been denied her by the acts of our Government.

Clear Off the Oil

FROM Mr. Lewis Radcliffe, Deputy Commissioner of Fisheries, comes a pertinent criticism of a recent Outlook editorial on the pollution of our waterways. Mr. Radcliffe writes:

The editorial states that the Willis Bill "wisely limits its provisions to crude mineral oils, since the lighter forms, such as gasoline or kerosene, quickly evaporate and do little harm." According to "Hearings on the subject of the Pollution of Navigable Waters"

held before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, p. 5, the Willis Bill as passed by the Senate states: "That when used in this Act—(a) the term 'oil' means oil of any kind or in any form, including fuel oil, oil sludge, and oil refuse." No limitations are contained in this definition to "crude mineral oil." Furthermore, the lighter forms, such as gasoline and kerosene, are especially toxic to aquatic life and are slightly soluble in water.

We will change our statement to read The Willis Bill ought to limit its provisions to mineral oils at the present time. The statement of fact concerning gasoline and kerosene relates to a matter on which Mr. Radcliffe is doubtless better informed than the editors of The Outlook. The expert upon whom we relied for our information takes a different view of this matter from that of the Deputy Commissioner of Fisheries. But Mr. Radcliffe, The Outlook's expert, and The Outlook can all unite on the statement that gasoline and kerosene are undoubtedly better out of the water than in it.

Mr. Radcliffe believes that present efforts should be directed to the elimination of oil pollution from floating craft. He writes:

Our oil-burning merchant ships increased from 239 vessels of 650,364 gross tons in 1914 to 1,826 vessels of 9,017,000 gross tons in 1923, the world tonnage for these years being 1,721,000 and 16,478,000 gross tons. In 1923 the United States tonnage of oil-burning merchant vessels, therefore, exceeded sixty per cent of the world tonnage of this group, and the tonnage of our oil-burning vessels was about three times that of our coal-burning vessels. Congress has authorized the calling of an international conference on the subject of pollution outside of territorial waters. In view of our own preponderance of oil-burning vessels, it is important that we should provide for the stoppage of pollution from floating craft within territorial waters before such a convention is called into being.

We do not believe that if the Willis Bill were amended to limit its requirement to mineral oils there would be any rightful objection to including land plants among the agencies prohibited from dumping oil upon the waters. The chief aim of all those interested in this matter, however, should be to get into active operation legislation which will curtail the present pollution of our waters. Experts disagree as to some of the methods of accomplishing this. There is no disagreement as to the end which must be achieved.

France at the Polls

By ELBERT FRANCIS BALDWIN

The Outlook's Editorial Correspondent in Europe

ON May 11 the French elections occur. Two main political groups oppose each other, and each has its "lunatic fringe," to quote Theodore Roosevelt.

The Monarchists

THE "lunatic fringe" of the first group (the Bloc National) is the monarchist element, not yet dead despite the Republic's more than half-century of distinguished record.

There are two kinds of monarchist fringe, the Royalist and the Imperialist, namely, the Orleanist and the Bonapartist. The "party of the first part," the Orleanist, calls itself the Action Française. As if it were living centuries ago, it believes in action by a hereditary party leader rather than by a Parliament. Its titular leader is, of course, the lightweight Duke of Orleans, "the heir of the forty kings who made France," in the words of the slightly misleading party manifesto. Events in Italy inspire the authors of the manifesto to add that Mussolini's success shows what a leader can do and what a Parliament cannot. The active man of affairs for the Royalists in the Chamber of Deputies, the lower house of the French Parliament, is Léon Daudet, a lively, loquacious, ubiquitous, and irrepressible person.

The Imperialist or Bonapartist party naturally finds its supreme leader in Prince Victor Napoleon and its parliamentary man in Prince Joachim Murat. Like the Action Française, so this party chooses a title, the Appel au Peuple, masking its real purpose—indeed, the "Appeal to the People" seems less frank. Its principal plank would confer supreme authority on the chief executive of the state, whoever he might be. That means ultimately, in the Imperialist vision, a Prince-President, as in the case of Louis Napoleon, and then the same kind of lightning transformation as took place when he suddenly evolved into Napoleon III, Emperor of the French.

The Bloc National

LEAVING the monarchist "lunatic fringe," we come to the first of the two main political groups in France, the Bloc National. It is composed of five parties, all republican, but conservative or liberal as the case may be.

Let us start with the Action Nationale Républicaine. Here is a group of gentlemen who insist on economy, first, last, and all the time. They demand the sup-

pression of both money and labor waste. They justly claim that the same amount of governmental work might be done by fewer functionaries; that more money would accrue to the state by simpler and juster taxation and that more money would come to the citizen if state monopolies were revised so as to return enterprises not normally under state control to private undertakings.

The Fédération des Républicains Rénovateurs has similar economic aims, and in addition would brush up parliamentary manners a bit.

The Fédération Républicaine also wants tax reform. It is anti-monopolist, but it would abolish personal taxation and replace the land tax.

Then comes the Fédération des Républicains Démocrates. It stands strongly for state control of all industries involved in the National defense, and in foreign affairs for the Poincaré "energetic policies," to quote its manifesto—indeed, so stand most of the other parties.

Finally follows the similar Parti Républicain Démocratique et Social, with the accent on the "Social." It would extend woman suffrage, give a bonus to large families, prohibit strikes in public service industries. It is highly Poincarésque in its insistence on German disarmament and debt payment, as on its opposition to Bolshevism and its equal approval of any constitutional Russian state recognizing Russian debts.

The Bloc des Gauches

THE second great group in the French Parliament is also made up of five parties and constitutes the Bloc of the Left (*Bloc des Gauches*). In most if not all Parliaments the Conservatives sit on the presiding officer's right, the Radicals on his left.

Here in France the party of the Left with most conservative instinct is the Parti Radical National. It has been of immense help to Premier Poincaré, for it has generally supported his policies, internal and external.

Closely following this lead is the Parti Radical Socialiste. Its particular reason of being seems to be to assert that one can be a Socialist without the least Bolshevik squint, for its manifesto repels any alliance "either with Rome or with Moscow."

Another sort of Socialist is the Parti Républicain Socialiste, with ex-Premier Painlevé at its head. This party demands a progressive repartition of taxes,

proclaiming itself at the same time no enemy to private property. In foreign affairs it stands for strong defense measures, a full satisfaction of the demands of France, and a modification of the League of Nations giving it greater executive power.

Still another brand of Socialism is the Parti des Socialistes Chrétiens. These Christian Socialists favor a state subsidy to large families, universal woman suffrage, real proportional representation, the establishment of the referendum, and the neutralization of the Rhine's left bank. The party is largely directed by Marc Sangnier.

Finally we have the Parti Socialiste Unifié, as representing more the kind of thing we have been wont to call Socialism. It stoutly resists the transfer of any public service corporation from state control and demands far fuller protection for labor union rights, especially to the famous and all-embracing C. G. T. (Confédération Générale du Travail, or General Confederation of Labor), of which it is the backbone. It also would see the Rhine's left bank neutralized. Its chief spokesman is Paul Boncour.

The Communists

NOW, leaving the ten parties which really form the active force in French government-making, we come again to a "lunatic fringe." This fringe depends from the Radical Socialist Bloc des Gauches. It is a Communist fringe. Like the monarchist, this is made up of two elements.

The first calls itself the Union Socialiste Communiste. It is not the simon-pure article. It tries to be a bridge from Socialism to Communism in the way it supposes Karl Marx would advise.

The real Moscow garden variety of Communism is furnished by the Parti Communiste, without any "Socialiste" to deceive you. These precious politicians declare that only by seizing large private fortunes can you pay the public debt of France, that the state must own not only all transportation and mining enterprises but also all banking, insurance, and industrial companies, that an armed proletariat must replace the existing army, and that France must ally herself with Soviet Russia.

France will not do this. But every one will be surprised if, on May 11, the electoral pendulum does not swing slightly towards the Left.

Valescure, April 16, 1924.