

# FASCIST CORPORATISM

*From Antiquity to Modernity: The Resilience of Corporatism in Political History.*

Part: I

## INTRODUCTION

---



**In this essay, I will provide a historical overview of the roots of corporatism, delving into its definition and tracing its origins from classical antiquity through the medieval period to the modern trade union movements of the**

**19th and early 20th centuries, particularly those associated with Italy. Before we begin, it is crucial to address a widespread misconception nowadays: the notion that fascism, “fascist corporatism, was a merger of multinational corporations like Amazon, Google, Apple, etc., and the state is a significant misunderstanding.” Please, dismiss once and for all this erroneous idea that corporatism has anything to do with multinational corporations or capitalist entities; it is false.**

**Corporation, as we will see, does indeed have everything to do with a political concept of organic unity, the totality of society’s organs, the political corpus of society, which later manifested in medieval labor guilds and trade union corporations. So, once again, forget this idea of fascist corporatism being related to capitalist and multinational corporations.**

*Definition of corporatism:*

**Let’s begin with the definition of corporatism we have in mind for this study. To do so, I will**

use the entry on corporatism from the extensive political dictionary of the National Fascist Party, written by several fascist intellectuals appointed by the regime. From this source, we find two significant quotes to establish the definition of corporatism in fascism, take a look: *Etymology. Etymologically, the word “corporatism” refers to the legal concept of corpus, that is, the association of individuals for a common purpose; namely, those entities or “trade corporations” that, under different names and with different characters, appear among almost all peoples and in almost all times. Under the name of “corporatism,” we can understand all economic, sociological, and legal proposals or doctrines founded on an organic principle, on which the social order rests, replacing the atomistic fiction that characterizes the individualistic system. This organic principle must be precisely identified in the “bodies,” preferably in professional bodies that one would like to restore, to some extent or another, in the*

*theoretical and practical order of civilization, in order to correct the mechanical outcomes of the “individualistic order.”* (PNF. Dizionario di Politica, edited by the National Fascist Party, Rome, Lulu, 2014. P. 116 and 118.)

There is a very important implication at the end of this last quotation, which we will revisit as we transition from our historical analysis of medieval corporatism to modern trade unionism. So, essentially, these definitions convey the following: corporatism comes from the Latin word “corpus” (Corpus = body), the organization of society into corporate groups, such as agricultural, labor, military, scientific associations, or guilds, etc. This signifies a social body, meaning a political organism composed of various distinct bodies, each performing its specific function, much like our bodily organs carry out specific functions. Thus, we have a large organic social and political body with different bodies, in this case, as the dictionary mentions, professional bodies like guilds and workers’ guilds, which

later evolve into corporations and trade unions. These are the organs of the political body, hence corporatism.

*Thus, just as in the human body, the arms, legs, heart, and mind must all be interconnected and function like a well-lubricated machine, in society and politics, all actors must be equally integrated: religion and governance, economy and politics, lords and peasants, capital and labor.* Howard J. Wiarda. (*Corporatism and Comparative Politics, the Other Great “ism”*. M. E. Sharpe, New York, 1997. P. 28.)

*Origins in classical antiquity, Greece, and Rome.*

We begin our historical analysis, therefore, where it usually starts, in ancient Greece and more precisely with Aristotle. And here is what Aristotle had to say about corporatism:

*Aristotle, in his Politics, put forth the notion that society should be organized according to “natural” classes and functional lines: warriors, priesthood, slaves, and rulers. While we no*

*longer accept Aristotle's notion of a "natural" slave or dominant class, his ideas that society should be organized along functional or occupational lines in an orderly and bureaucratic manner, where each unit of society should perform its appropriate functions, and that all parts need to be harmonized into an organic whole, would prove very appealing to future corporatist writers as well as political. (Leaders .Howard J. Wiarda. Corporatism and Comparative Politics, the Other Great "ism". M. E. Sharpe, New York, 1997. P. 28-29.)*

The second step now is to observe the influence of Aristotle on ancient Roman political and legal thought, which also created a type of corporatist system more or less in line with Aristotelian principles. This is the Roman corporatism. Roman political theorists drew from Greek conceptions (the organic theory of the state and society, the functional organization of society, and "natural" inequalities among individuals) but also

**introduced their own new concepts. Rome had a much more elaborate and organized system of corporate and social associations, including various military, professional, and religious institutions (often referred to as collegia), each with its own constitution. While these groups were generally monopolistic, the state exerted control and governed relations between them. It is evident that even in ancient Rome, there were various guilds for each type of occupation, including military and priestly roles, where the Roman state exercised a form of regulation and control over activities. It is presumed that, for mutual benefit between the political class and the elite in these market sectors, there was a form of restriction and regulation of activities and the free market for the mutual benefit of these political and elite elites of the respective corporations. One can now understand the importance of the concept of corporatism, that is, a political body in which organs, unions, guilds, and corporations must adhere to a plan for the entire organism.**

**This is because, even in antiquity, there was state control over these occupational activities, and they reappear later, after the fall of the Roman Empire, in the high and late Middle Ages, in the form of control over pricing and entry into trade and industry activities, manifesting as the famous medieval guilds—a resurgence of corporatism.**

### *Medieval corporatism*

***Medieval corporations emerged as autonomous organizations, particularly the guilds of craftsmen and trades with their hierarchical systems of apprentices, journeymen, and master craftsmen. Guilds licensed and policed their own members, helped regulate trade and prices, and were essentially autonomous professional associations that contributed to progress and social peace. It is within the guild system that later corporatist writers often sought a model for efficient economic management and class collaboration.***



*(Howard J. Wiarda, "Corporatism and Comparative Politics: The Other Great Ism," M. E. Sharpe, New York, 1997, p. 30.)*

**Fascist intellectuals interpreted the emergence of medieval corporations as a return to the much-praised, deemed necessary organic and totalitarian conception of social life, wherein each organism of the political corpus must be regulated in a uniform and centralized manner. Although medieval corporations arose somewhat spontaneously due to the expansion of trade in the late Middle Ages, fascist theorists argue that, consequently, political power inevitably intervened and once again became a fusion of political and corporate power.**

*In the recovery of artisanal production and trade that slowly matured beyond the narrow confines of manorial*

*economy, craft guilds reemerged among new populations, always with the goal of professional protection. Especially in northern Italy and Flanders, the guilds gained such strength that they managed, by intertwining with political competitions and intrigues, to reach political power. (PNF. Dizionario di Politica, edited by the National Fascist Party: Rome, Lulu, 2014, pp. 116-117.)*

*The liberal rupture*

**Now, moving into modernity, the end of the medieval era, there is a key event to understand where the fascists drew their corporatism, and we must always keep this in mind as we discuss corporatism going forward. With the end of the medieval age and the onset of modernity, there emerges the individualistic revolution of natural law, liberalism that comes along with the explosion of the French Revolution.**

**For the fascists, the rise of liberal individualism and natural law is a great misfortune because it destroys that organic, totalitarian, integral conception of society and political bodies that the medieval guilds had resurrected from antiquity.**

**In the fascist historical interpretation, there is a significant temporal rupture in which medieval guilds emerged, bringing back this organic conception of society only to be shattered by the emergence of liberalism and natural law. A crucial fascist author who wrote a book specifically to theoretically recount this rupture of medieval guild organizations with the rise of individualism and the bourgeois revolution of the 18th and 19th centuries was Sergio Panunzio. He was one of the major theorists of the fascist state and wrote a book called “Sindacalismo e medio evo” precisely to explain to his contemporaries the**

**importance of the resurgence of the modern labor movement as na heir to medieval guilds.**

***“The bourgeois revolution pressed, what it aimed for was this: that in the State there would be no orders, corporations, associations that would impede the action of public power. So, having dissolved everything, it reduced society to a dust of individual atoms, spinning in a vacuum. But the masses (the workers) learned from the experience of almost a century that, thus dissolved, they are subjugated and need na organization, not only to avoid being subjugated but, as human nature desires, to subjugate.”***

***(Sergio Panunzio. “Sindacalismo e medio evo.” Napoli, Società Editrice Partenopea, 1911, p. 40.)***

**For Panunzio and the fascists in general, the bourgeois revolution is**

**seen as the evolution of natural law and individualism that gives rise to liberalism. It dissolved medieval guilds, eroding that organic conception of society, creating atomistic individualism that fragmented individuals into societies. This dissolved the organicity of the social body, rendering the state absent, merely as a distant observer of labor relations.**

*The Modern syndicalism*

**According to Panunzio and fascist theorists, the 19th-century modern syndicalism is then a resurrection of medieval corporatism, restoring the organic nature of political bodies after the misfortune of liberalism and the state's absence in regulating labor-capital relations. This brings to mind the concluding part of an earlier quote I mentioned in the text from the political dictionary itself, stating that**

**modern fascist corporatism, stemming from a resurrection of the organicity last present in medieval guilds, was explicitly intended to rectify the errors and problems resulting from 19th-century liberalism and the absence, so to speak, of the state in labor-capital relations.**

**In other words, fascist corporatism emerged to address the issues of the free market.**

*This organic datum must be found precisely in the “bodies,” and preferably in the professional bodies that one would like to reintroduce, more or less extensively, into the theoretical and practical order of civilization, to correct the mechanical outcomes of the “individualist order.”*

*(PNF. Dizionario di Politica, edited by the National Fascist Party: Rome, Lulu, 2014, p. 118.)*

**However, 19th-century syndicalism, though theoretically, for Panunzio, a resurrection of medieval organicism, remained a somewhat anarchic movement with the vision of a society of producers regulated by various union corporations, as noted by Canadian historian David Roberts.**

*The new social order would be a network of unions, but they [the syndicalists] never explained the mechanics of organizational relations in the future society. Nonetheless, the syndicalists' visions of the future reveal the frustrations and aspirations that made these Italians particular radical opponents of the current order. Through the vigorous self-sufficient economic organizations now emerging, society would gradually become capable of governing itself without the corrupt parliamentary state and suffocating centralized bureaucracy,*

*without politicians as intermediaries. The conventional political sphere would disappear completely, replaced by a direct democracy of producers, where "political" participation would be more constant and immediate than under the liberal suffrage system.*

*(David D. Roberts. "The Syndicalist Tradition and Italian Fascism." The University of North Carolina Press, 1979, p. 71-72.)*

**Sergio Panunzio asserts, and he is very clear and explicit in stating that, yes, modern unionism is na heir to medieval corporatism. Even though, in its early stages, this unionism was na anarchic movement because they aimed at the destruction of the bourgeois state, the parliamentary state, the absent state that allowed liberalism to reign supreme. Here is what Panunzio says:**



*Panunzio strives to show that modern revolutionary unionism is na extension and a return to the principles of autonomy and solidarity from medieval times, preparing for the destruction of the unity of the state and the advent of a particularistic and autonomous economic, political, and social regime. It is a return because, as the modern state had destroyed medieval guilds and their principles, the “union today claims them back and makes them its own again” against the liberal state.*

*(Sergio Panunzio. “Sindacalismo e medio evo.” Napoli, Società Editrice Partenopea, 1911, pp. 56-57 and 65.)*

Therefore, we reach the 19th century, moving into the 20th century, after the decline of medieval guilds during the time of Italian communes, leading to the rise of liberal individualism, the redundancy of liberalism, and the free market in the 19th century. This,

according to fascist theorists like Sergio Panunzio, results in the ascent of the labor movement and the working class to combat the liberal state or liberalism and the individualism that atomizes individuals. In this revolutionary Italian movement at the time, they aimed to create an anarchic society of guilds, unions—a new society where the working class could exist in an organic, cohesive environment with various autonomous union bodies. To conclude this initial part before the conclusion, I will share the account of Gioacchino Volpe, an influential fascist historian. He describes the historical impact of the ideas of medieval communes and guilds on the realization of fascist corporatism. Here's what the historian says: *The influential fascist historian Gioacchino Volpe, in his "Storia del movimento fascista," points out that within the*

*speculations and debates of the regime, especially in the 1930s, intellectuals often turned "to that corporate life of the 1200s and 1300s when economic, social, and political activity was a means of defense and reconciliation of category interests, a body controlling production through participation in public life."*

*These intellectuals highlighted the birth of guilds during the time of medieval communes as a moment, albeit transient, of the creation of national consciousness due to the aforementioned organic characteristics of these medieval communities.*

*(Gioacchino Volpe. "Storia del movimento fascista." Milano, Ispi, 1939, p. 135.)*

*Primary conclusion*

*In the second part, we will delve into how this initially anarchic syndicalism, opposed to the idea of the state they*

associated with the liberal state maintaining the liberal system, eventually transformed into a national unionism. They rediscovered the idea of union corporations, once again with political power centralized. This will be the central theme of Part II, which is a crucial step in the evolution from anarchic union corporatism to national syndicalism, ultimately evolving into fascist corporatism.

## *Part: II*

*Ideological Transformation of Revolutionary Syndicalists in the Wake of the First World War*



2 **IL FASCISMO MI HA DATO  
TRANQUILLITA' E LAVORO**

**In the first part of this essay, we discussed the conceptualization of corporatism, along with a historical contextualization that brought us from the mid to the late 19th century. It was during this period that modern labor movements emerged, composed of revolutionary unionists largely inspired by medieval guilds and corporations. We also highlighted that this Revolutionary Unionism was fundamentally anarchic, in the sense that they aimed to combat the bourgeois or liberal state, viewing the congregation of unions as the true, inherent social form—an organic and collective structure wherein the proletariat or collective proletariat could realize its social essence. We must remember that revolutionary syndicalists opposed the liberal parliamentary democracy of universal suffrage. Simultaneously, they aimed to establish a form of political**

representation more directly tied to the producers, through an anarchic syndicalist society of union corporations. Their belief was grounded in the idea that the proletariat, integrated into the union, would truly embody its social essence through new values of sacrifice, mutual labor, and solidarity. These values were seen as essential for the class struggle that would ultimately overthrow the liberal state.

*Regardless of the controversial relationship of Italian syndicalists with the Sorelian myth, the emphasis on elitist and pedagogical characteristics of the union structure is shared by both, especially when focused on creating new values strong and coherent enough to surpass liberal and bourgeois values. Revolutionary syndicalism positioned itself as the antithesis of liberal democracy and the reformism of the*

***Italian Socialist Party, not only due to strategic differences but by fully turning towards a new conception of the revolutionary individual to be created. In 1903, Labriola stated, “The workers’ syndicate, therefore, assumes the task of preparing the masses’ consciousness and organizing the ranks of the future workers’ army.” (“Luca Melegari. Birth and affirmation of revolutionary syndicalism in Italy 1902-1904. Scienza & Politica. Per Una Storia Delle Dottrine 4, 1992. P. 57.”)***

**This second part will entirely focus on how syndicalists placed extreme importance on the ability of unions to shape consciousness and bring forth new values for the proletariat. Values they deemed much more in line with the social essence of the individual proletarian, far superior to the liberal and bourgeois values that, according to**

**them, atomized, oppressed, and alienated proletarian individuals.**

**These authors, syndicalists, perceived the syndicate corporation in an anarchic manner, opposing the bourgeois state and bourgeois values, viewing it as the true community of destiny for the Italian working class. The Italian proletarian workers would only truly become free and realize their social essence by inheriting and learning proletarian values during labor, sacrifice, and class struggle. This, in turn, would overthrow the artificial, atomized, and alienating society of liberal capitalism and parliamentary democracy, establishing the true community of destiny embodied in a syndicate corporation.**

***Syndicalists often spoke about a transformation of workers through “organizational affiliation,” initiating***



*the pedagogical process for the proletariat by fostering not only the capacity for revolution but also new anti-bourgeois and anti-liberal values. When referring to “creating new values,” it entails an active process of psychological change in the minds of proletarian masses, as articulated by Sergio Panunzio. According to him, “Thanks to today’s union organizations,” the working masses have “become intelligent, conscious, and organic forces,” making the “syndicate mark a high degree of perfection or elevation in the mental, psychological, moral, and social evolution of the proletariat.”*

*(David D. Roberts. The syndicalist tradition and Italian fascism. Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 1979. P. 67.)*

**You may have already noticed that syndicalists did not get along with the**

**Marxist orthodoxy of the Second International and the Italian Socialist Party because they rejected the idea of economic determinism as preached by Marxist orthodoxy. The notion that the means of production, the societal infrastructure, or the productive base would automatically lead to the end of capitalism and revolution was, in their view, complete nonsense. They believed the true process was the reverse – driven by values consistent with the nature of the proletariat, encouraging them to work together, learn, and sacrifice in the struggle against the bourgeois state.**

**This is why syndicalists placed such emphasis on constructing a syndical society with union corporations. They believed that essential values for the revolutionary class consciousness would only truly emerge through an active pedagogical process undertaken**

**with the proletariat, rather than simply waiting for historical laws or the collapse of capitalism due to its intrinsic contradictions in the economic base. No! Syndicalists wanted to advance the pedagogical process and class consciousness, hence their strong emphasis on building an anarchic and syndical community of destiny for the working class.**

**The outcome of this conception lies in the realm of political representation because, once the proletarians were properly socialized within new values aligning with their social essence, within their syndical destiny unity, a genuine and justified political representation would emerge between the proletariat and the organic structures of their anarchic society. This form of political representation was considered by syndicalists to be far superior to the parliamentary**

democracy and universal suffrage that characterized Italy's regime at that time.

*Angelo Olivetti came to see union corporations as the primary subjects of "political sovereignty" with a high degree of democratic evolution, leading to a "truly syndicalist regime," as the common state was governed by an illusory universal suffrage. It is essential to note that this syndical conception of democracy is based on the organic nature of political participation, diverging from the liberal and atomistic democracy of periodic indirect voting. Instead, it emphasizes broad and constant participatory solidarity of workers in the productive and distributive processes of social wealth, regulated by a new legal framework stemming from proletarian values. (Gian Biagio Furiozzi. From socialism to fascism. Studies on Italian*

*revolutionary syndicalism. Esselibri, Simone, 1998. P. 150-151.)*

To get na idea of the importance that these syndicalists attached to this new organic formulation of political representation, far superior to liberal democracy, a very famous syndicalist of the time named Paolo Mantica (1878-1935), who actually never turned into a fascist, also believed in the superiority of organic union democracy. Here's how he puts it; *Another syndicalist, Paolo Mantica, was the first to directly articulate the idea that syndicalism itself could offer na alternative to political participation based on the universal suffrage of the parliamentary system. According to Mantica, the proletariat should multiply union centers based on the energy and solidarity of production, allowing for continuous participation through socio-economic associations to emerge: "It is*

*the man who acts, participating in an effective and continuous process, who is a social element, a component of the world of production.” For Mantica, the proletariat actively engaged in cooperative production is a “citizen,” in contrast to the man who “simply exercises a vain and ephemeral right”; consequently, “socially, this latter individual is nothing.” The traditional political sphere disappears to make room for a direct democracy of producers.*

*(Source: David D. Roberts. The syndicalist tradition and Italian fascism. Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 1979. P. 95.)*

**These revolutionary syndicalists, although advocating their ideas to achieve the proletarian revolution, remained theoretically and ideologically distant from the Italian Socialist Party. This was because they placed much more emphasis on the**

psychological and pedagogical process that stirred the sentiments of the proletariat, fostering a sense of belonging to a true community of destiny. This distinction became evident to everyone in Italy, even those who were not syndicalists, such as Giuseppe Prezzolini (1882-1982), an influential journalist and opinion influencer. He too recognized this unique influence of revolutionary syndicalism, expressing it as follows; *In the syndicalist view, owing to the social nature of the individual, they can, through education, common and cooperative work with other proletarians, become a new free individual. Giuseppe Prezzolini, a shrewd observer of the intellectual currents of the time, described it as follows: "The greatest fruit that [syndicalists] hope for, however, is the new man, the new law, the new morality."* Thus, in the workshop, the

*proletarian “forms the man who has work as a companion, and freedom and strength of character are rooted in obligation and hardship.”*

*(Giuseppe Prezzolini. La teoria sindacalista, Napoli, Francesco Perrella, 1909. P. 110-111.)*

The Syndicalists remained revolutionary until the outbreak of the First World War, which is when a very specific event led them to reconsider the true community of destiny for the Italian working class. This event was easily observed by all: “the proletarians of each nation did not take up arms to kill their respective bourgeoisie.” No, they took up arms to fight, kill, and struggle against the proletarians of other nations. And this was a significant shock for the Second International, for Marxists of all kinds, and also for the Syndicalists who, until then, entertained the idea that the



working class would create its universal anarchic society of unions. However, they now realized that class consciousness seemed to be much more closely tied to the reality of the sentiment of nationality in their respective nations. *Angelo Olivetti, in his newspaper Pagina Libere, proclaimed that “coordinating social revolution with the fact of the existence of nations is the most serious problem for true and sincere revolutionaries today.” He founded the Fascio rivoluzionario d’azione interventista, under which other syndicalists gathered to advance Italy’s intervention in the war. (David D. Roberts. The syndicalist tradition and Italian fascism, Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 1979. P. 108.) Angelo Olivetti and Sergio Panunzio, among other syndicalists, realized with the outbreak of the First World War that the fate and fortune of the*

*proletariat were inherently linked to its national community, its nation. This connection extended not only to other social classes such as the middle class and the bourgeoisie but also to the political system that the state must establish because the state is the source of law and hierarchy for a nation.*

*Therefore, they recognized that, due to the reality opened by the First World War, socialist revolution should be intimately connected with the nation, the sense of nationality, other social classes, and the state in a coherent and logical way.*

*Panunzio logically concluded that if individual needs reflected in a collectivity find expression in the sense of community, then the nation, by satisfying certain needs of the proletariat, becomes a fundamental part of the revolutionary struggle in the 20th century. Angelo Olivetti stated that "the resolution of social problems could*

*only be a consequence of solving national concerns." Hence, "national socialism, a developmental Italian socialism formed from the elements of revolutionary socialist thought and national aspirations," became an imperative that revolutionaries could not ignore.*

*(A. James Gregor. Italian fascism and developmental dictatorship. New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1979. p. 74-75, 78-79.)*

Indeed, among all the syndicalists who were vocally advocating for Italy's entry into the war to defend its proletariat, Sergio Panunzio and Angelo Olivetti were the most straightforward in drawing the most obvious conclusions for the development of an idea that became known as "National Syndicalism," which, let's say, is the precursor to fascist corporatism. Here are some

**excerpts from what Angelo Olivetti wrote at the time to advance the idea of national syndicalism; Angelo Olivetti himself stated: “The class is not against the homeland but within the homeland. The interest of the workers is not to deny the homeland but to have na increasingly larger part of it. The class lives in the nation and must live for the nation. [...] We want the Italy of the people, of all the Italian people and not of exclusive castes. Workers’ internationalism, as conceived by official socialism [Marxist], is a German reaction and, therefore, feudal and militaristic. Working-class patriotism, as revolutionary syndicalism conceives it with perfect coherence, is na achievement, a national revolution, the continuity of the tradition of our great ones.”**

**(Angelo Olivetti. *Nazione e classe*, in *L’Italia nostra*, May 1, 1918.)**

**National syndicalism seems to be grounded in the idea that the true community of destiny for the working class is no longer the anarchic society of trade union corporations. Instead, it is fundamentally tied to their own nation – the Italian nation has become the true community of destiny for the proletariat and should thus be the foundation of the new type of syndicalism, National Syndicalism.**

*Syndicalism recognizes the fact and existence of the nation as an immanent historical reality that it does not intend to deny but integrate. In fact, the nation itself is conceived as the largest union, as the free association of all productive forces within a country, within those limits and with that unity imposed by the nature of history, language, and the deep and invincible genius of the race. The national fact is immanent,*

*fundamental, and supreme; it is the greatest interest of all producers. (Angelo Olivetti. Manifesto of the Syndicalists, in Pagine Libere, April-May 1921.)*

Remember that in the first part, I mentioned that Panunzio had written a book called “*sindicalismo e medio evo*,” asserting a historical interpretation in which the resurrection of that organic conception of society from antiquity, later revived by medieval guilds, was then disrupted again by the bourgeois state and liberalism. Well, now he sees modern Revolutionary Syndicalism finding its community of destiny in the nature of the nation as the most notable resurrection of an organic and totalitarian society, now directed towards syndicalism structured within the bounds of the jurisdiction of the national state. Sergio Panunzio says; *In conclusion: the nation must*

*circumscribe itself, determine, articulate, live in distinct classes and corporations, and organically result from concrete social organizations, not individual atoms. It demands, where nationalities have not yet established themselves and where they do not function historically, solid and robust connections of interests and class groupings. However, classes and corporations, in turn, find a more complete existence, destiny, and reality within the nation. Nation and the organic synthesis between Syndicalism and Nationalism, namely: National-Syndicalism. (Sergio Panunzio. Stato nazionale e sindacati. Apud A. James Gregor. Sergio Panunzio. Il sindacalismo ed il fondamento razionale del fascismo. Lulu, 2014. P. 175.)*

**The state, once viewed in classic Marxist terms as a machine of**

**oppression from one class to another, enabling the diffusion of bourgeois sentiments and values that alienated and atomized the proletarian class, has now been transformed into the legal structure that facilitates the construction of nationalized trade union corporations. In other words, it is placed in a cohesive order through which the Italian social classes, the producers, would be in harmony with the values of the community represented by the state. The state becomes an entity enabling a general will reflecting the sense of nationality across all classes of the nation. This is the national revolution, National Syndicalism.**

***The transition from revolutionary syndicalism to national syndicalism was possible because Panunzio could transfer his conceptions of a productive and unified trade union organization to***



*the heart of the nation and reconcile it with the structure of the State itself, identifying the nation “as the foundation of a union of functional components—and the revolutionary State, unlike the bourgeois State, was seen as that agency endowed with the necessary authority for administering the law as collective will.” (A. James Gregor. Mussolini intellectuals. Fascist social and political thought. New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 2004. P. 79.)*

**Political representation in this new National Syndicalism was integrated with the trade union corporations where the proletarians and all social classes would work and exercise their functions of solidarity and sacrifice for the nation, in a controlled and harmonized manner by the new Revolutionary National State. The state’s task was to unify national will and regulate relations between capital**

**and labor among all classes. This marks the beginning of fascist corporatism, emerging from Italian National Syndicalism, which evolved from revolutionary syndicalism.**