

solutism has destroyed all parliamentary means, also by force—to be conducted by the masses. Today, as ever, I maintain that mass action must be, and is, decisive, and that my act has been nothing but a modest individual act, not to take the place of mass action, not even to call forth mass action, as some of my friends, who believed that I hoped for a concerted uprising of the people in answer to my deed, have said. What I wanted was to establish the psychological premise for future mass action, in Austria. I did not hope, by my deed, to call forth a revolution, but I wished to force the party to consider its attitude to a revolution. I have never, I should like to call the attention of the public prosecutor to this fact—during the course of the whole war, said a word in favor of forcible uprising because I knew that, in the atmosphere in which I was condemned to live, in the milieu of this Executive Committee and this party, such words cannot be spoken. They have lost all understanding for the fact that force can only be created by action. They, in their cynicism, would have laughed at me. It was necessary, therefore, to present an avowal to the use of force, an avowal that would force the comrades to say, "This man is serious." He sacrifices his life in order to affirm his convictions. I wanted to force them to take a stand, and they have taken a stand. Today no Renner, no Seitz will dare to say to the workers of Austria that forcible action is impossible in Austria, that forcible measures must not and cannot be used. That was what I desired to accomplish, what seemed to me worth the sacrifice of my life, to force these people to change their attitude.

The argument against individual action is not altogether sound. My act was an individual act against the background of the masses, and I cannot understand how people whose whole action has been individualistic—an individualistic begging for consideration from the ministers—can condemn individual action when it is directed against a minister. Until 1889 the party made active use of the tactic of threatening individual authorities. Again and again individual organs of the government have been individually threatened and exposed.

I will add here that I have never over-estimated my deed, either before or after the first police hearing; I do not wish that my deed be over-estimated, either in its object, or in its effect. I simply wished once more to *give the revolutionary spirit a place in our movement.*

It was an open avowal of the policy of force, but it was a symbolic act, a parable as well. By it I wished 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 sacrifices 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. That also is not true. The International has admitted parties which, before the war, stood, in their programs, for individual action, the Social Revolutionists of Russia. I was one of their opponents, and have always carried on a sharp theoretical fight against them. *Mass actions must be supreme.*

It were wrong to value this deed as a coldly, mathematically thought out act, based purely upon theoretical considerations, and unfeeling logic. Feelings have played an extraordinary part, a double part, in my act. Because of the shame that has befallen my party, and because of the shame that Stürghk has brought upon Austria. Both motives have worked constantly upon my feelings. In a party meeting some one once said of me: "No one else has brought forth as many manifestos and resolutions during the war as Fritz Adler." I always felt the need of opposing the activity of the party. I tried everything I could to influence the people. My party did not use the right means against the Shame of Austria. My father shared this feeling of shame, in the same measure, in the same degree. In this matter, in spite of all differences between us, he stood completely on my side. I have tried to voice this indignity again and again. I delivered a speech in Zürich for which I was held for investigation; I published a manifesto; I persuaded my friend Liebknecht to speak in the Prussian House of Representatives of this shame, to the horror of the ruling class. I have tried all possible means to agitate publicly.