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The Stranglers of Socialism?

This international situation, in one phase, is a race between the coming of the peace conference and the completion of a proletarian revolution in Germany. Which comes first will determine largely the character of the peace and the course of events in Germany itself.

Just prior to the revolution, it was a race between the Petrograd and the revolution, between Marshal Foch and Karl Liebknecht. The Revolution and Liebknecht conquered. But it was a conquest that marked simply the first stage of the Revolution; the next necessary step was to incorporate the revolution, to make it a revolution, to the proletariat and imperialism, the establishment of a Socialist proletariat government.

The reactionary press in this country and the reactionary press in Germany are equally against the coming of this new revolution. It is being declared by the American press and the American press in Germany, the stranglers of Socialism. This is a monstrous proposal, the consummation of which would make the United States the executioner of democracy.

It is a serious proposition. The American press is trying to distort the problem of the coming peace into a problem of action to crush the German proletarian government. The Bolsheviki and the Russian people have their government.

The reactionary press in this country and the reactionary press in Germany are equally against the coming of this new revolution. It is being declared by the American press and the American press in Germany, the stranglers of Socialism. This is a monstrous proposal, the consummation of which would make the United States the executioner of democracy.

This is a rare specimen of logic. The Bolsheviki principle of government "is the same principle as that of the Middle Ages, in which one class ruled, and the Bolsheviki propose to substitute the rule of the working classes. The aristocratic class ruled mildly in some places, harshly in others; the proletariat begins, at least, by ruling ferociously everywhere that it gains power. Mr. Mueller is perfectly right and desirably clear on this difference between Bolshevist rule and democratic rule, which last is not the rule of any class, but the rule of the whole people. We don't want a democratic republic. We want a socialist, nay, a proletarian, republic." Enough has been said. No democracy; democracy is spurned.

"The Bolsheviki, whether Russian or German, do not want democracy. They want a Government in which the proletariat, one class, shall rule all other classes; and in Russia they have shown that this rule is not to be a mild one, but one of bloody tyranny. The Bolsheviki, in fact, adopt the same principles as that of the Middle Ages, in which one class ruled all other classes. The only difference is that in the Middle Ages it was the aristocratic class which ruled, and the Bolsheviki propose to substitute the rule of the working classes. The aristocratic class ruled mildly in some places, harshly in others; the proletariat begins, at least, by ruling ferociously everywhere that it gains power. Mr. Mueller is perfectly right and desirably clear on this difference between Bolshevist rule and democratic rule, which last is not the rule of any class, but the rule of the whole people. We don't want a democratic republic. We want a socialist, nay, a proletarian, republic." Enough has been said. No democracy; democracy is spurned.

The development of a Socialist proletarian government in Germany will not complicate peace—unless the purpose of the coming peace is to assure the supremacy of Capitalism and Imperialism in Germany!

The peculiar mental juggling—and the defense of Imperialism requires the most peculiar, insolent and shameless mental juggling—by which the Times concludes that making the world safe for democracy is synonymous with crushing Socialism, is indicated in the following words:

"The Bolsheviki, whether Russian or German, do not want democracy. They want a Government in which the proletariat, one class, shall rule all other classes; and in Russia they have shown that this rule is not to be a mild one, but one of bloody tyranny. The Bolsheviki, in fact, adopt the same principles as that of the Middle Ages, in which one class ruled all other classes. The only difference is that in the Middle Ages it was the aristocratic class which ruled, and the Bolsheviki propose to substitute the rule of the working classes. The aristocratic class ruled mildly in some places, harshly in others; the proletariat begins, at least, by ruling ferociously everywhere that it gains power. Mr. Mueller is perfectly right and desirably clear on this difference between Bolshevist rule and democratic rule, which last is not the rule of any class, but the rule of the whole people. We don't want a democratic republic. We want a socialist, nay, a proletarian, republic." Enough has been said. No democracy; democracy is spurned.

This is a rare specimen of logic. The Bolsheviki principle of government "is the same principle as that of the Middle Ages, in which one class ruled all other classes." That is a formidable indictment; it evokes visions of a small class of aristocrats, very small in number, who fooled, neither did they spin, thriv-

In the New York Times, in its December 11 issue, editorially says:

"Again and again, at the meeting of the Central Soldiers' and Workmen's Council at Berlin, Hugo Haase and others warned their comrades that President Wilson would only conclude peace with a stable democratic government in which all classes were represented. Richard Mueller, Chief Executive of the Council, described this assertion as an invention of the reactionary press. Yet, since President Wilson means what he said about making the world safe for democracy, Mr. Haase is absolutely right and Mr. Mueller is not only wrong, but he knows he is wrong and is whistling to keep his spirits up."

In other words, the Times desires that making the world safe for democracy is synonymous with crushing Socialism.

What is the attitude of the government? And what is the attitude of the American people? The suggestions of the Times and of other reactionary newspapers are sinister proposals of Imperialism, a call upon the American people to make sacrifices of blood and treasure to assure the supremacy of Capitalism and Imperialism in Germany!

The peculiar mental juggling—and the defense of Imperialism requires the most peculiar, insolent and shameless mental juggling—by which the Times concludes that making the world safe for democracy is synonymous with crushing Socialism, is indicated in the following words:

"The Bolsheviki, whether Russian or German, do not want democracy. They want a Government in which the proletariat, one class, shall rule all other classes; and in Russia they have shown that this rule is not to be a mild one, but one of bloody tyranny. The Bolsheviki, in fact, adopt the same principles as that of the Middle Ages, in which one class ruled all other classes. The only difference is that in the Middle Ages it was the aristocratic class which ruled, and the Bolsheviki propose to substitute the rule of the working classes. The aristocratic class ruled mildly in some places, harshly in others; the proletariat begins, at least, by ruling ferociously everywhere that it gains power. Mr. Mueller is perfectly right and desirably clear on this difference between Bolshevist rule and democratic rule, which last is not the rule of any class, but the rule of the whole people. We don't want a democratic republic. We want a socialist, nay, a proletarian, republic." Enough has been said. No democracy; democracy is spurned.
Reconstructing Governments

The Revolutionary Age

The Executive Committee of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils in Berlin has made an announcement, which is considered as againstSocialism, which is considered as against

The Soviet Government is so autocratic that it

When President Wilson made his declaration about "making the world safe for democracy," he was thinking of coarse to restore order,

"All this is equally to protect the enemy." Pecu­liarity, Socialism, which is considered as against

"Liebknecht's speeches were all absolutely Bolshevist. Now the proletariat is conscious of its power," he said, "the watchword is world revolution or world destruction. As the call to the national defense should be answered by the dicta­torial act, so by the overture of a capitalistic rule, thus establishing a Sociali­stian democracy to protect the nation, as the German Republic is sup­ported by the German Republic, then all countries will see the bourgeois world domination of the proletariat will begin.""

This is clear, according to Lenin, Liebknecht and the Spartacus Socialists, that even upon a dictatorship of the proletariat. Waving continuous, "Now the proletariat is conscious of its power," he said, "the watchword is world revolution or world destruction. As the call to the national defense should be answered by the dicta­tory, so by the overture of a capitalistic rule, thus establishing a Socialis­tion democracy to protect the nation, as the German Republic is sup­ported by the German Republic, then all countries will see the bourgeois world domination of the proletariat will begin.

Lenin does not believe in industrial democracy—then why the expropriation of capital by workers' control? What is the abolition of an industrial state? These are measures of industrial Socialism; and it is precisely this task of introd­ucing industrial democracy that must be performed by the dictatorship of the proletariat.

All revolutions are minority revolutions, p political revolution. In this sense, "minority" is a fact only in a society based on ownership of the means of production. In the actual revolution was accom­plished by the proletariat and peasantry, and that was the base of the bolshevication of the entire backward sec­tion of the people. According to all the evidence, the Soviet Government is a majority government and still it is a dictatorship—against the count­ervailing resistance, against the more backward sec­tion of the people, against the bourgeois and capital­ism.

The bourgeo­is revolution ended in dictatorship: Cromwell, Napoleon; and even after the Ameri­can Revolution—Washington was offered a crown; Hamilton's party represented the tendency of dictatorship, the democratic democracy alone prev­ailed. But in this Utopian dictatorship, the so­cietarian democracy does not exist. The proletarian dictatorship is the base of the bolshevication. In this sense, "minority" is a fact only in a society based on ownership of the means of production.

Capitalism is itself a dictatorship. It is, in fact, a dictatorship of the government of one class, the class that controls industry, the class that has wealth and power. Simplicity and in­dependence is the form of authority of the bourgeoisie. But this independence may pre­vent proletarian action, to centralise all pow­er in the representatives of the bour­geoisie. It is the arm­ed dictatorship; but by means of its centraliza­tion, it is the only means of information, of the factors for creating;
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The Quality of Clemency

RECENT developments in the Mooney case clearly demonstrate two things, both of which are of supreme importance to the workers of this country: that the forces of Capitalism are relentless in their efforts to sweep the scales away from the worker, and that the system—the language—the power of society, holds the center of the stage. In the countries where the masses of the people are not in action Socialism is also the dominant of progress but the fad of the bourgeoisie and the citadel of power, Socialism is the driving power of the government. Briand, Viviani, Guesde are friends of the old order, the people rose, and in Germany where the masses of the people have been prominently before the public, not only of the United States but of the entire world. It is not unexpected that the case will strike in the face of the Dreyfus case in France, no other case has been as prominent before the public, not only of Russia, England, Ireland, Italy, and Holland has taken an active interest in the case and asked that a new trial be granted. Public opinion throughout America has long been on the side of the accused. In spite of this wave of protest the capitalist interests have persisted in their endeavor to silence the voice of this man who spoke against the wrong system. The case was appealed to the Supreme Court and while the appeal was still pending the paper of one of the prosecution's chief witnesses was revealed. This additional evidence was laid before the court and the sentence of death was commuted to life imprisonment. The court, in that order, in the case which might be retried on a new count, and in the meantime the case was continued.

From the breakdown of the prosecution's witness it was evident that the whole case was a frame-up, the character of the witnesses was such that the prosecution's case, their testimony, and their remaining defendants fell through. It was proved by the defense that the whole of the prosecution's evidence was false. This is the greatest fact which the case, Mooney's life for a paltry bribe, that, in addition to the fact that these men were big-time criminals, even these drags of society could be persuaded to testify, and that the whole was the work of the prosecution. It was the endeavor of the organizer of labor and a fighter for the common good of the people, whom the courts denied the chance to testify. They are the greatest states in the union silent in anwsuer to the appeal that should stop the trial and cry halt to the murder of Mooney.

The Supreme Court spoke with the voice of re-action and with its decision an interesting fact was brought to light which would be well for all of the workers of this country to consider carefully, viz.: that the judicial system at present operating can convict but cannot rectify, at least in the case where the interests of the working class are at stake; that justice is all a matter of time and record and that no subsequent happenings can alter the mandate of the Supreme Court. Such a judiciary ceases to be a public of justice and becomes an instrument of the people to see that the workers of this country are free. There is no middle course in this case; the masses of the people to consider carefully, the evidence adduced, and for this reason one authenticated case will serve as well as a hundred.

The governor also speaks of reviewing "certain developments" following the conviction. What are these "certain developments"? The San Francisco "Call" on November 22, several days before the Governor's "clemency," printed nearly seven pages of "certain developments" under the heading: "Pickert is Trapped by Fickert," which it takes from the report of J. B. Denmore, U. S. Director-General of Employment, to Secretary of Labor Willson.

In summing up his report, which is chiefly the transcript of conversations between Pickert, the District Attorney in the case, and his associates obtained by means of a dictaphone placed in the office of the private secretary, Denmore says: "For the purpose of this report no further transcripts of conversations have been deemed necessary. It can readily be understood that merely to pile up a multiplicity of incidents of the same general character would be a work with no end in view. Each incident is built on an already long report without adding to its strength or its lucidity. In other words, it is not enough to prove one or two points; many instances of frameup can be laid to the account of such a system, not in the quality, rather than the mere amount of evidence adduced, and for this reason one authenticated case will serve as well as a hundred.

"The record establishes three sets of facts, that is, in the case of Pickert, inquiring upon the question at issue, namely, whether Mr. Mooney and his fellow defendants received a fair trial at the hands of the district attorney. These three sets of facts are:

"First,—That Pickert is in constant association with men interested in a nature as to render it incredible that he should be either indifferent or in a position to render help.

"Second,—That Pickert and his associates have within the past month been engaged in putting together a complete frame-up, and this it is which, in case in which it is his sworn duty to declare the case a new trial.

"Third,—That Pickert and his associates, with, in the past month, have conspired to fabricate evidence with which to frame up the defendants, and that to this end they have attempted, in the grossest and most shameless and blackmal a prospective woman witness.

"It will be apparent that these facts, which are all brought out in the case, are enough to leave the impression, made unavoidably by the weak and conflicting nature of the testimony in the body of the case, that practically the whole of Pickert's case against Mooney, Billings and Mrs. Mooney was made by "clemency." The threat of the workers purchased "clemency," the execution of that threat will bring freedom to the worker and not to the criminal, the stoppage of this country from lasting shame and disgrace. The most important thing to the workers is to cut the threat. Speak in the terms of your economic might. Set Mooney free.

Socialism—the Hope of all Sides

RANT as they may, the apostles of Capitalism are forced to face the unpleasant fact that Socialism is the predominant factor in all the changes that are at present writing the pages of history. Even where revolution is not marching on to action Socialism holds the center of the stage. In Russia where the proletarian revolution has conquered power, Socialism is definitely in the ascendency, and in Germany where the masses are beginning to march to the final assault on the citadel of power, Socialism is the driving power behind the march. In Ireland, in Australia, this workers dominated the scene Socialism became the chief of the day, even as now it is the rage in Germany.

The reactionary, caught in the swirl of revolt, could, at least, liberate their victims who are rising up, to the rising of the waters, Liberals were rushed into the lime-light, and the workers of this country, in centuries, and as quickly rushed into the outer darkness, when it was found that the liberal stage had become too hot for them, with acquiescence. "Friends of the people," were held up to the public gaze only to be cast aside and placed in supreme power and everyone became a "Socialist." "Socialists" and "Socialism" became the one hope of the reactionary. Out of the wreck of autocracy, out of the paltry thing must be saved, and only Socialists and Socialism could save it. Thus began the array of "Socialists" that for a time held the outside world at bay. Yet, as Kerensky, Titov, Kohn, Skobelev, Tschornov, mediated Socialistic pluses about moderation, coalition, evolution, just as today in Germany Ebert, Luef, Scheidemann hold the center of the stage and sing the same songs.

In the countries where the masses of the people are not in action Socialism is also the dominant factor. In France where the masses are rising to high places in the government, Briand, Viviani, Gaude are now in position to control the highest peaks of governmental fame are not, as Kerensky says, in the pockets of "Socialists" but in the high valleys, the foothills of fame, are thronged with "Socialists": Henderson, McDevold, Barnes, in England, in Ireland, in Holland, in Circles in Holland, in France, the men of the people, have a bowing acquaintance with Troetschel, Itze, the Capitalist looks with favor on Biesen, Musolin, d'Ambris. The best people in Belgium smile benignly on LeMann, Vandoehoek, La Fontaine, Vandewalde, Verhoeven, and his friends, who sit together at the council tables of the mighty, while the former bourgeoisie supports and wine with our old friends, Gompers, Bohn and Spargo.

It will be apparent that all these "Socialists" have not fought for their prominence; greatness was thrust upon them. They are the welcome guests at the home of the long blight of the old order, yet they are "Socialists." While all these pleasantries are being exchanged the masses of the world's disinterested are also in the game, turning the pages of history. Kerensky, with them Socialism means a clean sweep—a complete overthrow of the present system of society and in its place the establishment of a new order. As the bourgeois Socialists lounge round the tables of the old autocrats, they lose hold on the masses.

In Russia, for a time, Kerensky stayed the march of progress but events forced him to take a definite stand and when he was revealed as the friend of the old order, the people rose, and in their wrath sent him into the place of the darkened, all over time. In Germany the situation is paralleled. The advocacy of moderation, the disciples of the patchwork theory, rise to power, but the masses begin to move and compromise follows compromise, and while Kerensky, like the rest of them, desire to mend will vanish in incapacity. Kerensky, Ursula Steiner, in a two edged sword. It sweeps forward and backward, cutting all connection with the past, forward, clearing the way towards a new system.

The reactionary forces may flirt with Socialism, may even afford the Socialists a place in the eyes of the people, but the vivid history of the revolution proves that they are powerless and fruitless. Once the people glimpse their power they are invisible. With incredible swiftness the masses will sweep the Socialists away from its eyes, and after the first dazzling glare of the light is over, it sees with amazing clarity.
The Struggle in Australia

WHILE little is heard from the Commonwealth of the antipodean events are marching with incredible rapidity. Australia is commonly supposed to be a workingman's paradise owing to the fact that the labor unions virtually control the government, but the Socialist tendencies of the Australian government exists much more in the imagination than in reality. It is true that the leaders of the unions control the government to a considerable extent, but, when it is remembered that the present government is a part of such control, the Socialists may well pause to enquire as to the real nature of the labor union. That the capital and labor in Australia has been found to be the complete failure of what was supposed to be a labor government. Formerly, the labor unions, founded on a craft basis, were the instruments of the workers in the struggle against exploitation. But in modern times, they have become economically termed a "fair day's wage for a fair day's work," but outside this, they are the representative bodies of the people in Australia are in the same position as elsewhere. The control of the unions by the well-organized body of voters exercise power over the political state. When the conditions of the political state, including the condition of the national union, in the land of the Kangaroo, having more to industry and less to politics. It was this tendency that resulted in the heavy sentences imposed on the twelve advocates of industrial unionism some time ago. The Australian arm of the Industrial Workers of the World had for some time previously been very active in their advocacy of the One Big Union, but it was not until they turned their attention to the unions, themselves, and worked within these bodies in favor of the more revolutionary form of unionism that they began to make the weight of their agitation felt. While they constituted a weak minority they were left to carry on their propaganda in comparative peace, but with their power on the increase, they adopted the same attitude that the interests of Capitalism everywhere assume towards those who threaten their foundations. The I.W.W. became another "cesspool," by the press waged the same campaign of vilification against them as against any other organization that has elsewhere. By the jailing of the leaders the propaganda, as has been shown elsewhere, received a check. There is an impression of a setback, and now comes the report that the majority of the big unions in Australia, that formed the I.W.W., has decided to adopt the industrial form of organization and that the new spirit of organization in Victoria will shortly follow suit. The leaders of the industrialists are frank in their statements that when the political series on the industrial form of organization they will then wage war against the capitalist system, or to quote from a newspaper dispatch "make repeated assaults upon the citadel of Capitalism, choosing our own time and our own battlefields, culminating in one gigantic struggle between the organized forces of capitalist and labor, when, if successful, we will then be able to take control of industry and abolish the Socialist Commonwealth." At the beginning of the war, in Australia, as was the case in all the countries involved, the Socialist and Labor movements spent all their energies on the question of war. On the part of the party and called itself the National Labor Party. This was a united front with the Liberals, and together they succeeded in riding into office and gradually constitute party. But the Official Labor Party dominates the field. This is the sect, in alliance with the Socialists, who favor the formation of a "National Labor Union." Among them "simon pure" political activists, who have laborerd in all sorts of ways to gain the power of the New South Wales decision spell disaster as it amounts relagating politics to a secondary place. But, the Pauline charters of the industrial leaders says: "The political arm of the labor movement in Australia, elections, upon the uninvited vote of the middleman, the moderates of the community. Therefore, the scope of the movement is in reality governed by the moderates. It cannot march, by the very nature of things, to labor's final goal."
SWISS Socialism is bound by ties of language on the one hand to the Socialism of Germany and on the other to that of France. It was entirely natural that the crisis in these two socialist Parties should at once express itself in Switzerland, enclosed as the country is on all sides by the fires of war. The struggle was mirror'd in the Federal Parliament. The first dispute with respect to the war took place in 1914, when the Federal Parliament was considering the modification of the law to effect the conscription. At the close of the debate, the socialists voted against the bill. 11

A few days ago reports reaching the United States told of two coupes d'état which took place almost simultaneously in two different parts of Russia—Kiev and Odessa. In the former case Hermann Skroopakovsky, a German socialist, had been elected head of the government, a government which, on the one hand, was composed of people who have been close associates of the Germans, and on the other hand, of people who had been close associates of the Germans. In the latter case, a revolution had occurred in Odessa, a revolution in which the Russian Socialists, led by the Czar and the Czar's military, had been instrumental in driving out the government of the Czar and the Czar's military.

In both cases the coupes d'état were led by the ex-Czar's generals in Kiev—by General Denikin, in Odessa—the former leading the Christian Socialists, and the latter leading the Russian Socialists. Moreover, the two coupes d'état were closely related to the government of the Czar and the Czar's military, which had been driven out of Russia by the people of Odessa. The coupes d'état were led by people who had been close associates of the Czar and the Czar's military, and who had been instrumental in driving out the government of the Czar and the Czar's military.

A day a dispute was published to the effect that the Allies are marching toward Kiev. The fact that this dispute came on the heels of another dispute telling about the coup d'état in Kiev, shows that the coincidence of the two events was not merely accidental. Generally speaking, the Allies used their own men in Kiev and also in Ukraine. But what are the elements with which a contact should be affected in order to form an agreement between the labor unions? Surely, it can be seen from the documents that the German and the Russian Socialists have been in close contact with each other since the beginning of the revolution.

On the other hand, it has become necessary for the Allies to cut the complicated Siberian knot, at any cost. The Imperial government has become too complex, and it is probably the only military unit of any importance that is not a part of the Allied system. Therefore, it is not surprising that the Imperial government has been driven out of Russia by the people of Odessa, and that the coupes d'état have occurred in Kiev and Odessa.
socialism and reaction in austria
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Debs and Moyer—a Page of American Labor History

Who was present at its deathbed scene? Who was it that heard him express these thoughts? I want to know and insist on your telling me. I want to know whether those who were in the service of the A. F. of L. in Haywood and Pettibone hung twelve years ago just as the same gang went Haywood to keep him in the penitentiary today. You know that this gang, this Gompers gang that you are now check by jaw with, never lifted a finger to help you on the contrary, did everything they could in a sneaking and underhand way to send you to the gallows until the Socialists and the loyal men in the labor movement had stirred up the country and made your acquittal possible. The certain and then only did they allow themselves to drift with the current and reluctantly concede—and it meant them not a little to make the concession—that you were really entitled to a fair trial.

I want to know this to be the fact as well as I do. John M. O'Neil, your official associate and editor of your magazine, fiercely denounced Gompers and his crowd for their perfidy and cowardice. But before this, too, I want to confess that your official headquarters there was not a day that passed that Gompers and his pals, whom you and your constituents fought with, were not roundly denounced as crooks and traitors and traitors to the union labor for their cowardly and contemptible attitude in the Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone strike. This attitude stood almost alone in fighting their battle and the general belief was that they would be hanged as murderers.

And now, if I am right, you have the hardihood to stand before a body of labor delegates and tell them that it was the A. F. of L. that you have in your defense. If you do this, you are simply wishing to present an open avowal to the Mexicano delegates, which should be to their constituents and to the American public. I would rather that you were hanged, and the lives of Haywood and those in your defense. If you send the message back to their constituents and spread the lie in the Mexican labor movement so that it might be misled and betrayed into believing that the A. F. of L. is the only tried and true champion of the working classes, while the L. W. T. is the traitorous conspiracy against labor which should be wiped from the earth.

I have had very positive differences with Haywood as you well know, but if you made this statement to decide the Mexican delegates, then I would rather a thousand times be Haywood in a penitentiary for the rest of my days than to be hung, if only I could save the presidency of the western miners, or even the presidency of the United States. You are quoted in your statement as having said, and it is quoted following: "Pettibone died, and on his death-bed he gave thanks to the American Federation of Labor for the help it had given him."

I want to know to show to the masses what could be accomplished on a large scale, that each and every one must be willing to sacrifice his life, that sacrifice should not be invited, but that one must be ready to sacrifice. You object that I have committed this deed against the principles of the social democracy. This is also true. The International has admitted parties which, before the end of the present program, for individual action: the Social Revolutionaries, I was one of their opponents, and have always carried on a sharp and active political campaign. Mass action must be supreme.

I want to know whether a speedy death will release me, or whether fate will condemn me to an endless living death. But, when I stand face to face with my own life I have only my life, and I have no one single sense may serve me well in the last moment.

A few short words have been my obituary, but my obituary may have been only a part of the deeper than I know it...

We want to know whether a speedy death will release me, or whether fate will condemn me to an endless living death. But, when I stand face to face with my own life I have only my life, and I have no one single sense may serve me well in the last moment.

I have been told that my death was a blow to an enemy of the international, but I have been told that my life had been an happiness, from all my friends and comrades in all parts of the world. I will remind you, then, of the very April a place in this movement

It was an open avowal of the policy of force, but it was a symbolic act, a parable as well. By this I wished...
Socialism and Reaction in Austria

By Friedrich Adler

(From Adler's speech in court at his trial for the assassination of Premier Sturmer.)

I DESIRE to declare that I deny all responsibility for any statements made here by my attorney, that I do not assume that even the greatest criminal could do anything, actually, any attempt on the part of my counsel to present an inaccurate, or even a partial picture of my real character as a lawyer and an attorney to take care of my body or it is my duty to the profession to protect my convictions, which are more important than the defense of my life. There is a very much more serious issue than that which is involved here, and that issue, I believe, is to be determined, therefore, to say from the start: I did not commit this deed in a fit of mental darkness, but after ripe consideration: I have considered it for a year and a half, which weighed all its effects, from every side.

In the whole of Austria, no one is competent but the ministers and they have turned the constitution into a scrap of paper and have refused to be called to account. I ask you, therefore, what is to be done when there is no institution through which these eleven people may be called to account, what means are left in the state? What other remedy is there when a ministry rules by force, to call it account, except the methods which they themselves have chosen? Does not, under such circumstances, force become a necessity, just as you have made it a necessity for the state, which is called an orderly society, under such circumstances is there anything left but force? I will not speak of the right of revolution. The Social Dem-ocratie, upon whose program I have always stood and still stand today, does not consider force a method. It has declared in its program that it will use, for the realization of its aims, all effective means, and it has agreed with the natural sense of justice of the people.

The state's attorney intimates that I am an enemy of Austria. The state's attorney's mention that I ac- cepted the Arbeitnehmer Zeitung of patriotic excesses, that I accept Annie, who has become my friend, as the claim to be hatred. I have never made this claim, neither before nor during the war, nor will you believe that I, in order to win your sympathy, will turn my convictions aside and say, "I am a patriot." You will believe it only when the evidence will have guided me. I have heard the word patriot, fre- quently used as Austria as an abomination and this is a substitute for the concealment of a certain thing. Long before the war the Austrian patriotism was denounced not only by social-democrats, but even by bourgeois as something inferior. The intelligent bourgeoisie was everywhere not patriotic but nationalistic; I need only call your attention to the fact that those people of the Deutsche National Volb reducer, who were so indignant at the unpatriotic activity of the Clemens, at one time called the "E. K. (imperial) social democracy," to express their deepest contempt. At that time there was a discussion as to the meaning of patriotism, and I stated then that it was only the case that it was not Austria but the national state, that was discussed. But in the course of developments this war has evolved a change of functions in the conception of Austrian nationality.

In former times there were no fatherlands, but simple nations which had to be governed. The war, however, has turned the life in the bourgeoisie and so Austria was looked upon as a tremendous idea of a state, that was expected sooner or later to fall apart into its separate national entities. Now this idea of the fatherland had a new conception, one that is no longer based upon na- tionalistic lines, but upon questions of economic inter- ests. The bourgeoisie has discovered its interest in the conservation of the economic field of Austria, an interest not only in Austria but in the foundation of a Great German Empire, under the King of Prussia. Of course, at its head, to whom Austria shall be subordinated. Its ideal now is no longer a national independence but national rule. They are no longer satisfied with the class rule of the bourgeoisie over the workers, they have turned a kingdom from Berlin to Bagdad, over which the German people, i.e., the German bourgeoisie, reign.

Since the beginning of the war the same national and economic peace has made itself felt in other na- tions as well. The Great German economic interests have been diminished to a sharp conflict with each other and their economic functions has taken place within the Social Demo- cratic. When field attacked Nationalism most violently, it is in the land only in such a state of an actual state and so a government in the place of a German Republic, but begun a struggle for the popular liberation of a Greater Germany, for which the German demo- cracy of that time and wish it the labor democracy had been fighting. Now we see in this war that the labor movement has deviated from this old primitive Socialism which the Social democrats have already adopted, has turned into a socialist modus of thought, into a temptation, into an attempt at defending a pro- gram in which they do not defend the German na- tional state, but which is brought to the relation of the al- defense of the French and the Belgians, but the integrity of the German Empire, including even its colonial state, which is necessary for the national state when Social democrats sacrificed the international character of the movement, a policy of might, and the means of strategic securities. There have been Social-De- mocrats who have gone so far as to surrender them- selves to the shameless policy of conquest of impe- rialism.

The party has always maintained that Austria can exist only as a federation of national states; much energy was spent in the effort to spread recognition of this nation in this war. There are only two eventualities, and I have furthermore neither of these eventualities, but have, rather, accepted a strictly neutral position toward the war, and we could not have refused to continue or bind his fate by an intimate identity with the fate of a nation, a mistake that was made in the past, I regret to say, by many of my former friends. I believe I shall claim the title patriot, I nevertheless regard the war as discordant, not only when it is a part in my motives, not the national, but the moral exis- tence of Austria, the Austrian spirit.

Austria has such a spirit that has bred in me a hatred, not against Austria as a country, but against Austria as an imperial entity, against its prin- cipal spirit. This Austrian spirit exists in all of its parts and in all of its nations: all are degraded by it, all are enslaved by it, all are lost to it, it is a curse to us. And you wish to understand what brought me here, it was that this lying spirit has entered into my party, that I, Dr. Kemper, am the work of the Social Democracy, has brought this readiness to sacrifice our people, on the altar of the Smith. I have become shaken to the depths of the omen that it reflects upon us.

The whole country has been so shaken to the founda- tion that has been sneered at by these politicians on that which has always filled my whole being. I have attempted again and again to get away to myself in opposition to those who have betrayed the spirit of my party. That is the real cause for my deed; I was a protest against this spirit that has entered our movement.

I have, all my life been a revolutionist. I have seen in the daily political activity of the party a weapon for the revolution and have never regarded the war as a weapon of social activity. And when I speak of revolution seven months ago you would have called me a traitor, I would have called you traitors in time of war. The counsel would have called for alienists and you would have thought him justified. But today, in the passage of the entire capitalist press in our country, revolution to be represented as an easy and enthusiastic enthusiasm in other countries. And to-day even the Ar- beitnehmer Zeitung celebrates the revolution in Russia.

It makes a great difference whether you look at the world from the walks that separate the nations from one another, from the walls that the war has built, or whether you see it from the wall. I have always been the most important, the wall of the class- es that separates the exploiters from the exploited.

We Socialists have always looked upon the world from the point of view of the class struggle—until the war began—and the anti-war movement is now the whole world to this highest point of view. We fought against this war as supreme, yet there are people who say we must change this point of view; in peace the struggle between classes, in war the struggle between nations.

I went through an exhausting struggle to bring back my right to be called to account. The depriva- tion of the International looks exceedingly naive. It is the same position that Marx described, when he said that; it is the simplest the attempt to establish the simple laws that regulate relations between pri- vate persons, as between classes, and that relations to each other. This morale of revolutionary democracy which was first formulated in the Great French Revolution, and is the maxim of the Constitution of 1979 is "The greatness of freedom lies in the maximum freedom of the individual in the relations between them do for your own good."

Naive as it may be, that is the morale of de- mocracy, the morale that has again been taken up by the Russian revolution in opposition to land-robbing, that has been handed down from generation to generation, the principle of equality of all people, by working for peace without respite, by working for the sake of the people.

I am convinced that the great majority of Social- democrats went into this war only because they be- lieved it to be a war of self-defense, and from the point of view of self-defense, in order to defend the national state, the nation should defend its entity. That is still the same sentiment which is, I believe, the sentiment that we were trying to avoid, with all its horrors and all its misery, upon others, took possession of us. It was the idea that found expression in the Arbeiter- Zeitung on the 5th of August in the words, "However the day may be, we hope, from the depths of our hearts, that it may be cast for the victory of the low- class of the German people." This word victory was the Socialist party by explicit standards, but close and it became the main point of difference between the two parties, we must oppose those who seek to profit from this war. Just as I feared, a short victories war would absol- ute humiliation.

The same spirit, which with its horrible ravages and destruction, has awakened a sort of national consciousness of the people and its anti-semitic, the revolutionaries of the people with its anti-semitic, has brought the sentiment of which Goethe speaks in his 'Hermann and Dorothea,' to live, and moved us the victory, peace, has lost, forever, the joy of hope." A short war would have been followed in decades of a revolut- onary frenzy on both sides: war, out of itself, would be, anarchy, speaks, creates true people. For the lessons that the war has taught the young all of every generation like, who, and Funder and his ilk, praised war as a faith of the eternal, the".

It was a terrible disappointment for me to discover that the Social Democracy, which has been the highest thing in my whole existence, was but a blind leader of the blind in Austria. I cannot measure by the Socialist parry by explicit standards, but close and it became the main point of difference between the two parties, we must oppose those who seek to profit from this war. Just as I feared, a short victories war would absol- ute humiliation.

The same spirit, which with its horrible ravages and destruction, has awakened a sort of national consciousness of the people and its anti-semitic, has brought the sentiment of which Goethe speaks in his 'Hermann and Dorothea,' to live, and moved us the victory, peace, has lost, forever, the joy of hope." A short war would have been followed in decades of a revolut- onary frenzy on both sides: war, out of itself, would be, anarchy, speaks, creates true people. For the lessons that the war has taught the young all of every generation like, who, and Funder and his ilk, praised war as a faith of the eternal, the".
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