

conjure," and that it "helped the Progressive cause in California and in New Mexico, in Illinois and in Kansas, that we here in New York had named such a man as our candidate for Governor." He then gave accounts of the personal services and qualifications of the other members of the ticket, and with this meeting the Progressive campaign of 1912 closed with a blaze of unforgettable enthusiasm.

PROGRESSIVE CAUSE A CRUSADE

On election day I received the following letter from Roosevelt:

Oyster Bay,
November 5, 1912.

Dear Oscar:

I count myself fortunate in having run upon the same ticket with you and in having had the privilege of supporting you. You are the kind of American who makes one proud of being an American; and I wish also to say that I feel just the same way about all your family, your dear wife, your two daughters and son. It is

just such a family, and just such a family life, as I like to think of as typical of our citizenship at its best.

With affectionate regard and esteem

Faithfully yours

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

The Progressives, as might have been expected, had been poorly organized. The time had been too short for intensive development of our forces. We had no machine, and in a number of the counties there was scarcely a skeleton of an organization. It was, in fact, not a party in the ordinary sense of the word at all, but rather a crusade, and what we lacked in organization we made up by an abundance of spontaneous ardor. We did not really expect victory, although Roosevelt several times said that while he knew he would be defeated, he thought I would be elected. As a matter of fact, I believe I was the only candidate of the Progressive cause for Governor in any State who ran ahead of Roosevelt. In New York State he got 389,000 votes, in round numbers, while I had 393,000.

I knew from observations during my campaign from one end of the State to the other, how poorly, from a political standpoint, the Progressives were organized, and I confess I did not see the slightest chance of being elected. I was not disappointed, and I think that the men generally who ran for offices on the Progressive ticket were not disappointed. They realized that their contest was waged for a cause and not for office, and from an educational point of view the campaign was eminently successful.

Considering the vastness of the undertaking and the shortness of the time, we did as well as any of us could have anticipated, if not better. We were confident that the cause would triumph, in a degree at least, no matter what party was in power, and I think the facts amply justify our belief that the Progressive ideals made a definite impression upon the country, and have given strength, if not dominant influence, to Progressive principles in both of the old parties.

HOW CAN BRITAIN PAY AMERICA?

BY MAJOR-GENERAL SIR GEORGE ASTON, K.C.B.

IN the old pre-war days it was my business to lecture at the British Army Staff College at Camberley great wars in which the British might be involved (not only how to move armies and fleets and how to win battles, but also what went on behind armies and fleets, about finance and economics, and their influence upon the issue of wars). It was a big subject, about which, in common with my audience of staff officers in embryo of the British army, I knew next to nothing. We searched the city of London for an expert to come to Camberley and tell us about the effect of finance upon war under present-day conditions of international credit. After searching for three years, we came sadly to the conclusion that no such expert existed. There were some who claimed to have studied the effect of war upon finance, a very different affair. Even they had but little knowledge of their subject. The most reliable of them told us that if Britain intervened in a great European war it would cost us about four million dollars per day. It cost us nearer forty million dollars per day before we were through with it, and it left us heavily in debt to the United States.

International finance is a matter for experts. European nations are now tottering into chaos, famine, and civil tumult on account of recent developments in this international finance, and, as usual, experts disagree about the best remedy. Who shall decide? Great Britain used to be a creditor country; now she is a debtor country to the United States, and certainly not in a po-

sition to help other people until she has paid her own debts. She cannot pay them at present out of what the bankrupt states owe her, but she obviously has to pay them. Her credit depends upon it, and credit is everything in international finance, as it is in all finance on a large scale. At least that is the view of the inexperienced man in the street, whatever the experts or the men in public life who are guiding our destinies may say. In these circumstances, after all the learned disquisitions by the experts and the Balfour note which gives actual figures (with far too many ciphers for them to be grasped by the ordinary mind), the time seems to have come for the ordinary man to have a say in the matter. Disagreement between experts has an unfortunate tendency to spread to the nations which they represent, or to which they belong. I quote from memory, but the outstanding point is that Great Britain owes the United States nearly four billion dollars. What Great Britain did with the money is beside the point. As a matter of fact, it was spent in America upon munitions of war, but its equivalent was lent to Allies who, without it, would have been unable to carry on the war; the point is that the sum was borrowed and the man in the street means to see that it is paid back somehow; but how?

We used to be told at Camberley that business transactions between nations are very different from transactions between individuals, and that is now a commonplace remark. Individual men pay their debts in "money"—in gold, or in paper with gold or something else of

the nature of a token with a standard value behind it. There is no use in talking about paying a debt of four billion dollars in gold. The first reason (out of thirty-two) given by the commander of Tilbury fort to Queen Elizabeth for not firing a salute in her honor was that he had no powder. She was graciously pleased to dispense with the other reasons. The first reason why such a debt as I have mentioned cannot be paid in gold is similar to the Tilbury commander's reason for not saluting. There is no gold, when sums like that are involved. How, then, can the debt be paid? We are told by the experts that it could be paid by goods, by sending a lot of manufactured or partly manufactured articles over to America for nothing. We were taught at Camberley not to bother about statistics of imports and exports as indications of prosperity, but to remember that the best prosperity barometer to consult was employment. If a nation had few unemployed, that nation was prosperous, and *vice versa*. That means that sending manufactured or partly manufactured British goods to America in payment of the debt would be very bad for America, because unemployment would increase there. It would be very good for Britain, because employment would go up. It is true that the British workers would have to be paid by the British taxpayer, but that would not matter. At present he is paying millions of them a dole for doing nothing, and anything is better than that.

How, then, can Britain pay her huge debt to America, when the gold does not

exist, and payment in goods would only do harm to Americans? If my late friend Sir Robert Giffen, the economist, were alive, he would say, by "invisible exports"—in other words, by services rendered. For instance, the British Government (in other words, the British taxpayer) could subsidize the British merchant service to carry goods about the world for nothing for American shippers. How would that work? The latest shipping returns show that the actual amount of British steam tonnage stands now at about the same figure that it did before the war, in spite of war losses, but the total world tonnage has gone up, so that the British percentage of the total is now only about 33½ per cent,

compared with 44½ per cent before the war. The principal reason for this is that American steam tonnage has increased enormously, by nearly 11,000,000, since 1914. Presumably it is desired to keep these vessels running. The question of doing so by subsidies is a controversial matter of great domestic concern to Americans, and one about which discussion emanating from elsewhere would very naturally be resented, but it is fairly obvious that "services rendered," in the way of cheap freights offered by British shipping, is not likely to be an acceptable method for Great Britain to discharge her debt to America.

We seem to be drifting into an eco-

nomie morass. For the experts there may be some solution in view of the difficulty. Let us hope that they will find one. The man in the street cannot grasp the complications of international economics; he finds it easier to argue from the individual to the mass. If he wants to draw his money from a bank where it is lodged, he is accustomed to being asked, "How will you have it?" John Bull is at present in the position of a banker, with a debt to Jonathan, and it seems to the ordinary man in Great Britain to be high time to ask a similar question of his creditor, whom he has every intention of paying, if only he could be informed of any acceptable method of payment.

GOING WALKING

BY ELON JESSUP

IN this progressive day and age, when we seldom have to walk unless we wish to, we are beginning to realize what a splendid recreation walking is. A care-free rhythmic saunter along pleasant highways and byways brings health, cheer, and vision.

Now comes autumn, the golden time of the year for walking. It is the serene, soft-smelling season when sweltering days and annoying insects are of the past, the season of marvelous color torrents of russet browns, golden yellows, bronze reds, and flaming scarlets. The time of all times to go the foot-path way to the painted woods.

The pleasure of any walk is largely dependent upon the elimination of all sense of pain and discomfort. In fact, when you are getting the best out of walking you are unconscious of the presence of legs and feet. This condition is impossible unless the feet are wholly devoid of pain or blemish. A blister on the hand may be of slight consequence, but a blister on the foot is likely to mean distressing agony.

It is with various practical details of walking that the present article is concerned: feet, footgear, and the actual physical motion of walking. Most foot misery which interrupts the pleasure of a long hike is wholly preventable, and even when trouble does start it can oftentimes be stopped before well under way. An ounce of prevention is of course worth more than a pound of cure, but I will try to indicate both of these.

A fairly rough-and-ready piece of footgear having broad toe-caps and wide, low heels is quite the most suitable shoe for hiking—provided it fits. But if it doesn't fit, it is almost as hard on the feet as pointed toes and French heels. The term "fit" as applied to hiking shoes is commonly misunderstood. When the average person buys a pair of shoes for city use, he or she is fitted in somewhat the same manner that a man is for a new hat; that is, comfortably snug.

And one can walk ten blocks in such shoes without any great discomfort, but if one were to go ten miles there would be a different story. Some people buy hiking shoes in this same manner. Which is a tragic beginning for any long walk.

A hiking shoe "fit" means a shoe which is at least a half size, and possibly a full size, larger than footgear which is ordinarily worn in average city use. Only around the heel and over the instep should there be permitted any suggestion of snugness. Blisters sometimes develop as a result of too much lateral play of the heel because of roominess of the shoe at this point, but, even so, these can oftentimes be prevented by lacing the shoe more tightly.

Of prime importance in a shoe are length, width, and height of toe-cap. During the course of a long, hard walk your feet change size, blood-vessels become distended, and the feet grow noticeably larger. Tight-fitting shoes under such conditions are a forerunner of sore feet. Your feet must always have

free play; not enough to invite chafing, but a sufficient amount to allow them to function without constriction. In using the term "fit" I do not mean a shoe which is far too large for one.

We hear a great deal, and rightly so, concerning the evils of shoes which are too narrow, but not so much about shoes which are too short. Yet in some respects the short shoe is the worse offender of the two. During walking the toes have a way of working forward if with each step they meet a leather wall there is bound to be in the form of toe blisters or abrasions. If the shoes are of sufficient length and still toe blisters threaten these can usually be prevented by lacing the shoe more tightly. There is no cure, however, for a shoe which is too short. And the same may be said of the low stiff toe-cap. When blisters form on top of the toes, you may hold the toe-cap accountable for the damage.

In addition to the natural distention of the feet while walking there is the question of bulkiness of stockings to be considered. The wool-stocking habit so far as hiking is concerned is an excellent habit to acquire. To most hiking feet wool is far more satisfactory than cotton. Wet feet which are incased in wool are no special disadvantage, whereas with cotton the result may be a bad cold. Furthermore, the comfortable elasticity of wool on the feet serves a valuable purpose.

What has been said in regard to roominess of shoes applies to some extent to wool stockings. There is of course much greater elasticity to wool than leather, but the fact remains that stockings which have shrunken badly may play havoc with pedal comfort. Stockings should be neither so large that they wrinkle nor so small that they squeeze the feet. A tight, pinching stocking will start an ingrowing toe-nail about as quickly as will a tight shoe. Stockings which are badly shrunken

NATALIE DE BOGORY

is a name which we always like to see at the head of an article in our morning mail. We think that our readers share with us our enthusiasm for her interesting interpretations of the foreigners within our gates. A forthcoming Outlook article by Miss De Bogory is called "The Turning of the Tide."

It tells the story of sojourners in our country who are returning to their native lands. Some of their reasons for going back to Europe ought to make Americans do a little hard thinking.