

Vlozhennyye Soobshchestva:
Corporatism as the Economic Basis of Royalism and Social Nationalism

Matthew Raphael Johnson
Johnstown, PA

I.

The title in Russian means “nested communities.” This refers to membership in smaller communities such as the family and guild given meaning and broader purpose in the larger community of the nation and even the broader civilization such as the Roman or Latin American. This is the essential point of this essay. Nationalism is about two things: the family and the larger community that grows out of it. It doesn't make any sense without both together. This has a strong economic component, and that is the Corporation.

Nationalism is far stronger on economic concerns than the public normally thinks. National Socialism is one of the highest manifestations of nationalism in its European, royalist and Third World, postcolonial varieties. The economic expression of the family, then, is generally known as “Corporatism.”

Fr. George Titov, one of the priests writing for the Union of the Russian People (Black Hundreds) recently argued that the Corporate state was ideologically essential to Orthodox royalism. In his (2007) “Corporatism as the Basis for Orthodox Monarchy,” he says capitalism is out of the question, as is Marxism or any other kind of materialist socialism. Monarchy isn't just a devotion to a religiously-based king or ceremonial pomp, but it's also a complete philosophy of politics and economics in its own right. Many modern royalists such as MV Nazarov, MB Smolin, NV Boldyrev and Vladimir Karpets have argued that Corporatism is critical to understanding monarchy. A Corporation refers to a functional unit – or a class – within the social body, not a profit-driven commercial enterprise. This is the original definition of “class.” To distinguish, “Corporate” uses a capital letter.

One simple way to conceive of a social “sector” is the five-fold model. These are the primary sector, agriculture, employing fewer than two percent of Americans. The secondary sector is industry, employing only 12 percent of Americans. The tertiary is services, which can be subdivided into areas such as retail, transportation and distribution, restaurants, media, tourism, insurance, banking, health care and legal.

The quaternary sector deals with intellectual work, government, culture, libraries, scientific research, education and information technology. This makes up about 60 percent of Americans. Then the quinary sector which includes the highest levels of decision-making in a society. This sector includes top officials in government, science, universities, nonprofits, health care, culture and the media. It may also include police and fire departments, which are public services as opposed to for-profit enterprises. This might also include home-care work too. Today, about 14 percent of Americans work in this field.

Each one of these sectors (and important sub-sectors) is represented by a Corporation. These will maintain standards for quality work, establish basic practices, provide benefits and education in the field as well as acting as a labor union for the sector. Hegel advocated that these be granted direct representation in the upper house of a legislature. Each is equal to every other, though some are more fundamental than others. Hong Kong today has probably the most important and representative Corporatist system of government in existence, which is partly why its been targeted by American capital.

The main theorist of the Corporation was GWF Hegel in his *Philosophy of Right* (1831). He writes, in section 251 and 252

The labor organization of civil society is split, in accordance with the nature of its particulars, into different branches. The implicit likeness of such particulars to one another becomes really existent in an association, as something common to its members. . . . In accordance with this definition of its functions, a Corporation has the right, under the surveillance of the public authority, (a) to look after its own interests within its own sphere, (b) to co-opt members, qualified objectively by the requisite skill and rectitude, to a number fixed by the general structure of society, (c) to protect its members against particular contingencies, (d) to provide the education requisite to fit others to become members. In short, its right is to come on the scene like a second family for its members, while civil society can only be an indeterminate sort of family because it comprises everyone and so is farther removed from individuals and their special exigencies.

Hegel makes it clear that these are for professionals only. These aren't for "day laborers," as he says in the "Remark" that follows. It deals with crafts that have an objective technique that can be improved over time. Membership in the Corporation will automatically show others that he's a part of a craft and an expert in it. It makes him a "somebody" (253). "It is also recognized that he belongs to a whole which is itself an organ of the entire society, and that he is actively concerned in promoting the comparatively disinterested end of this whole. Thus he commands the respect due to one in his social position."

His skill and membership is a guard against poverty. "The wealthy perform their duties to their fellow associates and thus riches cease to inspire either pride or envy, pride in their owners, envy in others. In these conditions rectitude obtains its proper recognition and respect." So while the Corporation is hierarchic, the better off must assist all members. Personal pride is to be found in membership, not money. Social status is Corporate based.

Riches are often arbitrary: gained through inheritance or "luck" in playing the stock market. The Corporation eliminates the "random" factor in the granting of wealth and prestige (254). Its now "elevated to conscious effort for a common end," its now national, not merely egocentric self seeking.

Differences in wealth force the growth of the Corporation, as skilled labor seeks to defend itself against the arrogance and randomness of great wealth. All societies disintegrate into egocentrism at some point, but, when it becomes clear that all sectors of society need each other, the Corporate idea develops. This is Hegel's understanding of the national idea: it stretches out from the family. "The sanctity of marriage and the dignity of Corporation membership are the two fixed points round which the unorganized atoms of civil society revolve" (255). Labor is inherently social because society needs all the above sectors to work together. Self seeking doesn't lead to the "invisible hand" in Smith's sense, but a different realization: that the social body is a real one and not merely an invention. The mere drive for profit isn't enough to make sense out of labor. It has to have a public presence; the individual man has to "be" somebody over and above his income. He says,

Of course Corporations must fall under the higher surveillance of the state, because otherwise they would ossify, build themselves in, and decline into a

miserable system of castes. In and by itself, however, a Corporation is not a closed caste; its purpose is rather to bring an isolated trade into the social order and elevate it to a sphere in which it gains strength and respect (255).

The two must exist in balance. The family and village provides the early, immediate experience of community. When man strikes out on his own, he soon realizes he's a nobody. Working for "yourself" usually means working for others in all senses. Greater than this, however, is the fact that your work only matters as a part of the broader field and in cooperation with others.

II.

St. Philaret of Moscow wrote: "What is a state? Its a specific part of the universal dominion of the Almighty, separated by function, but held together spiritually, coupled with the unity of the whole." The phrase "separated by function" is a direct reference to a Corporation, since this is the nature of economic justice as its part of the nature of the state. Its an organization based on a specific social function serving an objective need. In the same way, any social phenomenon is a part of a single whole or a moral universe within which it makes sense. The whole must exist before the parts make sense. Integrity implies a hierarchy of function.

St. Philaret continues:

What is the state? A union of free moral beings who joined together through the donation of a part of their freedom for the protection and affirmation of the common forces of the moral law which constitutes the necessity of their being. Civil laws are nothing more than the interpretations of this law and its boundaries, applied to special cases, set against its violation. So, where the sacred law of morality is firmly established in our hearts by education, faith, sound, undistorted teaching and respected examples of our ancestors, we remain faithful to our fatherland and when it comes under attack, we sacrifice ourselves for it without any desire for glory. There, we die for the law, and while we do not fear to die from the law, we'd rather obey it than save our own selves. If the law that dwells in our hearts is expelled by false enlightenment and unrestrained sensuality, then written laws command no respect, lawful commands are ignored, self-will leads to oppression there and soon, society comes close to its final end (Met. Philaret of Moscow, "On the Causes of Our Success in the War of 1812").

He's referring to natural law, that which dwells in the "heart" and informs the conscience. When this is the foundation for positive, written law, one will die rather than break it. When society is motivated by it, the written law isn't necessary except for the alien and the unrepentant. When it's gone, written laws fail. This state is a unity of multiplicity, not certainly a multiplicity of individuals, but a multiplicity of functions.

Othmar Spann a leader of the Austrian Christian Socialists, an early National Socialist group, says:

For this theory, the individual is not something in himself and for himself, but in his essence and concept, he is thinkable only in community, that is, in connection with others. Therefore, society cannot be obtained by adding individuals, like a

bunch of stones, but the individual is initially a member of society. And therefore, the individual's attitude to society is not external, utilitarian, instrumental, but spiritual and moral (Quoted in Titov, 2007).

Economics came into being as a "social science" to justify the rule of money after the British Revolution and later empire. Therefore, it began either with the abstract "market" or even worse, the equally abstract "consumer." It can't envision culture, nations or traditions since these aren't quantitative elements.

As always, the Anglo-American academic deliberately misunderstands and destroys the idea of "society." Rather than seeing it as a collection of rationally organized functions, they merely define the Corporation as "interest group" rule, with the implication that it is only the elite that rule as "corporations." They come close to claiming that a "corporation" and a "Corporation" are the same. When the system wants to manipulate with words (and this is all it does), they force the term to cover phenomena not just radically different, but almost opposite one other. The term becomes meaningless. It then has only an emotional content.

The writers in the volume, *Social Corporatism: A Superior Economic System?* Edited by Jukka Pekkarinen, Matti Pohjola, and Bob Rowthorn (Oxford University Press, 1992) are aware that, if they seem to be sympathizing with the traditional conception of "Corporatism," they will be accused of being sympathetic to fascism. They then have a choice: they either redefine it beyond recognition, or they condemn it as "retrograde." Matti Pohjola states:

We shall here call an economy corporatist if its wage-bargaining structure is centralized, that is, if workers and employers are organized into a few powerful national federations negotiating wages and other terms of employment on behalf of their members, and if, in addition, the government is prepared to share some political space with these organizations.

He's well aware that this isn't Corporatism. If he's not, then he's incompetent. This might be a very indirect and secondary effect of it under specific circumstances, but its nowhere near the actual definition. Claiming that Austria and Scandinavia have such structures again, is to redefine it beyond recognition. Thankfully, a fairly obscure journal from Australia, the *Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs*, got it vaguely right in 1995:

In an ideal-type corporatist system, at the national level the state recognizes one and only one organization (say, a national labour union, a business association, a farmers' association) as the sole representative of the sectoral interests of the individuals, enterprises or institutions that comprise that organization's assigned constituency. The state determines which organizations will be recognized as legitimate and forms an unequal partnership of sorts with such organizations. The associations sometimes even get channelled into the policy-making processes and often help implement state policy on the government's behalf. Corporatism, moreover, usually involves more than just a working relationship between the state and the associations representing interest groups. An actively interventionist state often helps to organize the relations between the various sectoral organizations. It bases its intervention as a grand arbiter or mediator on the premise that the government is the guardian of the common good, of a national

interest that supersedes the parochial interests of each sector. Yet within such a corporatist framework, the state does not attempt to dominate directly. It leaves some degree of autonomy to the organizations within each of their respective spheres of operation. But to ensure that the compacts and agreements achieved at the top get implemented effectively, it demands that the organizations exercise some discipline and control over their own memberships (Unger, 1995).

Note how different this is from the other cited above. Stripped down to its most formal essentials, this is a tolerable definition. Importantly, the Corporation acts as both a representative body for different sectors of socially necessary labor as well as acting as a check on the power of the state. Given how corporate capital is almost infinitely more powerful than the isolated individual (not to mention the state), the Corporation is a necessity for representation to even start to become realistic.

One of the many myths abounding today is the idea that the government in Beijing is a “communist” state, that is, a Leninist one. It is a Han-nationalist Corporatist state, a National Socialist government.

During the 1980s, as the Chinese state moved further to free up the economy and to relax direct Party controls over society, it needed additional mechanisms to bridge the gaps in control that were thereby created. Thus, in addition to the proto-corporatist organizations of the command-economy era, a large number of new associations were created to serve as corporatist intermediaries and agents. As of 1993, 1,400 national associations had been approved by the government; 19,600 associations and branch organizations were registered with provincial authorities; and more than 160,000 were registered at the county level. These range in nature from science and technology associations, to organizations for different economic sectors, to cultural organizations, to health, sports, social welfare, and public-affairs associations (Unger, op cit).

The author goes on to argue that China's structure is very similar to that of Taiwan during the 1960s and 1970s, the exact same structure that Korea had during its takeoff. Might there be a pattern here? Racial nationalism and homogeneity seem to be necessary conditions for this development. Race and religious divisions are not exactly associated, to say the least, with rapid development.

China, Korea and Taiwan exploded economically under the Corporatist system, put into place by authoritarian governments. Hitler's Germany and Franco's Spain likewise. In China, the “democratic parties” are the Corporations. Each one is assigned to recruit from a functional group including intellectuals, technocrats and scientists, medical, education and Chinese living abroad. There are eight total. The most recent is for the private sector, ensuring that development isn't merely for profit, but for the welfare of the nation (Seymour, 1987). It's worked to such an extent that it frightened the US into almost declaring war. When Mao was butchering over 30 million, the US was sending aid. The moment China develops a nationalist system, its war.

Hong Kong has a highly representative system of government. Its Executive Council is its chief policy making body, elected from a 1500 member college that itself draws members from industry, labor, the rural areas, medicine, education, legal, engineering, real estate, tourism and social services. This is out of a population of about seven million. Its likely the most

representative system possible in modern times. These interest groups are called Functional Constituencies and basing a government on them guarantees superior representation. Therefore, these protests are filled with highly privileged people in a free society.

In the Legislature, about half the body is elected by the citizens at large, while the rest come from the citizens as organized into these Functional Constituencies. The Wikipedia entry says “Currently, only 40 of the 70 Legislative Council seats are directly elected by the majority of people (35 through geographical constituencies and 5 through District Council (Second) functional constituency), with the rest of 30 elected by 28 traditional functional constituencies.” Are the Functional Constituencies not “people?” What is implied here? Hong Kong is a free society by any definition, politically speaking.

In interwar Romania, the political theorist Mihail Manoilescu defined a Corporation as

a collective and public organization composed of all persons (physical and juridical) who together fill the same function in the nation. Its purpose is to assure the exercise of this function, in the supreme interest of the nation, by means of rules and rights imposed on its members.

Corporations, in Manoilescu's ideal, would be based partly on functional differentiation, but it would go beyond economics in that “. . . any other national function, such as those pertaining to religion, education, cultural, etc. functions” would also define distinct Corporations. Corporations would not be selfish pressure groups like trade unions. Rather, they would be public institutions primarily serving the national interest. They were also supposed to be unitary; single corporations that would include all those fulfilling a particular function throughout the nation.

Manoilescu wrote that Corporations would be comprehensive in society, that is, “The network of corporations covers the whole nation and leaves not one single individual national activity untouched, that is not organized into a corporation.” What he means by “activity,” to the extent it's national, is a field, a discipline and has great social significance.

Corporate bodies were to be semi-independent organizations passing voluntary agreements with each other and the state to insure mutual harmony. Corporations would select their own representatives who would combine at the top in a national parliament. Each corporation's numerical weight in this assembly would be based on the importance of its national functions.

The Corporatist ideal seeks to integrate individuals into occupational and functional groups in order to reduce *anomie*, class conflict, and the irregularities of the market, thus remedying the great flaw of modern capitalist society. Manoilescu's conception sought to push small states into a balanced modernization. Manoilescu was concerned with the relief which individuals might gain from being more securely integrated within corporations, but even more so, with the possibility of eliminating internal disputes at a time of national danger the Corporatist system can both serve political and economic ends in their own sphere (Manoilescu, 1931).

In his work on economic development which preceded his work on the theory of Corporatism, Manoilescu had written that poor, agrarian nations, like Romania, Italy, Spain, or Portugal in the 1920s were condemned to permanent poverty unless they closed themselves off from the world capitalist market. They had to rely on forced, autarkic industrial development, and keep at bay the interests of the major capitalist powers. From this Manoilescu concluded that

class-based divisions had to be overcome by national solidarity in order to permit poor nations to undergo the difficulties of economic closure and forced investment (Chirot, 1980).

Nationalism and corporatism were thus ideally suited and progressive. He predicted that eventually even the old industrial centers of western Europe would abandon individualistic, anarchic capitalism and its attendant division and alienation. Western Europe had lived by “the exploitation of the rest of the world,” but it would no longer be able to do this (Manoilescu, 1931). Consequently, the notion of “egocentrism had become an obsolete virtue” and “organization,” in Hegel's sense would take its place, and for the same reason Hegel thought. Pressure from the outside, from exploited economies closing themselves off from the old rulers would force the European elite nations to abandon their imperialism (Chirot, 1980).

In Hitler's Germany, reconstruction took a Corporate form. Five institutions organized and represented labor: the first two were the Councils of Trust and the Labor Commissions. The former was as its name suggests, empowered by the state to equalize the bargaining power of labor with capital. Rather than short term irrationality, the Council of Trust focused on long term cooperation in the interest of both parties and thus the state. The Labor Commissions were arbitration boards under state control and, at least in Germany's case, neutral between the two sets of interests. They relied on the advice of the “Consultative Council of Experts” which brought the Corporate membership of various fields to make sense out of technical issues. This is the third institution and then, if all else failed, the Court of Honor would be the final judge (Neumann, 1966).

Not only did worker morale soar, so did their production and wages. Finally, the innovative National Labor Service idea would bring all classes to engage in necessary labor nationwide as a form of national service. The wealthy worked in the fields along side the poorest members of society (ibid)

Under Hitler's semi-Corporatist system, wages and working conditions improved steadily. From 1932 to 1938, gross real weekly earnings increased by over 20 percent. At the same time, rents remained stable, and there was a relative decline in the costs of heating and light. Prices actually declined for some consumer goods, such as electrical appliances, clocks and watches, as well as for some foods. Consumer prices rose hardly at all from 1933 to the start of the war, no more than one percent. German standards of living increased like no other state in history. Between 1933 and 1938, weekly net earnings (after taxes) rose by 22 percent, while the cost of living rose by under seven percent. Even after the outbreak of war in September 1939, labor income continued to rise. By 1943 average hourly earnings of German workers had risen by 25 percent, and weekly earnings by 41 percent (Schoenbaum, 1980).

In this same period, food consumption increased by about 20 percent, while clothing and textile turnover increased by more than a quarter; the consumption of furniture and household goods rose by 50 percent. During the Third Reich's peacetime years, wine consumption rose by 50 percent, and champagne consumption increased 500 percent. In this period, the volume of tourism more than doubled, while automobile ownership during the 1930s went up 300 percent. German motor vehicle production, from all manufacturers, doubled in the five years of 1932 to 1937, while Germany's motor vehicle exports increased 800 percent. Passenger air traffic in Germany more than tripled from 1933 to 1937 (Schoenbaum, 1980 and Ferguson, 2006).

During the first four years of the National Socialist era, net profits of large corporations quadrupled, and managerial and entrepreneurial income rose by nearly 50 percent. Germany's gross domestic product grew, on average, by a remarkable eleven percent a year with no significant increase in the rate of inflation, a fact very rare in history. In the three years between

1939 and 1942, German industry expanded as much as it had during the preceding fifty years (Schoenbaum, 1980 and Craig, 1978). Military spending was a tiny fraction of this, contrary to widespread myth.

III.

Unlike the liberal, individualistic, humanistic approach, according to which a person is self-sufficient for himself and is the center of the world, Corporatism transfers the center of human aspirations outside the individual, to those communities or functions of which he is a member. Still, Corporations must have something in common, the national and religious ideal that animates the society as a whole. The two must always be in balance.

The notion of the “individual” in the liberal sense is impossible. The “individual” is a creation of society (beginning with the family) and hence, cannot be the creator of it. An individual cannot function without the social body and is thus parasitic on it. This is the pathogen of nominalism and liberalism. St. Philaret of Moscow writes:

Where there is a human society, there must be a power connecting people to it, for without power it is possible to imagine only an unsettled multitude of people, and not a [real] society, but power acts in society and preserves it by means of obedience. Consequently, obedience must be combined with the existence of social life. Anyone seeking to weaken obedience would weaken the foundation of society.

The liberal individual is an atom, not a person. The individualism of humanism as a self-affirming and therefore depleted element is, of course, the individualism of simplicity and uniformity. A full life for a person according to the teachings of Corporatism is possible only as a whole and in the whole.

The concept of the whole, the unity, applies both to the human community and to the human person. Man can be guided by both individual desires of the passions, motives, and man as a spiritual being can determine himself despite them. The determining principle of the whole is the consistency of its structural elements, guided by the meaning or idea of the whole. The most important property of the whole is its structure and, therefore, hierarchy. Spirituality, that is, the desire to be like God, should determine the life of a person and structure the parts.

In public life, its meaning is always present – its idea – which this community creates. The converse is also true: a value cannot exist for long if it doesn't manifest an organizational form. It follows from this Hegelian idea that the essence of society is not an exchange of services aimed at satisfying desires and passions, but serving the values that underlies society, despite the fact that these come, in some sense, from concrete needs. The question is not in satisfying concrete needs, but why satisfy these needs at all?

Individualism is opposed to those organic communities into which a man enters as a matter of necessity. These seem to be external to him, but they constitute his personhood. His self is unthinkable outside these relations. If these connections are unhealthy, so is the self. Life takes on a meaning and a purpose when the center of gravity is outside the self, and when the citizen becomes a living organ of a living super-personal being. This means that, when individuals begin to behave like organs in the social body, they become themselves. Since the individual is almost nothing in the social body, he becomes himself only as part of a larger unit. Man becomes a part of the structure that gives purpose to all action and then can realize a true identity and then can

contribute to society.

A specific person has many definitions. The healthy man is a member of the Russian nation, for example, but also a worker, a member of a city or a family man, but by each of his elements he enters into a certain integral community that unites them all. Without the larger community, he becomes schizophrenic. Mental illnesses are social problems. Modernism cannot accept this because it would be condemning itself.

Only one of two values can rule: two values that unite people into a very wide world. The first is the arrogant hedonism that rules the Western, post-Christian world while the second is the Community that breaks the ego and constructs actual persons in its place. Pride doesn't take well to having its source broken. A community, then, is the connection people share when bound by a common principle that constitutes their being or their personhood. Narrower unions in their own way express those ideas and values that serve as a unifying factor of higher ones.

Pitirim Sorokin wrote:

Every great culture is not just a conglomeration of diverse phenomena that coexist unconnected with each other, but there is unity or individuality, all of whose components are permeated by one fundamental principle and express one main value. . . . Take, for example, the culture of the West of the Middle Ages. Her main principle or main truth (value) was God. All important sections of medieval culture expressed this fundamental principle or value, as it is formulated in the Christian Credo (ibid).

That cultures are implicitly seen as “a conglomeration of diverse phenomena that coexist unconnected with each other” is axiomatic in modern social science. Even when they speak of some vague “community,” it's nothing but a collection of identity-less egos. My book *Officially Approved Dissent: Alasdair MacIntyre's Strategic Ambiguity in His Critique of Modernity* (Hromada Books, 2017) centers around this same problem. I wrote the following:

The concept of “tradition” that he uses is without content and overly formal. MacIntyre speaks of practices or cultures as abstractions. Avoiding actual cultures and practices make his argument flaccid and hypothetical. Speaking of a “tradition” without reference to historical examples is like teaching someone how to drive without ever having seen a car. There is a reason for this. If MacIntyre commits himself to defending, say, classical Athens as a tradition worth accepting or defending, feminists – immensely powerful in academia – would immediately accuse him of accepting the males-only rule of the *agora*. Many liberals would grab onto the existence of slavery in that society. It is much safer professionally to rest content in the vague world of abstractions.

So even the “communitarians” in modern academia are speaking of nothing. Their communities are words on paper, using collectivist verbiage while strategically avoiding any talk about real societies or ideas. Nothing is concrete because a community is inherently anti-liberal. The poor communitarian has to be content with the endless repetition of terms like “membership,” “identity,” “tradition” and even “virtue” in the abstract. It's quite literally a theory about nothing.

Given this, the first task of the healthy state is to know the central value of the people

(what functional groups all have in common) and then to strengthen the union among these. This requires an understanding of the single purpose of the nation. This is the job of political theory, though political philosophy concerns what all nations have in common. If the highest unit expresses and implements this highest value, then its structural elements are the necessary link in this hierarchy, each expressing the truth in an incomplete way. The inviolability of the organic unity of subordinate elements is a necessary condition for the existence of social integrity. This is the definition of freedom and is part of political philosophy.

Integrity requires that the state determine and maintain a hierarchy of communities expressing one value in different ways. Only with this approach to the structure of the state body can civic power satisfactorily fulfill its main function, that is, the explication of unity in diversity of function. By maintaining the hierarchy of communities, the hierarchy of values is maintained.

The Corporate state is first of all an organized national economy where the main processes are not carried out spontaneously, but according to the goals and ideals that the society is founded upon. These ideals are expressed in these communities, and therefore the Corporate system is not only an organized economy, but a hierarchically organized life in all its socially significant manifestations.

Unity here is not imposed from without, it exists thanks to the inner power of the idea uniting them. However, due to the fact that they represent separate spheres, they are independent. Due to the inequality of talent in such communities, a natural hierarchy and natural authorities are formed. As Michael Waltzer famously argued, this is the foundation for inequality, because there are universally accepted standards of conduct that some will accomplish more than others. Self-government, an internal organization based on a natural hierarchy, the ability to publish rules of law within its competence, i.e. the legal status granted by them to the state is made from these of societies and estates.

The New Martyr St. Ivan Vostorgov writes,

The obligation to use our income not only in our own interests, but also in the interests of general well-being, is a purely moral obligation imposed on us by love for our neighbor. God created wealth inequality to enable people to help their fellow men, and thus indicated a pure source of wonderful and noble impulses. . . . The material well-being of the worker and his family depends on the height of wages subject to constant fluctuations due to fluctuations in the market and retail prices. Labor power is turned into a commodity, and its value is reduced to the last degree. Free competition and unlimited power of capital: these are the reasons that caused this phenomenon. The liberal and radical parties indicate various means to alleviate the plight of the workers, but they cannot solve the great problem of our time and protect the working masses from decline and decay. The reasons for this situation of the working class and all the disasters resulting from it lie in the falling away of society from Christianity with its covenants of love and selflessness (Quoted in Titov, 2019).

The great weakness of the Left is that they used to pretend to concern themselves with labor, but only *qua* labor. There are no ultimate interests *qua* labor. Labor must be nested in other values in a hierarchy. Today, of course, the Left substitutes gender and non-white races in the former place of the working class. Only nationalists and Corporatists today talk seriously about labor interests. He contrasts liberal democracy with class democracy, in which class unions acted

as a counterweight to state on the one hand and the rule of capital on the other. Today, of course, these are one and the same. The Corporation becomes a stabilizing factor in the achievement of social harmony.

Established trade unions became the foundation upon which Catholic Socialism brought the faith to modern economics. The working class was a new phenomenon seen only in modernity. The church, both east and west, answered this with the Corporation in its various guises. In the proletariat, a new social unit has arisen – albeit deformed by urbanization – but it still must find its appropriate forms of organization. Cut off from its rural roots, these men became an easy target for the false promises of the Jewish Marxists.

IV.

Our corrupted society, which began with the British revolution of 1688 and the French Revolution of 1789, is ruled absolutely by a class of large financiers and their lawyers. The lauded system of abstract “rights” for equally abstract “citizens” doesn't impose any obligations on anyone except that they pay taxes and refrain from crime. In a society based on justice, the principle is that to whom much has been given, much will be asked. Class is as much a set of obligations as anything else. Therefore, giving such people a special legal status would oblige them to use their privileged position to the benefit of society.

The anti-Christian, egoist imperative rejects this except as rhetoric. There can be no “community” in liberalism by definition. The opposite of justice is the privatization of profit and the externalization of cost. In fact, this might even supplant Marx's definition of exploitation to a purely social level. “Economics” and “law” as academic disciplines are just extensions or projections of their own pathology. The assumption of all modern social analysis is that the ego is assumed to want all the money and power it can get while minimizing all obligations and consequences.

Hilaire Belloc wrote in the *Servile State* concerning the medieval conception of politics which opposes the modern on all points:

The [medieval] State. . . was an agglomeration of families of varying wealth, but by far the greater number owners of the means of production. It was an agglomeration in which the stability of this *distributive* system (as I have called it) was guaranteed by the existence of co-operative bodies, binding men of the same craft or of the same village together; guaranteeing the small proprietor against loss of his economic independence, while at the same time it guaranteed society against the growth of a proletariat. If liberty of purchase and of sale, of mortgage and of inheritance was restricted, it was restricted with the social object of preventing the growth of an economic oligarchy which could exploit the rest of the community. The restraints upon liberty were restraints designed for the preservation of liberty; and every action of Medieval Society, from the flower of the Middle Ages to the approach of their catastrophe, was directed towards the establishment of a State in which men should be economically free through the possession of capital and of land (Belloc, 1912).

This was true all over Europe and even much of Asia. It failed in Britain because the confiscation of the monastery lands by Henry VIII led to the growth of a landed oligarchy. That is, men, suddenly coming into landed wealth and connected to the crown, soon turned against it.

Such property rejects all limits and breaks all bonds. By the time Henry died, an oligarchy of great proprietors such as the “Howards (already of some lineage), the Cavendishes, the Cecils, the Russells and 50 other new families” had arisen and dominated the legislature. The Roses decimated the aristocracy, permitting the London oligarchy and the new gentry to control the cash the crown needed to function. They became “parliament.”

This phenomenon developed in many ways depending on the nation or the civilization. In Russia, it was Ivan III and IV that crushed these families before they could take over completely. In the 18th century, this was reversed, only to be put in check though most of the 19th. In Byzantium, it was the work of Emperor Basil II that prevented an oligarchy in the Greek lands. Yet, other states weren't as successful as time went on. The British empire was built by these powerful families and promoted this ideological interest worldwide.

The meaning of capitalism is the domination of mercantile interests over all others. Soon, this becomes the assumption of all social thinking. A skillful flair in tricking others out of money becomes the sole route to political power and prestige. It stands in for education, manners and obligation. It redefines “right” and does away with justice. The market rules all, but this is hardly a “democratic” vote with dollars, but a tightly organized system of consumption where conglomerates create demand rather than respond to it. Under capital's rule, the only thing that isn't relative is income, taxes and the size of armies.

Pavel Florensky wrote:

The political freedom of the masses in states with representative government is their self-deception, but a dangerous self-deception, distracting from useful activities. It must be firmly said that politics is a specialty that is as inaccessible to the masses as medicine or mathematics, and therefore as dangerous in the hands of the ignorant as poison or explosive. The corresponding conclusion about representation follows from this: as a democratic principle, it is harmful, and not satisfying anyone in particular, at the same time relaxes the whole. Not a single government, if it does not want to collapse, actually relies on the decision of the majority in matters of major importance and makes its own adjustments; which means that in essence it does not recognize representation, but uses it (Quoted in Titov, 2007).

“Democratic” in 2020 means liberal just as, during the British revolution, the “will of the people” was the same as the London oligarchy. The line “It must be firmly said that politics is a specialty that is as inaccessible to the masses as medicine or mathematics” is a powerful conception that explicates the nature of the Corporate way of thinking. All these fields are technical ones and rarely accessible to outsiders. Because the vocabulary is a common one, journalists think the words used mean the same thing as it does in conversation. While astronomy, cardiac surgery and mathematics use a vocabulary largely foreign to the educated layman, politics, law and economics use common words with uncommon meanings.

The ignorant think “Political Science” is about “current events.” Since journalism, not Political Science, decides what “issues” are important and prepackages these “issues” complete with arguments and superficial logic, these are actually confused with Politics as such. It is not. “Issue oriented” journalism has little relation to power and right and is rather connected to entertainment. Journalists aren't specialists in Political Science or History and cannot be taken as providing any insight into either.

The fact that media-generated “issues” are packaged in easy-to-understand verbiage has no relation to politics, government or reality – this is merely entertainment. These exist to justify the present ruling class and give people the impression that they matter, or that they know anything. “Issue politics” has no relation to politics. Its part of the entertainment industry. CNN is to actual Politics what Dr. Phil is to Psychology or Pink is to music. The relations are coincidental. These are easy to grasp counterfeits that attract readers and listeners while imparting no information on the nature of power, justice or right.

Elements of the state can only be that which are organic to it. Without them, the state cannot exist. State organisms have been doing fine without parties for millennia. Florensky says

The basis of the state’s internal policy is a fundamental ban on any political parties and organizations. Opposition parties impede the activity of the state, while parties that express especially deliberate devotion are not only unnecessary, but also decompose the state system, replacing the whole state, narrowing its scope and ultimately becoming Janissaries playing the supreme state power. Reasonable state power does not require praetorians, in the form of devotion, who want to give directives to the authorities (Quoted in Titov, 2007).

Parties are special interest organizations connected to wealthy families and sectors of the economy. These are part of the “issue oriented” entertainment industry. Capital rules both and parties are increasingly irrelevant. Parties aren't guilds or Corporations as they express only one interest, and its usually hidden. Parties provide no real service, represent no one but capital and have no concern for excellence, standards or even logic. Social bodies do not rule, but serve; they do not dominate, but sacrifice themselves for the good.

V.

From the very beginning, the Russian royalist program in emigration emphasized the need for a Corporate system for the future of Russia (cf the “Brief Summary of the Program of the Russian Imperial Union,” 1934, *Imperial Bulletin*, No. 4, 1988). In the 1930s, almost all Russian emigrants agreed on this, having successful examples of Corporate states (Spain, Portugal, Italy, etc) before their eyes. From M. Nazarov’s book *The Mission of the Russian Emigration*:

Corporatism is aims at the harmonious structuring of functions, not fragmenting it according to class or party. It connects different classes on the basis of their social function, not income. A Corporation here means the union of people according to their function in the service of society such as Corporations of workers in the woodworking, metallurgical, education, agricultural, and many other industries. The Corporation has not only the function of protecting the economic interests of a certain group of workers before the employer and the state, but also the joint function of harmonizing the social and economic life of both its industry and the whole country, right up to the legislative level and should have its own chamber in the upper house of the legislature, as Hegel prescribed.

This author has interpreted Hegel as a social nationalist for 25 years. Given his difficult, dense prose and overwhelming public ignorance of his doctrines, the Right has never embraced

him. Often anti-intellectual, many elements of the Right even believe he's somehow connected to Marxism, largely on the grounds that they both use some sort of “dialectical” method in philosophical writing. In Russia however, thanks to Il'yn's work on him, Hegel is far more popular and is a significant figure in the nationalist movement. This is also because much in Hegel's conception of the state corresponds roughly to the Russian *sobornost*, that eternally misunderstood conception in Orthodox theo-politics.

Representation isn't the arithmetical addition of opinions, but a joint struggle for popular solutions, which is the meaning of Russian *sobornost'*. This is a consensus that's not merely the deliberation of parliaments, but of the broader population over time. Before the rise of mass media and its corrupting influence, this was the true meaning of “consensus.”

In the Corporate state, overcoming class antagonism is part of the nature of social justice. Class here is defined by wealth and thus, power, though this isn't the classical definition. A “class” traditionally has been a function represented by a Corporation.

Inequality is natural and inevitable if freedom and personhood are respected. Serious socialism rejects the impossible equality and Corporatism seeks a “managed” or “complex equality” that ensures basic freedoms, but, unlike western systems, rejects any inequality not based on personal qualities and labor.

To summarize, the Corporatist idea is that of a strong supreme power – recognizing the spiritual ideal of the people – manifest by a Corporate structure of society's five sectors and subdivisions. These preserve the integrity of the nation by keeping the moneyed oligarchy at bay and protecting society from atomization. The ideal of the nation is manifest in the specific functions (the five sectors) that any society needs to work. These are equal in the social body, but internally, they're organized based on the expert knowledge of the field and, while equal in relation to each other, are hierarchic within each.

Corporatism arose in western Europe precisely as a national defense against the omnipotence of the financial conspirators who emerged victorious after the First World War. The financial oligarchy, by its very structure, methods and wealth, functions as a conspiracy. It loathes to show itself to public scrutiny. Italy, Spain, Portugal and Germany developed the Corporate structure, but similar theoretical developments existed in many European countries. Thus, the Austrian Corporatism of Chancellor Dolfuss emphasized it, proclaiming in the constitution “the restoration of Christian social virtues” in the struggle against the “barbarism of the naturalistic and atheistic age – capitalist or communist.”

Unlike Western Europeans, the Russians did not need to reinvent the Corporatist social ideal because it had long existed in the Russian tradition in the form of traditional self-government. The political system of Muscovite Russia had many features of the Corporate system as the entire population was organized according to the ranks, representatives of which expressed the people's will in the form of the *Zemsky Sobor*, an older form of Corporate representation. This means the Russian nationalist doesn't have to borrow anything, as it can be found locally. Fascism, at its best, unconsciously sought to realize an ideal close to the Russian, as Ilyin noted in the late 1930s:

The state is not a mechanism of competing interests, but an organism of fraternal service, the unity of faith, honor and sacrifice – this is the historical and political basis of Russia. Russia began to move away from this and paid the price, but will return to it again. Fascism does not give us a new idea, but only new attempts to implement this Christian, Russian national idea in relation to [present] conditions

(Quoted in Nazarov, 2010a).

So what is Corporatism? Unlike most ideologies, its fairly well defined and generally successful in practice even under wildly varying conditions. There are four critical marks of this system. First, it is structural in that it brings together interest groups that actually represent the labor of populations. It ensures the internal articulation of social needs.

Second, it brings these entities into the decision making process through real and informal representation. Third, it has to do with psychology in that it is meant to reach consensus in policy rather than empower powerful, but hidden, elites that dominate parliamentary systems. Finally, it forces these interests to organize themselves in a national context. The corporation is nothing unless there's a unity of purpose for the society as a whole.

Select Bibliography

Belloc, H. *The Servile State*. TN Foulis, 1912

Western B. A Comparative Study of Corporatist Development. *American Sociological Review* 56: 283–94, 1991

Parsons S. On the Logic of Corporatism. *Political Studies* 36:515–23, 1988

Fedotov G. Our Democracy. *New City* 9(23) 1934 (in Russian)

Tikhomirov L. *Monarchist Statehood*. Buenos Aires, 1968 (in Russian)

Ilyin I. *Fundamentals of Government*. RTHD 1930 (in Russian)

Nazarov, NI. *About the Corporate System*. URP, 2010 (in Russian)

Nazarov, NI. *Lost Criterion: More on the Comparison of National Socialism with Soviet Socialism*. URP, 2010a (in Russian)

Nazarov, NI. *Brief Summary of the Program of the Russian Imperial Union, 1934*. *Imperial Bulletin* 4, 1988 (in Russian)

Titov, G. *Corporatism as the Basis of the Christian Monarchy*. URP, 2007 (in Russian)

Titov, G. *Austrian Christian Corporatism*. URP, 2019 (in Russian)

O'Donnell, Guillermo. *Corporatism and the Question of the State*. In James M Malloy, ed. *Authoritarianism and Corporatism in Latin America*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 1977

White, Gordon. *Riding the Tiger The Politics of Economic Reform in Post-Mao China*. Stanford University Press, 1993

Goodman, David and Beverley Hooper, eds. *China's Quiet Revolution: New Interactions between State and Society*. St Martin's Press, 1994

Gelman, V and Sergei Ryzhenkov. Local Regimes, Sub-National Governance and the 'Power Vertical' in Contemporary Russia. *Europe-Asia Studies* 63(3), 2011

Manoilescu, Mihail. *The Theory of Protectionism and of International Trade*. King and Son, 1931

Bobulescu, Roxana. Protectionism in Retrospect: Mihail Manoilescu (1891-1950). *The Brazilian Journal of Political Economy* 23(4): 2003

Pinto, AC. *Corporatism and Fascism: The Corporatist Wave in Europe*. Routledge, 2017

Williamson, PJ. *Varieties of Corporatism: A Conceptual Discussion*. Cambridge University Press, 1985

Williamson, PJ. *Corporatism in Perspective*. Sage, 1989

Johnson, Matthew Raphael. *Officially Approved Dissent: Alasdair MacIntyre's Strategic Ambiguity in His Critique of Modernity*. Hromada Books, 2017

Molina, O. *Corporatism: The Past, Present, and Future of a Concept*. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2002

Haag, John. *Othmar Spann and the Ideology of the Austrian Corporate State*. Master's Thesis, Rice University 1966

Spann, Othmar. *Types of Economic Theory*. Routledge 1930

Unger, J. *China, Corporatism, and the East Asian Model*. *The Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs* 33, 1995: 29-53

Schoenbaum, D. *Hitler's Social Revolution*. Norton, 1980

Neumann, Franz. *Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism 1933-1944*. Harper and Row, 1966

Craig, G. *Germany 1866-1945*. Oxford, 1978

Ferguson, N. *The War of the World*. Penguin, 2006

Hegel, GWF. *The Philosophy of Right*. TM Knox, trans. Clarendon, 1942