

## DEMOS DEFAMED.

Here it is again! This time a member of Congress repeats it.\* He says, "Pilate acquitted Christ; an appeal from Pilate's decision was taken to the people, and the Savior was crucified." In other words, *it was the people who condemned Christ to the cross!*



Our "representative of the people" is not the only one who has said this—in one form or another. And it could not be more absurd and false if Satan himself had said it. It is high time these Scripture-quoting defamers of Demos were made to face the truth.

When the Devil quotes Scripture, it is best to verify the quotation and to be careful about the exegesis. So, too, is it when Scripture is quoted by a man who is (or wants to be) seated in public office by the methods that in lying euphemism are called "election by the people."

How did the "member from Kansas" learn that Pilate acquitted Christ?

Matthew, Mark and John each say that Pilate "delivered him to be crucified;" and Luke says that Pilate "gave sentence that what they asked for should be done."

It is true that "Pilate sought to release him," but like many another office-holder, his manhood was too light weight to over-balance his selfishness; and so he delegated to Christ's accusers the legal power to take his life and furnished them the soldiers to crucify him.

But "the gentleman from Kansas" says that Pilate acquitted him, and the people condemned him to the cross!



If our history is wrong and our statesman right, and Pilate really did decide to release Christ, and there really was an appeal to the mob which our legislator respectfully calls "the people," then who was it that appealed from Pilate's decision?

Was it he who was accused? Was it Pilate himself? Was it the chief priests and elders? Or did the mob appeal to itself?

But let us not confuse ourselves with puzzling questions. It is plain that the appeal "was taken to the people"—our statesman says so. In other words, the appeal was to Demos! It was a *referendum*! Demos reversed Pilate's decision! And Demos condemned Christ to the cross!

Christ himself said: "Behold, we go up to

\*Campbell of Kansas in his published letter to Roosevelt.

Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him unto the Gentiles to mock and to scourge, and to crucify." But our Scripture-quoter says *the people* condemned him.

We read that at one time "the Pharisees took counsel against him, how they might destroy him;" that at another time "the chief priests and the Pharisees . . . sought to lay hold on him," but "feared the multitudes, because they took him for a prophet;" that at another time the chief priests, elders of the people, scribes and Pharisees "gathered together unto the court of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas; and they took counsel together that they might take Jesus by subtlety, and kill him. But they said, Not during the feast, lest a tumult arise among the people." And we read that Judas "sought to deliver" Jesus "in the absence of the multitude;" that the chief priests, the scribes, the elders and the Pharisees sent officers and a company of men, with whom went a mob [*ochlos* not *demos*], in which, doubtless, there were money-changers, and merchants whom Christ only a few days before had the second time driven from the temple. We read that this "great multitude [*ochlos* not *demos*] with swords and staves" seized Jesus at night, took him to Annas, and then to Caiaphas, and "when morning was come," to Pilate; that when Pilate sent him to Herod, "the chief priests and the scribes stood and vehemently accused him." and that when Herod sent him back, Pilate called together the chief priests, and the rulers, and the people [*laos* not *demos*]; "and that the chief priests and the elders persuaded the multitudes [*ochlos* not *demos*] that they should ask for Barabbas, and destroy Jesus."

So it was not Demos, but the aristocrats and the mob *Ochlos* (more respectfully *Laos*) who cried, "Crucify him! crucify him!"



We read that "the common people heard him gladly;" that they desired "to make him a king;" that a few days before his crucifixion, great multitudes of them—gathered at a great national feast—went out from Jerusalem to meet him, and "spread their garments upon the way," and palm branches "which they had cut from the fields"—and rejoiced, and praised God "with a loud voice," and shouted "Hosanna to the Son of David." We read that after Pilate had delivered him to be crucified and he was on the way to Golgotha, about the middle of the forenoon, when, doubtless,

the tidings of what was being done had spread, "there followed him a great multitude of the people, and of women who bewailed and lamented him."

Surely the people who did these things were not the same people that cried, "Crucify him!"

If we *must* call that cry a *Referendum*—a *viva voce* referendum, then the "votes" were the votes of hierarchs and aristocrats and the votes which they controlled; if perchance a few brave negative voices mingled in that fearful cry, they were votes not "called for"—not counted—not heard; it was a referendum to the Jewish *aristos* and not to the Jewish *demos*.

Demos had nothing whatever to do with that aristocratic tribunal. The Jews of Palestine were then subjects of the Roman Emperor, and demos and democratic methods had no existence in that country.



It is not the masses but the classes that have made history a tragedy. Thus far Demos has played a very, very small part in the drama—even in these United States of America. And while, now and then, he may have been guilty of some sin of omission, the sins so freely charged to him have been almost universally the sins of *Aristos*—that defaming hypocrite, that pretender and usurper, who always has been, is now, and always will be, leprous with every sin possible to a ruler.

Let us remember with hopeful and grateful hearts, that the Prince of Peace, so cruelly slain by *Aristos*, has taught Demos to build no longer rude, perishing structures on the sand, but to build gloriously on the rock, and so firmly that he need fear no wind nor flood.

ASHER GEORGE BEECHER.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### PROBLEMS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

South Devon, England, March 21.

The discussion caused by the coal strike in Great Britain is noteworthy for the advance it shows in clear economic thinking since the great Budget campaign concentrated attention on the land question. It is doubtful if any previous labor dispute has revealed more clearly the common enemy of both capital and labor, viz, land monopoly. It has become a commonplace to ask what service the landlord performs in return for the estimated £6,000,000 he receives yearly in royalties from the coal mines. The risks of the capitalist are obvious, and the sufferings of the laborer are better realized each day as the sordid conditions of life in the mining regions are described. But the landlord, without risk or

anxiety, collects a tax of about 5½d. on every ton of coal brought to the surface.

Nobody supposes that a minimum wage concession will secure stable conditions, although it is perhaps the immediate step best calculated to bring about a quick resumption of work in the mines. State ownership and operation is advocated by Mr. Chiozza Money and J. A. Hobson, one estimate of the cost of purchase being £85,000,000! A wiser suggestion is to tax mining royalties heavily enough to compensate for the abolition of the present taxes on tea, coffee, cocoa, sugar and tobacco, a step which would bring a measure of relief not only to the miners but to all wage earners, and would be in harmony with the Freetrade principle.

The sudden and unexpected attack by the Tories upon the Government's minimum wage bill is regarded as a daring, if heartless, attempt to regain control in the game of party politics. But so reckless a move must have been determined by some powerful influence. The land-owning class, frightened by the events of the last few years, and fearful of further assaults upon their privileges, are apparently determined to make another desperate effort to break the power of advancing democracy.



On March 12 the final report of the British Royal Commission on Vivisection was issued as a Blue Book. It defends the practice in these words:

After full consideration we are led to the conclusion that experiments upon animals, adequately safeguarded by law, faithfully administered, are morally justifiable, and should not be prohibited by legislation.

At the same time a number of recommendations are made, advising (1) an increase of the inspectorate, (2) further limitations as regards the use of curare, (3) stricter provisions as to the definition and practice of pithing, (4) additional restrictions regulating the painless destruction of animals which show signs of suffering after experiment, (5) a change in the method of selecting and in the constitution of the advisory body to the Secretary of State, (6) special records by experimenters in certain cases. A majority of the Commission expresses the opinion that present enactments favoring horses, asses and mules might well be extended to include dogs, cats and anthropoid apes. This view is taken also by Lord Cromer, President of the Research Defense Society, in a letter approving the findings of the Commission. Dr. G. Wilson, one of the members of the Commission, in an additional memorandum, maintains that the fallacies and failures of vivisection are far more conspicuous than the successes.

FRANCIS W. GARRISON.



### THE INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM IN OHIO.

Columbus, Ohio, March 30.

After an all day session and late in the evening of the 27th, the Fourth Constitutional Convention adopted a Proposal recommending amendment of the Constitution to provide for use of the Initiative and Referendum. While this Proposal is not all the