

DAILY PEOPLE

VOL. 8, NO. 152.

NEW YORK, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1907.

ONE CENT.

EDITORIAL

PURISHKEVITCH AND MITROFAN.

By DANIEL DE LEON

THE two names that head this article do not sound American. Far otherwise. They have a decided Russian twang about them. And so they are—Russian. Nevertheless, the suspicion is justified that their bearers were originally called something sounding more like Smith and Brown, and that they have assumed the respective names of Purishkevitch and Mitrofan to disguise their identity, and thereby smooth their path into the Duma. True enough, the kingdom of the usurping class is international; and, the same conditions producing the same results, generate the same trend of thought, expressing itself in the same language. It is an everyday occurrence to notice how similar the language is of the usurpers, whether uttered in Italian, Swedish, German, English, Russian, or what not. Nevertheless, it is difficult to explain the marked identity of utterance, noticeable on the lips of Messrs. Purishkevitch and Mitrofan, with certain utterances of the lay and clerical spokesmen of American usurpation—the identity is difficult to explain except upon the theory that the Russian-sounding names in this instance are disguises for something like Smith or Brown.

For instance, Prince Purishkevitch, speaking in this Duma in favor of the continuance of autocracy, and against a constitutional regime, said: “All attempts to establish a Constitutional Regime have failed.” Is not that exactly the language of the lay capitalist Smiths in America against Socialism and in favor of the continuance of Capitalism? Do these also not remind us tirelessly that “all attempts to establish Socialism have failed” and, consequently, we should continue Capitalism? And is not the brazenness of the impudence and profundity of the stupidity of both like two peas, seeing that the so far “failure” of all “attempts to establish Socialism,” like the so far “failure” of all “attempts to establish a Constitutional Regime” in Russia is due to the barbaric Smith-Purishkevitch

hindrances thrown in the way? Is not the Purishkevith reasoning cast in the identical mold of the Smith reasoning—an attempt—and the illusion that the attempt can be successful—to impute failure to inherent unsoundness, when, in fact, the “failure” is not other than, or different from the “failure” Civilization has often encountered on its onward march, as it beats its way through Barbarism?

Again, there is Mitrofan. He is a Bishop. Speaking on the same side with Purishkevitch, he said: “Every assault on autocracy is criminal.” Is not that, to a T, the cord on which the clerical capitalist Browns in America harp when they thunder anathema at the Labor Movement by declaring: “Every assault on capitalism is criminal”?

What American capitalist Prince and what American capitalist Bishop is it that are now masquerading in the Duma under the names of “Purishkevitch” and “Mitrofan”?

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official Web site of the Socialist Labor Party of America.
Uploaded November 2009

slpns@slp.org