

The Social Philosophy of N.N. Nepluyev (1851-1908): Fragmentation, Redemption and Christian Socialism

" ... holiness begins only where duplicity ends ... "

Matthew Raphael Johnson
Johnstown, PA

I.

American capitalism is inherently exploitative. Presently, in the USA, surplus value extraction was 210% in 1940 and had reached 515% in 1973. This percentage is the difference between remuneration for labor and the massively increasing productivity it manifests. In other words, as labor power increased massively, wages and benefits have begun to decline in absolute terms. All this excess product went to the banks and profiteers. There are no real “entrepreneurs” in the US, its system does not permit it. Rather, it is a financial oligarchy that strips the work of others and sells it as a profit through currency swaps and derivatives.

Usury, unnecessary production (such as massive, state of the art sports stadiums with retractable roofs, theme-parks and immensely expensive movie budgets) and debt, not even including profit, make roughly 95% of all labor today unnecessary.

In 2015, 85% of all stocks are in the hands of 1% of the American population. The huge level of debt and low wages mean that Americans don't actually own anything – they owe more than they are worth. In 2005, 2 million Americans filed for bankruptcy. Banks own American homes far more than any other institution. The bottom half of Americans hold less than 1% of its wealth. Most Americans make under \$35,000 a year, and more than 40% work in low-wage service jobs. Hence, adding underemployment to the unemployment statistics, the USA is looking at 60%. As most of the wealth of the 1% is in non-productive, low-risk investments, its useless socially except to extract more wealth from their social inferiors.¹

There is one thing that makes Americans forget about this. Credit. So long as the banks will risk more and more bankruptcies, credit adds a huge percentage to the American perception of their “assets.” However, since the debt level is so high presently, there is no room upwards. The reckoning is coming.

This paper on Nepluyev will show one of the more interesting and successful alternatives to the present rotten system. Socialism does not require a state, nor does it require a bureaucracy. In reality, it requires the regime to leave society alone as it continues to adjust to its comping apocalyptic reckoning of mass poverty and civic unrest. As of now, Americans are too dense to respond to anything other than mass poverty and the total collapse of their economic system. The die has been cast.

II.

Seymour Frank writes on the question of Christian Socialism in 1939:

Socialism is, as mentioned, the idea of compulsory implementation of justice and

¹ The table of contents for the Census Bureau data on these statistics is here:
https://www.census.gov/hhes/www/cpstables/032015/hhinc/hinc01_000.htm

brotherhood among men; as such, it is directly contrary to the Christian consciousness of free brotherhood in Christ. The idea of social reform and social legislation is that the state restricts the economic freedom where it lead to unacceptable exploitation of weak by the strong; the state with the help of compulsory measures to protect the poor, property weak, prohibits certain actions or attitudes that it considers unacceptable from the point of view of social justice; but otherwise it does not restrict economic freedoms (Frank, 1939: 31)

Frank is known for many things, but going out on a limb is not one of them. The social teachings of Christianity are not found in the New Testament. That is because the writers of that compendium as well as Christ Himself assumed that his hearers were already well-versed in the prophets. The prophets laid out a detailed and often vehement conception of social justice that is oddly ignored in these long standing debates.

The prophets are avoided by establishment Christians like they possess some sort of social cancer curable only by the loss of establishment funding. It is rare that Christians read these men, and when they do, the common reaction is to explain them away. Statements such as “They sell the just man for silver, and the poor man for a pair of sandals. They trample the heads of the weak into the dust of the earth, and force the lowly out of the way” (Amos, 2:6-7) are clear, but it is easy to pretend he's referring to slavery, and not daily business. Here he is even more explicit:

Hear this, you who trample upon the needy and destroy the poor of the land!
“When will the new moon be over,” you ask, “that we may sell our grain, and the Sabbath, that we may display the wheat? We will skimp on the measure, boost the price, and fix our scales for cheating! We will buy the lowly man for silver, and the poor man for a pair of sandals; even the refuse of the wheat we will sell!” The Lord has sworn by the pride of Jacob: Never will I forget a thing they have done!
(Amos 8:4-7)

As a result of these ideas, the modern, bourgeois Christian will a) to refuse to believe that the Old Testament matters; b) inexplicably and arbitrarily decide the prophets have no relevance for “advanced economies”; c) pretend that no one does this in modernity; or d) suppress the matter altogether. The sheer number of books on the “Social Teaching of Christ” is a mechanism to repress this truth. Christ and his people knew these passages by rote. Christ had no social teaching of his own because it was stated over and over again centuries before and was ignored. Pharisees justified their wealth by referring to private charity which meant they did not need to change themselves. The Orthodox church has an entire feast previous to Lent dedicated to this. Instead, sexuality, foreign policy or a media-generated issue of some kind is substituted for the truth. Sexuality so dominates the Christian mind that it is likely a means of covering over for the sins of usury and profiteering that the prophets (without exception) associated with promiscuity!

Christian Socialism is far older and more venerable than the bizarre materialist, atheist socialism that comes from Jewish involvement in this movement. Socialism is merely the principle of the community as more significant than the ego. The “self” is not the ego, though in the nominalist world it can be no other. Collective is not communal, so “socialism” is associated with the state. Dialogue is impossible when there is no common language. At present, no

language in the west can speak of real communitarianism since everything has been reduced to nominalism, arbitrariness and power. Only in those terms can anything be discussed, and even that poorly.

Without Jews, socialism would have maintained its Proudhonian agrarianism that was overthrown by Marx. Famously, it was Bakunin who exposed the Jewish side of this materialism, unaware that he was infected by the same nonsense. Marxism had nothing to do with labor. This might sound a highly immoderate statement, but in the USSR, there was not a single benefit accruing to labor in that country. All attempts to improve labor's condition was met with harsh sentences. All successful socialist projects were destroyed. In fact, labor was the main group who suffered untold miseries in the “worker's paradise.”

NN Nepluyev is entirely unknown in the west. Any google search will prove that. No doubt, this paper will cause a massive flood of people who suddenly discover this genius, citing everyone in creation but this author. That indulgence aside, this paper will outline the essential doctrines of Nepluyev's socialism, its idealism and philosophical underpinnings.

One of the most essential statements from him reads:

The hallmark of a culture without God is a brutal struggle for the fruits of civilization and the ugly combination in the bowels of the same public body senseless luxury numbing and beggary. As a result, the philosophy of despair and unprincipled Epicureanism, on the one hand, and heavy vexation of spirit, envy and resentment - on the other. No matter how highly educated, rich, strong and numerous concourse Cain and boors, their social life will always reflect a rude and selfish brute viciousness and relative order maintained solely by fear or self-interest considerations; only ceased to be Cain and boors, they may love the Lord conscious of God to create a life of brotherhood and on the basis of their love (Nepluyev, 1893: 107-198).²

Being raised to believe these evils are in fact “virtues,” such comments should strike one as odd. Orthodoxy is not able to coexist with capitalism because of the above consideration. It is equally unable to co-exist with total statism because of the above consideration, with the added problem that the party – the regime using a state for its own enrichment – has temporarily won this ceaseless battle. The USSR was one giant machine for the enrichment of a predominantly Jewish communist party. It has no other purpose in its early years under Trotsky.

The essential element in the above statement is individualism and nominalism: the idea that only the “I” exist and only that “I” can give meaning. Of course, some “Is” are more powerful than others, but this is of no consequence once one agrees to pursue sheer self-interest. However, this does not end with economics. Nepluyev states with regard to the concept of “Antichrist:”

Antichrists are all those who do not recognize the primary importance of love in their relationship to God and neighbor; who feels like a fish in the water of the order of life, based not on love, all those who consider it impossible to

2 Nepluyev is totally untranslated into English. This is the first time his work has seen the light of day in this language (that I know of). All translations are my own and are probably full of errors. Apologies in advance for these.

realize Christian fellowship in life.

Antichrists are all those who consider it possible to bribe God with flattery and gifts, staying on the mood of the spirit children of the devil.

Antichrists are all those who do not deem it necessary always and under all circumstances, while remaining gentle as doves, be at the same time and as wise as serpents, who does not regret the meek sheep, tormented by wolves, between which they roam alone, who do not wish to these shelters Christian fraternities who do not recognize that you can not serve the cause unreasonable higher mind and the world is not willing to slim good organization of harmoniously united against him evil.

Antichrists are all those who put up the sacrifice of mercy, fear than love, anyway, whether it be fear or fear of the afterworld earth, as soon as this fear does not have a fear of offending loved one who slanders Christianity, giving it an uncharacteristically somber coloring asceticism Recognizing all sinful pleasure, and deters with pain instead inspiring and warming (quoted from Fedayn, 2009: 39).

The bourgeois Christians are a bit like Catholic Orangemen: they live in a conceptual fog that only the weakness of the church and the ignorance of the clergy permit to function. The fog is only partly cleared by fragmentation: the “church” part of one's life is separate from the “practical” or “real” part. This has become so common in the west to be proverbial. Christianity has been forced into a society where all vice has been enshrined as virtue: self-seeking, self-expression, profit-seeking and individualism are not seen as the perversions that all Christian societies in history have seen them, but rather now, they are virtues. The result is that “American Christianity” is non-existent. It is either “bourgeois-relativist” or merely the foreign policy adjunct of Israeli expansionist politics.

The worst sort of perversion is the bourgeois idea applied to the gospel. The life dedicated to gain and self-interest quickly loses meaning. Civilization based on this is in constant warfare, since all gains are insecure. His analysis of the Horsemen is that of a gradual decay from the Christian ideal (white) to the violence of anarchy and black, the rule of merchant capital. The merchant rule – that of usury – is the most evil because human life ceases to be special. It becomes just another commodity (quoted from Fedayn, 2009: 54).

His analysis of Revelation 13 and the two beasts emerging from the sea is unique. For him, it is the secular power divorced from grace. What remains is the letter of the law rather than love and devotion.

Then springing up out of the sea of humanity is a terrible new power which creates the dragon to fight against the true children of God. The strength of this is twofold as Revelation speaks two beasts. . . . it is impossible not to recognize the exact image of the state rejecting the work of God, but instead, worshiping the dead letter and making its peace with the world (Neplyuev, 1893).

The two beasts are elements of the world: one the institution and the other the mentality. The combination of the two beasts into a single unit is the whore; Babylon, the mother of all abominations. It is the perversion of Chalcedon. A life and culture without

God is predatory; based on fear and envy leading to either oligarchy or death in anarchy.

The essential core of everything in Nepluyev is transfiguration. This is both personal and institutional. Primarily, it is the final manifestation of love in the theological sense. It is the overcoming of fragmentation and the “compatementalization” of different areas of life. Politically speaking, this is the sobor of the crown, people and the church; personally, it is spirit, mind and will in harmony. The ultimate end, therefore, is the happiness that derives from harmony aided by grace.

The world and the church have nothing in common. Thus, the church must build its own institutions by any means at its disposal. It fails to the extent that worldly ideas and institutions penetrate its enclosure. For the Christian, to do nothing while the regime exploits its serfs is guilty of this exploitation. To see the destruction of the working class, the torments of the farmer, the death of the family and the institutional castration of the father and claim that there is nothing they can do are not only lying, but partake in the sins of the system. The age of Nepluyev was intensely corrupt as Petrograd was completely post-Christian. Yet, the common folk maintained an intuitive grasp of the old virtues.

Nepluyev writes on the modern Christian:

It is very wrong to think that all people who call themselves Christians believe in the same God. Perfect unfamiliarity with the original revelation and glaring discrepancy between faith and life makes it possible, even commonplace, that people who might be liturgically rigorous in Orthodoxy, worship completely different gods from the true God of the prophets, Christ and the apostles. One imagines God to be a formidable and proud ruler of the world and thinks that only through noble intermediaries can salvation be had. Others believe in an evil, stern god, a coarse, gloomy misanthrope acting as a hostile witness against every step of his creatures, always ready to send the smallest sinner to eternal brimstone and all joy is gone as this “god” is propitiated only by continuous self-torture. Still others believe in a selfish and egotistical deity who is easily bribed with gifts and flattery regardless of all other actions; still more believe in a capricious deity who demands stupidity, fearful of the light of reason, responding exclusively to meaningless, pious exercises and verbosity that for hours mumbles countless prayers and engages in the sacramental gymnastics of liturgical bows. They all agree only in that they have it wrong and do not see the truth of the Gospel, the God of Revelation, the loving and wise Heavenly Father. They have a perfect misunderstanding as to what God is. The truth is that love can not be complacent or coexist with evil. The only way to earn His goodwill and to be admitted into the kingdom is to cease to be demons, to repent and create fruits worthy of repentance, to repent, not only in anger, but in the coldness of the heart, to create the fruits worthy of repentance. This is not in the sense of sacrifice, long labors, self-satisfied charity; nor with bitterness and gnashing of teeth, but only in the urgent need of a loving heart the natural fruit of triumphant love, humble brotherly devotion and virtuous action (Nepluyev, 1902).

Nepluyev is speaking of the importation of worldly ideas into theology. This is another variation on his “Antichrist” thesis and is the result of intellectual laziness and

ignorance. The first is based on “knowing someone” in the bureaucracy that will get your petition through more quickly than through normal channels. The second is the God where everything is a sin, all is based on law and no matter what you do, God just cannot wait to send you to Hell. The third is not necessarily in reference to the Old Believers, though that might be the first response, but to any over-emphasis on ritual. What they all have in common is not just that they are in error, but that this error means that the person need not actually do anything to change himself. Everything is a matter of external action, not of inner transformation. The use of the term “love” is everywhere, and relative to postmodern western man, has no meaning.

III.

Love here is not some saccharine idea that no one wants to define. It is quite clearly defined as the active work towards unity through the subordination of one's will to the community and brotherhood. Community is based on the voluntary sacrifice of the will for the goods of the community. Such a simple notion has escaped millions of mostly useless pages in western “communitarian” thought. Of course, no follower of Marx or Bakunin knows anything but their will. In fact, Bakunin's whole philosophy centers on the force of the will that somehow, without limitation, will form “community.” These are words without meaning. Community really means the state, and brotherhood is force.

Socialism cannot form community since it is based on that one quality that destroys it: self-will, self-promotion and the rewards of violence. Communists are not workers nor are they interested in labor other than as an abstraction about which they know nothing. “Labor” is code for the party that, upon taking power, breaks every single promise made and takes all productive capital to itself.

Love is the medicine to heal self-interest. This passion distorts reality, making everything look like a commodity to be possessed. Left alone, it leads to the horrifying war of all against all that today, has led to a society so soaked in mental illness that the most powerful mass production methods cannot produce enough medication for its victims. Self-interest is absurd: when adopted, one then has no ground upon which to criticize those whose interest is more powerful than your own.

The American nominalist knows only two things: fear and coercion. He does not know what love is, and certainly, it could never be the foundation of social life. On the other hand, coercion is not acceptable either. The American is morally stunted: he only knows the individual (not the person) and the collective. Having never experienced community, he can only scoff and deny its existence.

The other side of the love of God is that of our brother. In the “reign of quantity” that often refers to “everyone,” making the term meaningless. It only refers to the Orthodox community. The basic virtues and duties of the Christian man is to be sincere and ready to accept humility through brotherly devotion. The notion is an honest readiness to share the common cross in friendship. Today, those words are vapid. Symbols that point to nothing. In this case, they have meaning and all fall under the rubric of self-limitation and the ascetic life.

Life in the community is a spiritual work; fraternity must become the home for the person, family and spirit integrated. This cannot countenance those who do not want to deny themselves, take up the cross and follow Christ. Such a person might live in the

brotherhood and work honestly, but it will never become a solid lifestyle. Nepluyev continues “It is necessary that brotherly love remains the highest demand, which is obeyed consciously and joyfully by all other needs.” (ibid).

Elsewhere he writes “Love is the supreme law of the world and of the eternal truth of God's person; the supreme revelation of God's covenant, the covenant of Christian morality as supreme” (Nepluyev, 1907: 14). And further, “The greatest crime of Christians and the greatest evil in the lives of Christian peoples is that tacitly reject the supreme law of the Christian revelation” (ibid, 34).

The letter of the law is pedestrian. The modern nominalist only sees letters on a page and fetishizes it as a talisman. From this comes the phenomenon of the Christian crusader who condemns entire nations for a minor breach of the law while living in the midst of usury and individualism with no protest. Perhaps there is a causal connection after all. The crusader will engage in detailed and tortuous analyses of ancient canonical texts while his neighbor is being evicted. The very act of engaging in such analyses itself misses the point. It is fetishizing words on a page that have no referent. The last thing the crusader will do is risk anything and will never interfere in the eviction of his innocent neighbor. “I have come to the conviction that the supreme good of the Russian Orthodox Church. . . consists mainly in the fact that all life is neatly organized itself on the one true Christian basis - Brotherly Love” (quoted from Ekzemplyarsky, 1908: 284). From this, one should interfere in the eviction. The causal nexus is that clear and immediate.

Love is always holy and sanctifies everything it contacts and purifies all into holiness. Let us not be mistaken. Love is sacred in all circumstances. It is no less a shrine in the heart of the atheist and in the heart of the robber, and in the heart of a sodomite. Sinfully their indifference to evil, God and the rest of His creation is such that they sink into the abyss. The single drop of love is no less holy for that reason. This is far purer than the self-righteous pharisee (Nepluyev, 1908b: 49).

Of course, the assumption is that all people, or even a substantial number, are capable of love. Few are able to live in humility and self-condemnation and in postmodern America, it is a rarity.

For Nepluyev, the idea of love is connected with our human history. He writes,

The Fall perverted the holy harmony of soul and introduced the disharmony of the selfish brute. In the absence of inspirational, jubilant love it is instead reduced to libido, or the lowest, physical dehumanization. Those victimized are property: his wife on one side and her husband on the other; most becoming rude and selfish as shame and anger lessen to become indifference. In the conjugal act man has in common with the animals (Nepluyev, 1902).

The inversion of modern nominalism is the essence of Satanism. The example is lifted higher than the definition. In reality, the nominalist cannot believe in definitions, since this implies a universal. The conjugal act becomes “love” while true love is considered a sign of mental illness. As the word is used constantly and incessantly, no one knows what it is, what it means or even if they did, they could not apply it. This is the

world where essences, that is, eternal formal properties independent of time and space, are denied. Once the essence is rejected, only energy remains – the will to power replaces virtue; rhetoric replaces communication; slogans replace information; training replaces education and Nietzsche replaces Christ.

Love alone can repair social and economic contradictions. Love, since it refuses to see its own self interest as significant, sees the other as itself. The more individualism rules, the more the purely quantitative will rule. Money, votes, market share, bureaucracy and mediocrity can be the only result.

Another way to explain this is that self-interest is identical to coercion, since the market, even at its best, is highly coercive and “democratic” only in that it registers the private desires of all. The worse element is that the moment greed and self-interest are introduced into a system, the remainder of the system must adopt it as a matter of self defense. If one faction begins arming itself, the rest, regardless of how peaceful they are, must do the same.

“Markets” are largely mythic. In the world of commodities, those powerful centers of capital, tightly integrated with both media and education, create desires by altering the images associated with terms like “success,” “high class” or “family.” Desires are inchoate until the Regime channels them. People “demand” pop music because it's what's playing. It's playing because it is what has been promoted. It is bought because it is what's in the stores.

Love is most often manifest in sacrifice, the sacrifice of self. Capital functions by rejecting such ideas except as useful images to sell. Love is the tie that binds all in a society together. It is the similarities in race, culture, language and faith that overcome the self-other distinction. When difference is introduced into a society, the polyglot mess contains no unity. Capital and the arrogant ego win by default. Without unity, there is no love, without love law is merely coercion. No law can exist without the devotion one person has to another. No society without this is even a society, and it cannot last unless the common folk be reduced to pure abulia.

Worse, “love” is confused with the idea of charity, that is, the haphazard donation of time or cash to a “cause” one thinks might be worthy. This is often a positive evil. He remarks that “For a rich man, economically speaking, it is certainly more profitable to pay the minimum wage to the workers and to bribe public opinion” by the public use of charity donations. These “are not organized life, and therefore they do not reduce any of the peasants, nor the number of proletarians in their need of work.” In fact, it might do the opposite (Somin, 2014b).

In such circumstances, and the charity is actually a substitute for meaningful change. Nepluyev caustically ridicules the muddled charity of secular society, sometimes called “love” and even the concept of “charity” is a foreign word to them. These public and tax deductible donations change nothing and are just palliatives for the middle classes. They not only will not change anything, they are not meant to.³

Love is utterly essential to Nepluyev social theory. His way of spreading a single idea

3 Several years ago, the media went wild in the US when Warren Buffet and Bill Gates gave “billions” away to “charity.” Of course, all were elite institutions and NGOs closely connected to powerful financial or manufacturing concerns. No one mentioned that these corporations just bought these institutions and now have the power to control where charity money goes and even what “charity” is.

over many manifestations is very Platonic and highly effective. Love is so common, yet almost never defined, that it should be treated with great care. Hence, love engenders self sacrifice that over time, becomes a normal mode of being.

The brethren and deferred to as a matter of course and is love in action. In contemplation, it is a grasp of God that is the: spirit, personal, non-legal. Love is projected onto logos, creating the fullness of truth. Science has reached its end – science and beauty not distinct.

IV.

In the building of his own Labor Brotherhood, it was understood that a network would have to be created in order to create a broader culture of this sort of labor. This is the sort of “peaceful progress” is understood. Before the perversion of Marx, socialism in all its forms was non-violent, seeing the slow growth of labor “cells” taking more and more of the responsibilities of governing to itself until the other institution simply had no more reason to function.

A healthy society would not need such a cellular development. Russia under Petrograd was slowly becoming cancerous, and hence, a massive graft of healthy cells were necessary. From there, a successful war on the cancer can develop. The problem for the west, however, is that there is very little health left to graft. In a society long dead, its flesh being used as fertilizer for a tiny elite with a very short-term agenda, no graft is possible. However, this rot might grow more than the elite's next set of bad loans and theft. It might also create an entirely new society brought about by the extinction of the old. When civilization breaks down, most will commit suicide either directly or through inaction. The handful that remain, however, will be the best and the brightest who will force themselves to rebuild. This is the task, not to “elect the right people to Congress.”

Russia then and now is healthier than the rotting west. Nepluyev's idea is that the best of Old Russia, urban or rural, will rebuild according to local conditions. The mentality will be the same.

The revitalization of Russia socially begins at three levels. The primary level was the network of Christian communities, labor, members of the All-Russian Brotherhood. The fact that here Nepluyev attributed to the existing peasant communities that they were “a dead letter,” ie they almost disappeared the spark of love, which previously gave the liveliness of the peasant community. The purpose was to create a labor fraternity. All institutions, especially in the age of the ascendancy of the merchant, will suffer from bureaucratism. However, Nepluyev thought that nevertheless their destruction will be even greater evil.

The second level was that of state property. By the beginning of XX century, the Russian government owned the powerful industrial world, transport and other systems, hence keeping them out of foreign hands. So at this level it will be occupied as much of the population.

The third level was that of the private capitalist sector. Nepluyev's negative attitude toward capitalism was very clear. He wrote: “We must understand that no partial reforms in this area of social life will help its character. It is inherently anti-Christian and anti-fraternal, and contains an inevitable economic struggle. It will be challenged with the peaceful life of Christian fraternal unity.” However, his teaching experience unequivocally testified that there are people who will still pull in the direction of their

own selfishness and greed. Only slightly more than half of the graduates of his schools wished to join the Brotherhood, the others left. Therefore, the private sector Neplyuev apparently regarded as a necessary evil, as a concession for people who like to have and not create (as was his attitude towards the market mechanism).

The difficult question is that of motivation. Without fear or the desire for profit, why would anyone work to satisfy the demands of others?

In his “Open Letter to His Students” (1906), Neplyuev argues that social order must be based on one of three things. Fear, or the internal coercion that lawbreaking will be punished, which bleeds into self-interest, where actions are based on the profit motive. Fear is useful only in that it pushes us away from what is potentially destructive. These are external forms of coercion that have been internalized. The problem then is that the soul remains disordered (Neplyuev, 1906). The external power has temporarily succeeded in forcing an external obedience, but that is all. No minds have been changed.

The final form of motivation is purely internal. This is the aspect of transfiguration. The “coercion” is freedom and truth (or the truth that manifests freedom). These three in each society and in each soul exists in different mixtures. Self interest is at the core of modern capitalism; love typifies the socialist and Christian society. “Public” property is not the same as communal property. At a low level of development, man requires these forms of coercion. Grace however, changes things and brings man to no longer require these crude motivators (Neplyuev, 1902).

The crude, materialist view of religion sees “God” as an isolated lawgiver that requires bribery and rule following. Pride leads to anger since frustration of desire injures pride. Over time, this leads to despair. There is no joy, just temporary satiation. Ego creates a crude, egocentric God like an earthly king. Love is a silly utopia.

When the ground is sensuality, greed and fear, truth is the same as profit. All things serve the appetites and people do what they would not normally do only through fear. The state is a mercenary enterprise. Text and ritual are deified; oligarchy picks and chooses doctrines to follow. Relationships are either servile or arrogant, and hell is experienced in the frustrated will.

The Labor Brotherhood is a political society with a vision of old Russia that is also the essence of real reform. Orthodoxy and Autocracy are the essence of Russian life. The energies of God are manifest in the nation, and this functions as an independent substratum synthesizing both. In Russian Orthodox culture, truth and authority – not power – are the means of healing and conversion. External trappings of police power and administration harm the mission of the church. The organization of power should be ideally as a federation of self governing communes.

Power should be able to unleash itself when needed. Russian society needs protection from attack. The state is the very last resort. The sobor comes first. Law is written only when severe social problems arise. The state's functions should be limited to the very fundamental nature of the constitution.

The press should not be in the hands of the oligarchy. It is one of the most powerful political weapons. A press should be created representing all elements of society no differently than a legislature.

His attitude towards foreigners and people of other faiths which are part of the Russian empire, should be full of brotherly love and respect for their identity. Violence can not convince nor can it inspire love and respect. It can only call stubbornness and hostility.

Among independent nations, the same principle allies. The only real function of the state is to zealously preserve Russian customs and peoples, but nothing is ever to be imposed on others. Russian nationalism does not prohibit learning and borrowing from others.

More specific to the Labor Brotherhood, the 1907 Charter was approved in Petrograd. Dying in 1908, he did not get to see the fruition of his labor, but the charter that continued to be used was entirely his (Avdasev, 2003 and Fedayn, 2009).

The essence was that labor is a matter of faith and fraternity; peace and love. Education based on voluntarily and conscious discipline. Relations with the state and the church are not utilitarian. They are not approached with our self interest in view. The church is not a collection of laws and texts, but grace in both freedom and love. Russia was to be reborn on the principles of peasant ownership, whether communal or individual.

V.

There is no separating Nepluyev from the Agrarian reform of 1861 and its development culminating in Stolypin. The peasant community remains, but its life is complicated through the redemption payments. In 1905, the whole of the Russian empire saw 80% of its households in the mir. Productivity was only slightly increased and Stolypin was to add more complexity to the matter. The

Russian mir was fully democratic and the level of government most relevant to the majority of the population. It offered the social guarantees that cooperation could give to community members. The basis of these guarantees was common ownership of the land.

The land belonged to the mir rather than the individual peasant since in much of Russia, the yeoman did not have a cooperative climate. The land was occasionally redistributed. Young families needed more land, removing it from families who could not handle it effectively. It is especially necessary to point out that all important decisions are made for the community together at the general gathering. The laws were known to all and customary, it was a trusted form of judicial authority almost unknown to Petrograd officials.

The severity of the living conditions of the peasants demanded reciprocity. All kinds of mutual aid, fund-raising for fire victims and free labor at harvest were a mandatory part of the community life. No one has ever been forgotten, unjustly offended or thrown out of the communal society. It remained vital until the Soviet Union, of course, destroyed anything that positively affected labor. However, no doubt that common ownership of land, and mutual assistance, as well as quick and authoritative justice was completely in harmony with the existing principles of the Orthodox community (Somin, 2012).

Finally, the community has helped to preserve the unique cultural world of the Russian peasantry which was exclusively imbued with Orthodox ritual. It should be noted that at this late date, Nepluyev believed that the commune was greatly decrepit. Here is his description:

There is a peasant community, but not the cement of love unites its members in a friendly spiritual and economic family. The anger in the bosom of the community spiritually and economically sprays her fellow members. Nothing to do but overall ownership of land and the total dependence on the mir they do not. As

they are not weighed down, and both of them! They and the community in the ownership of land reduced to a minimum. Treat the whole earth community together to organize their community of industrial and consumer co-operative, together, together earning a living, which is obviously more profitable, they can not for anything else, how shameful for Christians of the spiritual mood of the majority. In spite this majority is completely incapable of friendly solidarity in the sharing of the harvest each year all the men would have quarreled endlessly bickering on the proportion of each, requiring appreciation of his work, not wanting to give anything for nothing the patient, and generally multi those whose work for any reason was less productive. All women have quarreled every day because each chicken, because each egg, because each handful of flour, because each pot. Obviously not a form of communal life is to blame, namely the attitude of the majority is just as shameful for Christians as pernicious both socially and politically. Meanwhile, we continually see that it recognized the mood of the natural and inevitable phenomenon, which not only have to be considered, to which must be applied even. Communal life form does not fit this mood - to destroy the community. Better it can not be in the mood of this majority, and change the mood and can not and should not be: it legitimized routine life! (Nepluyev, 1903a: 39ff)

The Stolypin reform unleashed some of the best and worst of Russian life. The ideologists of the reform primarily set itself the task of destroying the mir, forcing the peasant, now without any social insurance, to wind up as a contract day laborer for the foreign capitalist. Laughably, bureaucrats isolated in the occult, "floating city" of Petrograd through they knew better than peasants. In the most condescending manner possibly, these alienated Masons demanded the peasant conform to their Enlightenment point of view. Yet the peasant fed him and his forebears for generations without their help.

The world of the peasants was totally unknown to the alienated urban, Jewish and elite radical. "Individualism" just meant mass-proletarianization, low wages and a slavery far worse than serfdom. Humorously, the "populists" pretended they were bringing "community" to the peasant world that had preserved it for generations through famine, invasion, revolution and urban stupidity. Their ignorance was so profound that they had no idea the community actually existed and functioned.

Stolypin and his allies were generally ignorant of the peasantry, but were determined to use the state to reform "those people." Capitalism was "progress" since it meant that low wages would be the norm for some time. Always concerned largely for export, these aliens saw the peasant as a slave. Hence, by 1906, Article 87 was forced through and stated that anyone who "requires the strengthening of personal property" can leave the commune. He then had the right to take the land presently allotted to him and was granted firm title to it. It most certainly occurred to the authors how easy it would be to swindle the peasant out of his land now the commune was not protecting him. The use of alcohol, insane promises and legalese meant that the "free individual" would be soon sleeping under a bridge. Worse, they also realized that the small plot, with all the expenses at one time covered by the commune, will be far from sufficient to support the

farmer. It was a deliberate recipe for total destruction of the peasant (Nepluyev, 1903a: 17-20).

From Nepluyev's point of view, the removal of the peasant from the protection of the commune was not a celebration of their individuality. It only exposed them to the swindles of the merchant, both foreign and domestic (Nepluyev, 1903a: 4-6). The commune's power and utility was shown only when it was removed. Despite the fact that by World War I, the peasant owned almost the entirety of Russia, much of this was still communal and not individual. In the case of a peasant successfully becoming part of Russia's new rich (which happened all the time), he then lost both the cultural and ethical world of his ancestors and in some sense, became an alien (cf Somin, 2001). The Old Believer merchant was the exception, since their conception of success had no relation to the secular variety.

V.

Detractors of this were oddly everywhere. Since it was a small experiment, the vehement opposition seemed oddly out of proportion. Of course the Petrine synod merely vetoed anything new, automatically hostile to actual expressions of Orthodoxy. Nothing heretical was taught, the school was a proven winner, so what was the problem? It was the same problem that led to the condemnation of eldership, hesychasm, and anything that might smack of Orthodox rebirth. Yet, this still does not answer the question.

First, it was not under the control of the synod. Hence, it was not to be trusted. Keep in mind that the church at the time was the result of mass purges, radical reorganizations, total secularization of property and total Latinization of theology. The Old believers alone maintained Orthodoxy against this strange urban, westernized church whose primary seminary language was Latin. The church has no sense of mission or purpose, yet, its dissidents such as Seraphim of Sarov and John of Kronstadt were taking the reins regardless – and risking quite a bit. It might be noted that St. John supported Nepluyev's position without reservation. Finally, the mission was successful. All the brethren were literate, all contributed to the common fund and all developed skills beyond that which was purely economic such as music, painting or poetry.

Nearby farmers did not believe in the sincerity of Nepluyev and did all in their power to steal from the new system, confident that the Christian ethic would prohibit a harsh response. Many of the upper clergy saw him as a Protestant or a Tolstoyan, introducing a strange, if not heretical, innovation into Russian life. The otherwise highly gifted and penetrating Pobedonostsev and a majority of bishops openly hated Nepluyev and sought his dissolution. Clergy assigned to the Holy Cross Church were often unhappy that they were not the spiritual leaders of the undivided community, and left, claiming that it was some sort of “cult.” Like today, his ideas were simplified, reduced to slogans, and associated with any evil sect the speaker wanted.

Early in 1900, Nepluyev met with St. John of Kronstadt. Father John blessed the activity of the Brotherhood, and said these words of cold comfort:

When living the Christian life, it is impossible not to experience persecution, impossible to avoid being cursed and hated. Rejoice in this, since it is proof that you are serving the cause of God, rather than one serving their own interests. Be

patient. God will soon bring you the strength to tolerate these insults with magnanimity, gentleness, humility and love. . . I am glad that I met with you, I have found in you a truly noble Russian engaging in a truly noble project (Quoted from Nepluyev, 1908: 208).

Christianity is intensely social. It takes in all of human life: the economic, technological, familial, sexual, temporal, cultural, vocational and all the rest. Christ did not come to save the bourgeois Christian when he has some free time on a Saturday evening. Christ came to bring the sword of division, to expose the lies of Moloch and its Canaanite civilization based on usury. For a society, like the postmodern American, one that actually has no culture of its own, to even envisage a real social life motivated by something other than self-love is impossible. There is no language to express it.

The first-rate social theorist and economist VY Katasonov analyzes the theology of capitalism in some startling ways almost totally unknown to those who do not read Russian. The rule of Gold is opposed to that of God, it is the Golden Calf at Horeb. The desire for greater luxuries means wasteful production, debt and decadence. More money merely signals more wants and desires. Enough has been written on poverty. The real problem is prosperity.

VI.

Modern capitalism is the result of usurious and rentier income, expropriations from the peasantry, secularization of church lands, piracy and the slave trade. Without these, the primitive accumulation of capital needed for modernity would not be present. Modernity is Jewish to the extent they internalized the Magi-Persian mentality. It is the demand for luxury and the insistence on the security of elite property that drives usury and mass production.

Capitalism is Darwinian and is characterized by economic struggle. No one can deny that. For each winner, there are thousands of losers. Thinking only of themselves, the capitalists

All seek to rob others in their favor, as moral concepts are replaced by practical calculations about the benefits while all social relations are reduced to exchange transactions. [Modern life] ends up being absorbed by the means of the acquisition of the “good things” in life. Shame is the final consequence as the society turns into an armed camp.” (Nepluyev, 1902)

While it is common for the libertarian to pretend that the capitalist is serving “the public” through “demand,” what is occurring is that the regime is teaching the world that life can be found through corporate domination and the inversion of all values. People do not know what they want, and rarely seek their own pleasure. In fact, they go far to knowingly bring misery on themselves.

Nepluyev calls capitalism the “penal servitude” of civilization where the interests of wage workers and capitalists are “diametrically opposed in irreconcilable hostility.” (cf Solodovnik, 1993). This is papered over by the abstraction of the “consumer” until one realizes that labor and consumer are identical. Capitalism, socially speaking, create a mythic world of consumer satisfaction and “voting with one's dollars.” Capitalism is the surrender to sin, the opposite of social theory.

Wages continue their plummet downward as the regime demands more and more consumption. Wages fall while freedom does the same. Women and the third world are important to drive down wages and silence the white man at work. The work available is productive only of retardation, with millions present preferring unemployment to the living death of serving the “consumer.” In modern America, prisons are not used to continue the downward pressure on wages, showing that the American worker and the convict are the same.

Bibliography:
Primary Sources:

Н.Н.Неплюев. Трудовые братства. Могут ли долее обходиться без них церковь и христианское государство и как их осуществить. Лейпциг, 1893

Неплюев Н.Н. Путь веры. Сергиев Посад, 1907

Н.Н.Неплюев. Отчеты блюстителя о религиозно-нравственной жизни братства. Полное собрание сочинений. СПб, 1908

Н.Н.Неплюев. Христианская гармония духа. Психологический этюд. Полное собрание сочинений, СПб, 1902

Н.Н.Неплюев. Открытое письмо к учащейся молодежи. «Церковный голос», 1906

Н.Н.Неплюев. Вера, милосердие, благотворительность; вооружения и самозащита. Сергиев-Посад. 1908а

Н.Неплюев. Жизненное значение трудовых братств: церковное, государственное и общественное. Беседа для друзей и врагов. СПб, 1905

Н.Неплюев. Воззвание к друзьям свободы и порядка. СПб., 1907а

Н.Неплюев. Беседы о Трудовом Братстве. Полное собрание сочинений. СПб, 1903

Неплюев Н.Н. Религиозные движения на Западе. Полное собрание сочинений. t3

Н.Неплюев. Доклад Глуховскому Комитету Высочайше Учрежденного Особого совещания о нуждах Сельско-хозяйственной промышленности по вопросу о крестьянской общине. СПб. 1903а

Н.Н.Неплюев. Голос верующего мирянина по поводу предстоящего Собора// Труды Киевской Духовной Академии. 1906.

Неплюев Н.Н. Партия мирного прогресса. Ее идеальные основы и жизненная программа. Глухов, Типография А.К. Нестерова. 1906а

Н. Н. Неплюев. Историческое призвание русского помещика. Православный социализм как русская идея, 1880

Н. Н. Неплюев. Частное ответное письмо Н.Н.Неплюева на письмо священника Иванова, письмо от 9 по 21 августа 1902

Неплюев Н.Н. К лучшему будущему, 1908b

Неплюев Н.Н. Что есть истина. Лейпциг, 1893

Неплюев Н.Н. Христианское мировоззрение. Берлин, 1895

Secondary Sources

Экземплярский, В.И. Памяти Николая Николаевича Неплюева. Труды Киевской Духовной Академии. 1908, 8

Боков, Николай. Успех утописта Неплюева. «Русская мысль», п. 4267, 1999

Авдасев, ВН Трудовое братство Н.Н. Неплюева. Его история и наследие. РИО «АС-МЕДИА», 2003

Сомин, Николай. Вокруг неплюевских идей. III. «Обособление от зла и злых» Православный социализм как русская идея, 2014

Сомин, Николай. Вокруг неплюевских идей. II. «Любовь, принуждение и корысть» Православный социализм как русская идея, 2014a

Сомин, Николай. Вокруг неплюевских идей. I. «Бессистемная благотворительность» Православный социализм как русская идея , 2014b

Сомин, Николай. Н.Неплюев и его Крестовоздвиженское Трудовое Братство. Православный социализм как русская идея, 2012

Сомин, Николай. Неплюев как социальный мыслитель. Православный социализм как русская идея 2009

Сомин, Николай. Дисциплина любви. К столетию со дня смерти Н.Н. Неплюева. Православный социализм как русская идея, 2008

Сомин, Николай. Христианская Империя: взгляд "утописта" Н.Н. Неплюева. Православный социализм как русская идея, 2004

Сомин, Николай. Кресто-Воздвиженское Трудовое Братство и его основатель Н.Н. Неплюев. Православный социализм как русская идея, 2001

Федянин, Алексей. Христианское мировоззрение в понимании и деятельности НН Неплюева. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата богословия.

Санкт-Петербург, 2009

Эрн, V. Христианское отношение к собственности. Классика христианского социализма, 1905

Франк, С. Л. Проблема христианского социализма. Путь, 60 (1939): 18-32