

stumbled into the oil fields of western Pennsylvania at the beginning of their discovery. Another became interested in lumber on the upper Susquehanna when, as even I can recall very distinctly, exploitation of the forests was just beginning. And so on in practically every case.

Those men got hold of natural resources, gathered a good sized nest egg for those times, and then came back to take up their farming just as their fathers were getting older and ready to quit work. They all continued to farm for some years, but, as my informant admitted, while they had the reputation of making big money on the farm because they were well to do, he could not see that there was much chance of their having made more than a comfortable living. The other enterprises that were the real source of their comparative wealth must have been those outside interests.

EDWARD J. SHRIVER.



JOSEPH FELS'S SECOND VISIT TO SWEDEN.

Chicago, Sept. 4.

It is very interesting to read in the Swedish papers about the visit of Mr. and Mrs. Fels to Sweden this summer.

Large and attentive audiences, made up of all classes of people, greeted Mr. Fels everywhere. Twelve hundred tickets of admission were sold for a meeting at Gothenburg, and 100 persons attended without tickets. At Arvika Mr. Fels spoke to a chautauqua of young people numbering 4,000.

As to the attitude of newspapers, it appears that those speaking for the common people were generally friendly toward Mr. Fels—one of them called him "the little man with the big heart"—while the organs of plutocracy naturally attacked him and his work. One of the latter kind (Stockholm's *Dagblad*) "wished it hadn't." This paper praised Mr. Fels highly as a philanthropist (of the common type), and especially referred to the colonies for poor people he had established in England; but belittled him as a land reformer, saying among other things that "it was a chimera if one believed that he (Mr. Fels) in any way furthered a really happy solution of the land question" (that is, I suppose, a solution that did not in any degree or manner lessen the land owners' power to appropriate the earnings of other people). But Mr. Fels called on the editor-in-chief and handed or sent him a reply for insertion in his paper, in which he, in the most lucid manner, showed both the futility and harm of philanthropy, and the effectiveness for good for all kinds of producers, of the land reform he advocated. This reply was duly printed, accompanied by the editor's apology. Mr. Fels, he said, was certainly honestly convinced of the correctness of Henry George's doctrines; he was a man of "unprejudiced amiability" and a "happily great proportion of humor." However, he, the editor, must continue his opposition to his economic theories; Mr. Fels was gazing at one point only—the tax on land values, which he considered as a panacea for all kinds of evils, while "we others" look at many things.

Among utterances of Mr. Fels that must have

struck his Swedish hearers with astonishment were the following:

"The United States could easily feed all the inhabitants of the globe, if they could get at the land there, and used it well."

"Sweden, with its rich resources, could support in abundance 50 millions of people, instead of 5½, its present population. And there would be no need of emigration to America."

"One of the big multi-millionaires of America could easily buy all Sweden, and then—in accordance with your laws—turn the whole population off its surface. What an insane state of affairs!"

All the above concerns Mr. Fels. But Mrs. Fels, who accompanied her husband and shared in his work, also shared with him the attention of newspapers. And for her they all had nothing but praise. Even to Stockholm's *Dagblad* she was "the refined and intelligent little American millionaire wife," who not only in a high degree shares her husband's interest in land reform, and was the one who originally called his attention to social problems, but "whose interests have a much wider range" than his, and embrace among other things, woman's rights.

AUGUST DELLGREN.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of *The Public* for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, September 10, 1912.

The Election in Vermont.

Complete unofficial returns from the Vermont election of the 3rd show the following results as compared with the Gubernatorial vote in that State two years ago:

	1912	1910
Allen M. Fletcher (Rep.).....	26,259	35,263
Harlan B. Howe (Dem.).....	20,350	17,425
Frazer Metzger (Prog.).....	15,800
Clement F. Smith (Pro.).....	1,443	1,044
Fred W. Suitor (Soc.).....	1,181	1,055

No choice having been made by majority vote, the Governor will be chosen by the legislature, which proves to be strongly enough Republican to assure the election of Fletcher. The Progressive Party claims 50 members of the lower House of the legislature, the total membership of which is 246; and the Democrats poll their largest total vote in the State since 1880. [See current volume, page 848.]



The Election in Maine.

Following less than a week after the election in Vermont, the election in Maine has been looked forward to as a sign in the general political sky; but its value in that respect is greatly minimized by the fact that the Progressive Party had no