

**TO READ: Andrei
Fursov:
CONSPIROLOGY -
The crypto-political
economy of
capitalism as a
basis for the study
of Western elites**

(Author's expert report)

Source:

This is an unofficial draft translation. Please do not cite.

Chapter 3

In economic terms, capitalism is a whole-world, supranational system, the world market knows no borders; its *locus standi* and field of employment, as Marx would say, is the world market, the world as a whole. But in political terms, the capsystem (capitalist system) is not an integral whole on a planetary scale, but an aggregate, a mosaic of states, their international (international) organization, i.e. the organization of national states. This is one of the most serious contradictions of capitalism - the contradiction between capital and the state, the world and the national (state).

By the middle of the 19th century, as capitalism becomes a totality, a system-for-itself or, as Marxists would say, a formation, i.e. as it acquires a material (material) base adequate to it - industrial productive forces - capitalism acquires a solid production foundation. But industrial productive forces have a regional character, being concentrated in the North Atlantic zone, while production relations have a world character, coming into contradiction with state-political forms and striving to break them. Thus, the contradiction between the integral world character of the economy and the total mosaic national character of the state-political organization acquires another dimension: world production relations (and their personifiers) confront not world, but regional productive forces and not world, but national state-political structures - and their personifiers.

As a result, firstly, the interests of states are, as a rule, closely connected with those of industrialists, the capitals of the real, "physical", economy, while the interests of financiers are objectively opposed to both. Of course, reality is more complex, it is sometimes characterized by various twists and combinations, cun-

ning intertwining lines of probability, due to the conjuncture, circumstances - both historical and family and personal (this was well shown in their novels by O. Balzac, E. Zola, etc.). Nevertheless, the above-mentioned basic contradiction and the ways (forms) of its removal remain determinant of the entire evolution, the entire motility of capitalism. But we are a little ahead of ourselves.

The big bourgeoisie, no matter what country it lives in (especially if it is a large country), especially its financial segment, always has interests that go beyond national boundaries, beyond state borders - its own and those of others. And it is possible to realize these interests only by violating the laws - of one's own state or those of others, or more often of both. And we are not talking about a one-time violation, but about a permanent and systematic one, which, therefore, must be formalized in some way. It is one thing when capital is confronted with a weak or even not so weak policy in Asia, not to mention Africa - here a forceful version of "gunboat diplomacy" is enough. But what about in the world of equals or relatively equals: Great Britain, France, Russia, Austria, and, since the second half of the 19th century, Germany and the United States? This is a completely different matter. Here you can't play around, you need not firearms, but organizational weapons, which would formalize the interests of the capitalist upper classes of various states, remove their contradictions with the state and become an expression of their holistic (extra- and supranational) and long-term interests.

Thus, since commodity chains on the world market constantly violate state-political boundaries, often contradicting the interests of the "crossed" states, the top of the capitalist class, firstly, needs supranational, supranational structures / organizations; secondly, these organizations should be, if not completely secret, then

closed from the general public, and, thirdly, these organizations / structures should be able to influence the states, influence their leaders, their leaders, while being one and the same.

In fact, what these structures do cannot be called anything other than a permanent and institutionalized conspiracy. That is why we should talk about CCs (closed clubs). The CCs include all types of closed, in conditions of capitalism, most often (though by no means always) supranational structures - Masonic lodges, closed clubs, secret societies, order-type organizations, etc. The CCs are by no means exhausted by Freemasonry and quasi-masonry, although in the XVIII century and in a significant part of the XIX century they were the dominant form of organization of the CCs. However, since the end of the 19th century and even more so in the 20th century, new, more modern forms of CCs have emerged, not abolishing the old ones, often related to them, but much more directly related to politics, economics, intelligence.

(These closed communities of globally-oriented and politically-focused capitalists occupy the top (of the power hierarchy)), above capital itself and the state, located on the same plane. The CC is the third dimension that completes the system of capitalism and gives it integrity. When the history of the capitalist era is written and told as the history of the state(s) and capital alone, it is an incomplete, incomplete and false history. It is a two-dimensional history of a three-dimensional system. Without the closed supranational steering "committees", the history of the capitalist era is incomprehensible - and impossible. Another thing is that the history of the CC must be inscribed in the history of capital (its cycles of accumulation) and the state (the struggle for hegemony), and their relations analyzed as subject and system. Only in this case we will get a holistic, integral history of the epoch,

and not a scheme that can satisfy profane people, including those from science.

CCs remove not only the basic political-economic contradiction we have been discussing, but also other contradictions: between different forms of capital and, accordingly, the factions of the capitalist class; between states.

Representing both capital and the state at the same time, linking them organizationally in a sphere that is outside the state and outside capital, CCs at the same time appear above the state and above capital, expressing the integral and long-term interests of the capitalist system and thus acting as personifiers of the integral and long-term interests of the capitalist class as its system-forming element. Here it is necessary to give a working definition of capitalism, which I will use: as Descartes said, "il faut définir le sens des des mots" - "define the meaning of words". If capital in the strict (systemic or, as Marxists would say, formational) sense of the word is embodied labor that realizes itself as self-increasing value in the process of exchange for living labor, then capitalism is a social system based on this process. But this is not quite a sufficient definition. Capitalism is far from just capital: capital existed before capitalism and is likely to exist after it. Capitalism is a complex social system that institutionally (state, politics, civil society, mass education) constrains capital in its long-term and holistic interests (and thus extends time for it) and provides it with expansion (space).

Expansion is necessary because capitalism is an extensively oriented system: as soon as the global rate of profit decreased, capitalism would tear out this or that part of the non-capitalist zone and turn it into the capitalist periphery - a source of cheap labor and cheap raw materials. The exhaustion of non-capitalist zones (1991) means asphyxiation and a relatively quick death, or rather

the dismantling of capitalism by the "lords of its rings"¹². In this respect, globalization is the terminator not only of the Soviet Union, of systemic anti-capitalism, but also of capitalism as a system. And quite symptomatic of the dialectic: globalization is very much a product of the CC.

Finally, there is another important contradiction of bourgeois society, which the CCs are called upon to remove. In bourgeois society, official power is not sacred, secrecy is not its inherent characteristic. It was in the "pre-capitalist" societies of Asia, Africa and pre-Columbian America that secrecy was an immanent characteristic of power, but this secrecy was in plain sight, obvious. People knew about the secret power and the mystery of power, and power itself was perceived as something mysterious and sacral. By the way, that is why, strictly speaking, in these cases there was no need for a conspiracy as a system, as a special phenomenon. Of course, this does not mean that there were no real conspiracies and secret struggle in these societies.

This is not the case with capitalism as a system. Since in capitalist society production relations are economic, and exploitation is carried out as an obvious exchange of labor power for objectified labor, the social process is almost transparent: the market, the domination of commodity-money relations, the institutional separation of power from property, economy from morality, religion from politics, politics from economy (economic management is separated from the administrative-political process - Lane's Law), and economy from the social sphere. All this exposes the social and power relations of bourgeois society.

The rationalization of economic, social and political spheres and relations opens up the processes occurring in these spheres to the maximum extent possible, makes them fundamentally readable and turns them into the object of study of special disciplines -

economics, sociology, political science. of mystery. Moreover, in addition to the state as a hypostasis (the foundation of) of power, there is civil society. In bourgeois society, power - the state and politics - especially since the middle of the 19th century, if not illuminated, is quite visible, especially since it officially claims to be open and rational. To this we must add the electoral system with its rights (in Great Britain - since 1867), as well as the fact that bourgeois society (in the core of the capsystem) is the only one that legalizes political opposition, and officially proclaims democracy and human rights as political principles, albeit hypocritically. This, of course, creates very serious problems for both the capitalist class and the state that reflects its interests, i.e. for the system as a whole - problems that have been aggravated and exacerbated as social conflicts, wars and revolutions have become more frequent.

The open democratic political facade seriously hampers, if not makes impossible, the normal functioning of the capitalist system, i.e. the realization of the class interests of the upper class at the expense and to the detriment of the bulk of the population, the maintenance of the power and privileges of this upper class. Therefore, the normal functioning of the political-economic system here requires the creation of a closed power contour, a shadow, a veil - something that was not so urgently needed before capitalism. The more democratic the facade looks, which, precisely because of its democracy and openness, must be deprived of real power, or it, should at least be minimized. This is another task of the CCs, whose growth and strengthening are directly proportional to the external democratization of bourgeois societies, while the balance of power between them is inversely proportional, representing a zero-sum game in favor of the CCs. Let me repeat: this aspect of the development of the CC .

And in this case, the CC is a means of resolving an acute social contradiction, unknown to societies other than capitalist societies.

With the public "denationalization" of the population, turning its citizens into agents of public policy, the role of secret, behind-the-scenes politics, secret power, and not only extra-state - (Davos, Fed Board deliberations that are not open to the public, etc.), but also the state itself, increased proportionally. The latter, in the conditions of the expansion of the public sphere and the growing importance of civil society, took the most important aspects, sides and directions of its activity, the real power and its main mechanisms into the shadows, behind the scenes. And the greater the part of the population that received voting rights, the more public the politics became, the more democratic the society became, the greater the part of the real power, especially in the 20th century. - of the real power went into the shadows, acted conspiratorially, as a conspiracy, merging with closed structures. In other words, conspiracy is the opposite, "dark", "shadow" side of democracy and publicity, in fact, the dark / shadow side of Modernity in the its North Atlantic core.

In this respect, we can say that conspiracy theology is the analysis of one of the most important, if not the most important, dark side of Modernity, compensation for what the science of Modern society does not deal with. Equally, the CCs themselves are a compensatory reaction of the capsystem to its historically forced deviation from its nature.

Through such organizations, the most important contradictions of the system, including the basic one - between economic integration / capital and state-political fragmentation / state, between social time and social space (with globalization this struggle of time and space ended with the victory of time, but the price of this victory is the exhaustion of capitalism and the resulting task

of its dismantling by its own masters) - were removed in the interests of the top of the capitalist class. The contradictions were removed beyond the visibility of this society as a type and as a reality, so that another contradiction - between labor and capital - would not lead to an explosion, i.e. the solution of one contradiction was dictated by the necessity of solving the other. And vice versa.

The "final solution" to this contradiction, according to the idea of the "masters of the world game" (O. Markeev), should be a kind of world, transnational government. The top of the capclass has been striving to create the latter since the 19th century: at the end of the 19th century the task of creating a world government was put on the agenda, and the whole 20th century they tried to exhaust this "agenda"...

...