

heelers of Cleveland. Whoever imagines that plutocracy will die without a struggle makes a great mistake.

When Johnson ran for mayor two years ago upon a three-cent fare platform, the street railroad ring and its organs were content to believe that he was not sincere. They have since learned that he was so sincere that nothing could stop him but the "ripping" of the city, which they therefore accomplished. They have learned, too, that he has other weapons besides three-cent fare ordinances with which to fight monopolies, and that taxation is one of them. It is this that has spurred them on to close up the Peter Witt "tax school," one of Johnson's institutions where by the enormous favoritism in taxation which prevails in Cleveland has been officially exposed. They know, of course, that if Johnson carries the next Cleveland election, he will soon have the three-cent fare movement and the tax school under full headway again. Therefore it is that they are determined to defeat his reelection at all hazards.

In one of his sermons recently delivered on the subject of gambling, the Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, of Cincinnati, defined the true objection to gambling. The usual objection is that gambling is wrong because its results are determined by chance. As Mr. Bigelow truly says this is no objection at all. Chance enters into most of the transactions of life. Moreover, whether a man shall take chances or not is a question for his own decision. What is there about gambling that subjects it properly to condemnation by society? Mr. Bigelow answers that it is the fact that success on one side in gambling depends upon failure on the other side. It is this that makes gambling un-social and therefore wrong—getting without giving, reaping without sowing, acquiring without earning. But what would become of many shining lights in our better element if getting without giving were condemned?

It now transpires that the Bucklin tax amendment in Colorado, defeated by more than two to one, according to the official report (p. 570), was defeated by only a small majority, if indeed it was defeated at all. The revelations of fraud in the count are astounding. Nor do these revelations depend upon the assertions of advocates of a defeated measure. The Denver Times, which opposed the amendment vigorously, concedes with marked reluctance enough to saturate the whole count with reasonable suspicion. We quote from its issue of the 13th, in which it compares the vote of one Denver district on the measure as returned by the judges of election, with the official abstract prepared in the county clerk's office:

FOR THE AMENDMENT.		
Precinct.	Judges' Co. Clerk's Return.	Abstract.
1	15	15
2	0	0
3	25	25
4	112	12
5	59	59
6	12	12
7	80	0
8	80	80
9	195	95
10	60	60
11	15	15
12	3	3
	656	376
AGAINST THE AMENDMENT.		
1	70	70
2	0	535
3	9	90
4	39	39
5	131	131
6	85	85
7	22	22
8	20	120
9	30	130
10	9	169
11	12	12
12	2	152
	429	1,555

Here is an aggregate change in only one district of 12 precincts which corruptly shifted the "official" vote from a majority of 227 for the amendment to a majority of 1,179 against it. In another district the vote in one precinct was changed in the county clerk's office from a majority of 35 for the amendment to a majority of 165 against it. That is, 50 for to 15 against, was altered to 50 for to 215 against.

The same paper quotes the county clerk as saying:

You may say for me that I admit the perpetration of all the frauds they have alleged. The evidence is indisputable and conclusive. I will start an immediate investigation and it will be a thorough one. Prosecutions will follow the investigation to the bitter end if I have to stand the entire expense myself.

These alterations appear to have been made most bunglingly. For the roughly written figures of the election judges were substituted neat clerical figures by the county clerk's assistants; and the forgeries were committed with ink of a different kind from that which the judges used.

It is explained by the local papers of Denver that these forgeries were perpetrated in order to keep the affirmative vote in Arapahoe county down below a certain small aggregate, some people who were in the secrets of the organization that opposed the amendment having felt so secure in their confidence that the election judges had been adequately bribed that they made bets upon the complete collapse of the affirmative vote. But as some of the judges were "not honest" enough to "stay bought," the affirmative vote as returned rose several thousand above the wagered maximum, and it was to save the bets that the county clerk's office force was set at work forging the returns by such alterations as those indicated above. This, at any rate, is the explanation; though similar frauds in other counties would indicate either that similar bets were made there or that conspiracy to defraud by forgery was general. The Denver frauds are believed to have been great enough to change a negative majority in the county of less than 3,000 into one of more than 10,000.

These forgeries were far from being the only frauds. Evidence is accumulating which goes to show that the opposition had raised a campaign fund which they used almost exclusively for the purpose of corrupting election judges. They did this in the guise of campaign contributions to

the two principal parties. Leaders in both parties being opposed to the measure for the same reason, namely, that they are interested in landed speculations which the Bucklin amendment would have enabled the people of each county to reach by means of taxation—it was easy to bribe the election judges of both parties without seeming to bribe anybody. Back, therefore, at the very beginning of the count, right in the voting precincts, the infamous work of falsifying the ballot began. As no one represented the interests of the amendment in voting precincts where both political parties opposed it, the election judges of those parties were able to make almost any returns they pleased. And this opportunity was not neglected. In at least one Denver district the judges having forgotten to count the ballots filled in their returns at a guess, with 23 for and 23 against. They at least held the scales evenly. But on good authority it is stated that hundreds of votes were fraudulently counted against the amendment on Capitol Hill, and specifically that in one precinct there the negative vote of 43 was returned by the election judges as 143.

Nor were the frauds confined to the Denver county. They appear to have spread all over the State of Colorado, excepting only a few counties in which the Democratic officials supported the measure and prevented false counting and doctored returns. Conejos county, for instance, returned an adverse vote of 2,128 to 62. This is a Mexican county, and according to the returns nearly all the Mexican voters must have voted on the amendment—something very improbable. In Huerfano county the vote was reported as 1,981 against the amendment and 78 for it. This is one of the counties in which the Colorado Fuel and Iron company owns the laboring population and votes their names at will. It doesn't even go to the trouble of sending its laborers to the polls and watching them. It keeps them at work, leaving to the election

officers the function of casting the ballots. These functionaries copy names into the poll books—such probable names, for example, as William Boxcar and John Tie—and put the ballots into the boxes themselves. The Colorado Fuel and Iron company controls 11 counties in the southern part of the State. In Pueblo and El Paso counties, which, with Arapahoe, contain all the large cities—localities where the largest votes for the amendment were doubtless cast—the election judges' returns were altered as at Denver.

As the large newspapers of Colorado of both parties were opposed to the Bucklin amendment, they are taking infinite pains to minimize these exposures, but they are forced to concede enough to show that the frauds are stupendous. Senator Bucklin is convinced that the conceded frauds in Arapahoe (Denver) county were not much if any worse than elsewhere throughout the State, and now regards it as doubtful that the amendment was really defeated. Steps have already been taken by Edwin N. Burdick, in Denver, who is cooperating with Senator Bucklin, to secure an investigation and a recount; and criminal proceedings against the Denver rascals, little and big, are delayed only by the fact that the grand jury is not now in session.

Press dispatches from Manila tell every now and then of the lawless exploits of "ladrones." As "ladrones" are thieves, the intention is to convey to American readers the impression that disturbances in the Philippines are confined to the operations of bands of highwaymen. But it begins to look as if these are bands of what, were we Filipinos, we should call patriots instead of thieves. For illustration, the latest dispatch on the subject reads in this wise:

In the province of Bulacan it is understood that a band of 300 ladrones, led by an American Negro, are scheming to wipe out the constabulary, and that four miles out from the town of Clacocan four American blacks are engaged in drilling a large number of highwaymen in mil-

itary tactics and training them in the use of firearms. Because of the increasing activity of the ladrones the continued withdrawal and concentration of troops in the islands is causing apprehension among the inhabitants of many provinces, who have depended wholly upon the military for protection. Ladrones are said to be notoriously bold and numerous in Rizal, and the president of that province recently called on Adj. Gen. Heistand for relief. He also has appealed to Gov. Taft.

That report does not describe the depredations of thieves. It suggests instead the operations of irreconcilables—such as are usually called "traitors" by a subjugating power and "patriots" by their fellow partisans. In the estimation of the British, Marion's men in the South and the cowboys of New York were of this type, and would doubtless have been called "ladrones" by the London papers and letter writers had so convenient a word at that time found its way into the language. The disingenuousness of our calling Filipino patriots bands of "ladrones," as the Spanish did, is exposed by mail reports from Manila received at San Francisco on the 24th. According to these reports three of the provinces now under the civil government of Gov. Taft—Cavite, Batangas and Tayabas—are to be "placed once more under military control in order to purge them of the insurrecto element." Patriotism dies as hard in the Philippines as it would in Illinois.

— If the Christmas season were a season for unselfishly doing right instead of selfishly "doing good," what a blessed example it might set for all other seasons.

WHAT BOYS READ.

I.

The following letter came to me a few days ago:

Here's something that will interest you!

Mr. — found his office boy often engaged in reading in such an absorbed way that he determined to encourage such a good habit, thinking the reading was beneficial. On questioning the boy he was astonished to find what had occupied all his spare time. Ask-