

Now I will tell you what it was that particularly worked upon me. During the investigation I spoke openly and at some length. Here I may confine my remarks to things that are already proven, occurrences that may be read in the papers, that have become notorious. I will speak only of *political oppression*.

I could not rid myself of the feeling of degradation that preyed upon me.

Are we dogs that we allow ourselves to be beaten? Have we no honor, that we should bear it?

You cannot conceive what it means to live under censorship in Austria. A propaganda newspaper, the "Volk," which I edited at that time was the only German paper to be forbidden. I edited the "Kampf," our scientific magazine, under the greatest difficulties. An article of mine was withheld by the censor for weeks. Then it was returned—one line had been stricken out. Other articles were held back for months. There was method in this madness.

This is an example of the contemptible, and partially inefficient character of Austrian censorship. In my position as secretary of the party I had become familiar with the censorship and its workings. My counsel has attempted to bring witnesses to describe this, but they were not allowed to testify.

Russia and China have their Parliament, we are the only truly degraded nation. We have no popular representation. We are not consulted, when money is needed, nor do our rulers trouble to account for the money they have spent.

During this whole absolutist regime it was Stürghk who played the leading role. He was always violently opposed to election reform, and was its bitterest enemy in the election reform commission. The whole opposition to the extension of a popular franchise grouped about him. This man later became Prime Minister, and from the beginning, he tried to prove the soundness of his opposition, by showing that Parliament was impossible, by proving, *ad absurdum*, its ineffect-

uality. Stürghk saw, with joy, how Parliament became more and more incapable; and purposely he finally brought about its adjournment.

It was clear to me, even then, that Stürghk had far-reaching plans. That he proposed to set aside Parliament completely was evident. Even though it had navigated successfully through the difficulties of the taxation debate, Stürghk nevertheless succeeded in bringing about its downfall.

When war came, and with it, the most critical period in the history of the Austrian nations, Parliament was not called. Absolutism reigned. And this undiluted absolutism, to which we were subjected, was quite a different thing from the absolutism of peace times. It was an open coup d'état. The whole fate of the country rested upon one man.

I must insert here a point I have forgotten to mention: the attitude of our party to the Stürghk-Hochenberger Ministry.

The relations between our party and the ministry had been broken. No representative associated with Hochenberger. It was impossible to discuss questions of judiciary and of censorship. Nor did the party have the opportunity to renew relations with Stürghk after 1916. Not even those whose patriotic fervor had never failed, who had forgotten everything but their patriotism, not even they could approach Stürghk.

The national conference which voted down my motion, of which I have spoken before, adopted instead a number of very tame proposals to assure their acceptance by the government. Seitz went to Stürghk with copies of the memorandum that was to be submitted two days later—that he might be informed, and ready to answer. Hereupon, in a letter to Seitz, Stürghk declared that he was not inclined to pay any attention to the proposals, which would have been, more properly, submitted by mail. After the rebuff the Social democrats did the least that they could do—they no longer went to Stürghk.

The considerations connected with Count Stürghk were