

most powerful, and the most absorbent of power, of all the trusts. They may not contract contrary to the Sherman law, they may not conspire, they may not connive and fight to choke competition. But they don't need to. They have it choked to begin with. The Steel trust with its monopoly of mineral deposits and terminal points, and the Harvester trust with its control directly of its lumber supplies and indirectly through the Steel trust of its mineral supplies and terminal facilities, can absorb the earnings of the masses and yet be as "good" as a star-scholar at Sunday school. If Mr. Roosevelt's distinction between good trusts and bad were defined, the difference would probably not be far from this: A good trust is an exploiting industrial organization which has its feet firmly upon the ground, and, reaching out lawfully for what it wants, gets it; a bad trust is an exploiting industrial organization which has its feet in the air, and, kicking about boisterously for what it wants, gets it if the good trusts don't want it.



Secrets of the "Money Trust."

Great anger has been excited among the senior crowd in Wall Street by impudent interrogatories of the Congressional committee investigating the "money trust." Mr. Morgan is reported to be much wrought up over the "impudence" of that committee. Another finance "sharp" of renown "would like to be jailed" for refusing to answer these impudent questions, for then he would "get a writ of habeas corpus and fight the action right up to the Supreme Court of the United States," which "would probably take three years and by that time most if not all of the politicians now in Congress would be out of office." His confidence in the supreme power of the courts blinds him to the fact that if Congress refused to obey the mandate of a branch of the government only co-ordinate with itself, he might have to remain in durance until his financial friends had bowled out those inquisitive Congressmen. These irritated financial gentlemen are perfectly willing to have the "money trust" investigated, *provided its secrets are not exposed!* That is the substance of what they say. But if its secrets are not exposed, how are its crimes to be checked?



Charles Frederick Adams.

Charles Frederick Adams, the New York lawyer of whose interesting career we told two years ago,* has since that time made two lecturing tours

across the continent—through the Canadian Provinces as well as the Middle, the Northwestern, the Rocky Mountain and the Southern States,—and is now devoting three weeks to the filling of daily appointments in Chicago. His speaking style and charming personality have been cordially recognized in every part of the country and by every class of auditor; and his fairness to all persons, theories and interests, his wide and profound learning and clear thinking, his exactness and eloquence yet spontaneity in exposition, make his message universally welcome whatever his special subject may be. The confidence and affection in which Mr. Adams has been held in Brooklyn, Washington and New York from early manhood, have begun to attach to him in the wider society of the whole continent in his maturer years. He is to speak on the 10th, in Kimball's Cafe, at the dinner tendered to Margaret Haley by the Chicago Single Tax Club on her return from the Pacific Coast and in honor of her work in the Seattle Singletax campaign.



TYPICAL OBJECTIONS TO LAND VALUE TAXATION.

The intense weakness, intellectually, of the opposition to land value taxation, a weakness which was demonstrated in the recent anti-Singletax campaign in Seattle, is emphasized in the Missouri Singletax campaign now opening, and also in the campaign in New York City, for progressively shifting taxes from improvements to land values.



In Missouri, an opposition organization has been set on foot which, in the name of "the farmers of Bates County"—though not with the approval of any considerable number, as we venture to hope out of regard for their intelligence—puts forth these extraordinary "arguments" against the Singletax:

That it places the financial burdens of government upon producers, though all receive equal protection and benefits; that when applied to the fullest extent it is destructive of land values; and that in this country land values do not belong to the people as a whole, because the government, which is of the people, has by Constitutional laws duly, conveyed the public domain to individuals for a consideration and provided that all property should be taxed.

If it were possible to bring fallacy to the aid of falsity more transparently than do those apologists for land-value grabbing in Missouri, the

*See The Public of June 10, 1910, page 532.