1

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

ON THE 'SCIENTIFIC' USE OF THE CONCEPT LUMPENPROLETARIAT

**by James Michael Yaraskavitch
B.A. (Honours) in Sociology
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
1992**

**a thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of**

Master of Arts

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

**Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
April 18, 1996
Copyright
1996, J.M. Yaraskavitch**

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-13827-5

Name James M. Varaskovich

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

Sociology - Theory and Methods

SUBJECT TERM

0344 U.M.I.
SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language
 General 0679
 Ancient 0289
 Linguistics 0290
 Modern 0291
Literature
 General 0401
 Classical 0294
 Comparative 0295
 Medieval 0297
 Modern 0298
 African 0316
 American 0591
 Asian 0305
 Canadian (English) 0352
 Canadian (French) 0355
 English 0593
 Germanic 0311
 Latin American 0312
 Middle Eastern 0315
 Romance 0313
 Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion
 General 0318
 Biblical Studies 0321
 Clergy 0319
 History of 0320
 Philosophy of 0322
Theology 0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology
 Archaeology 0324
 Cultural 0326
 Physical 0327
Business Administration
 General 0310
 Accounting 0272
 Banking 0770
 Management 0454
 Marketing 0338
Canadian Studies 0385
Economics
 General 0501
 Agricultural 0503
 Commerce-Business 0505
 Finance 0508
 History 0509
 Labor 0510
 Theory 0511
Folklore 0358
Geography 0366
Gerontology 0351
History
 General 0578

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science
 General 0615
 International Law and Relations 0616
 Public Administration 0617
Recreation 0814
Social Work 0452
Sociology
 General 0626
 Criminology and Penology 0627
 Demography 0938
 Ethnic and Racial Studies 0631
 Individual and Family Studies 0628
 Industrial and Labor Relations 0629
 Public and Social Welfare 0630
 Social Structure and Development 0700
 Theory and Methods 0344
Transportation 0709
Urban and Regional Planning 0999
Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture
 General 0473
 Agronomy 0285
 Animal Culture and Nutrition 0475
 Animal Pathology 0476
 Food Science and Technology 0359
 Forestry and Wildlife 0478
 Plant Culture 0479
 Plant Pathology 0480
 Plant Physiology 0817
 Range Management 0777
 Wood Technology 0746
Biology
 General 0306
 Anatomy 0287
 Biostatistics 0308
 Botany 0309
 Cell 0379
 Ecology 0329
 Entomology 0353
 Genetics 0369
 Limnology 0793
 Microbiology 0410
 Molecular 0307
 Neuroscience 0317
 Oceanography 0416
 Physiology 0433
 Radiation 0821
 Veterinary Science 0778
 Zoology 0472
Biophysics
 General 0786
 Medical 0760
EARTH SCIENCES
 Biogeochemistry 0425
 Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Minerobotany 0345
Paleobotany 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Polymology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences
 General 0566
 Audiology 0300
 Chemotherapy 0992
 Dentistry 0567
 Education 0350
 Hospital Management 0769
 Human Development 0758
 Immunology 0982
 Medicine and Surgery 0564
 Mental Health 0347
 Nursing 0569
 Nutrition 0570
 Obstetrics and Gynecology 0380
 Occupational Health and Therapy 0354
 Ophthalmology 0381
 Pathology 0571
 Pharmacology 0419
 Pharmacy 0572
 Physical Therapy 0382
 Public Health 0573
 Radiology 0574
 Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences
 Chemistry
 General 0485
 Agricultural 0749
 Analytical 0486
 Biochemistry 0487
 Inorganic 0488
 Nuclear 0738
 Organic 0490
 Pharmaceutical 0491
 Physical 0494
 Polymer 0495
 Radiation 0754
 Mathematics 0405
 Physics
 General 0605
 Acoustics 0986
 Astronomy and Astrophysics 0606
 Atmospheric Science 0608
 Atomic 0748
 Electronics and Electricity 0607
 Elementary Particles and High Energy 0798
 Fluid and Plasma 0759
 Molecular 0609
 Nuclear 0610
 Optics 0752
 Radiation 0756
 Solid State 0611
 Statistics 0463
Applied Sciences
 Applied Mechanics 0346
 Computer Science 0984

Engineering
 General 0537
 Aerospace 0538
 Agricultural 0539
 Automotive 0540
 Biomedical 0541
 Chemical 0542
 Civil 0543
 Electronics and Electrical 0544
 Heat and Thermodynamics 0348
 Hydraulic 0545
 Industrial 0546
 Marine 0547
 Materials Science 0794
 Mechanical 0548
 Metallurgy 0743
 Mining 0551
 Nuclear 0552
 Packaging 0549
 Petroleum 0765
 Sanitary and Municipal 0554
 System Science 0790
Geotechnology 0428
Operations Research 0796
Plastics Technology 0795
Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

The undersigned recommend to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
acceptance of the thesis

ON THE 'SCIENTIFIC' USE OF THE CONCEPT LUMPENPROLETARIAT

submitted by James Michael Yaraskavitch, B.A.

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

John de Vries, Co-supervisor

Bob Shields, Co-supervisor

Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University
May 16, 1996

ABSTRACT

This project argues that the concept lumpenproletariat, as created by two of the better known founders of Sociology (Karl Marx and Frederick Engels), is misunderstood by users today. To verify the argument, four databases were collected to reflect a history of use of the concepts proletariat and lumpenproletariat. First, there is a database illustrating the 100 year development of the French language concept proletariat prior to the Marx and Engels intervention in the debate. Second, another database shows the Marx and Engels intervention into that general debate on the concept proletariat. Third, another database contains the Marx and Engels creation and use of the concept lumpenproletariat. And fourth, a final database reflects some current use of the concept lumpenproletariat. The project's findings uphold the thesis advanced and suggests some advantages in using the originally created concept lumpenproletariat.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project found its spark through the question: 'Why does the Canadian working class accept the unfair system of taxation placed upon it in late 20th Century Canada?' Having completed a paper on the Marx and Engels view of taxation for a 'wealth and poverty' course in Carleton University's School of Social Work in the Fall of 1993, I returned to glance through Marx-Engels: Collected Works looking for a plausible answer.

Here I undertook a simple research procedure. In the 'Index' of the then newest Volume 46 of Marx-Engels: Collected Works, published in 1994, I found the term lumpenproletariat and traced it to its source document within that volume's cover. Within Volume 46, I uncovered the term used within a context that was different from what I had learned in undergraduate courses in sociology. Intrigued, I indexed and found the term in a few more of the existing 44 volumes of Marx-Engels: Collected Works and came to the view that my first impression, that the label of 'lumpenproletariat' traditionally used to describe these people as some type of social outcast, as rabble, just did not apply. At this point, I headed to the 21,332 pages long 20 volume 1989 2nd. Edition of The Oxford English Dictionary. In Volume 9, I found that Simpson and Weiner (1989b:102) credited "lumpenproletariat" as "a term applied originally by Karl Marx".

At the same time, Volume 12 showed that the term proletariat was created before Marx and Engels had used it (Simpson and Weiner, 1989c); these findings intrigued me. Indeed, I came to ask an extended question: The term proletariat has been widely used and is easily associated with the work of Marx and Engels, yet here is a term which appears to be created by them and yet it is not widely used within sociology? Why is 'lumpenproletariat' so little used given that its creators are so widely known? Logic might suggest that any conceptual creation by Marx and Engels would be celebrated, as was their concept exploitation and their analysis of the working day, rather than ignored by writers in sociology who had an interest in the concept of class.

The urge to answer this question led me to abandon my intended study of the more comfortable substantive material of taxation in favour of this more uncomfortable theoretical material associated with the concept lumpenproletariat. So from an initial curiosity about working class acceptance of tax policy in May of 1994 grew this project on the concept lumpenproletariat.

My next step was to get the 'lumpenproletariat' project moving. After consultations on this slight change in my intended thesis project with my temporary supervisor, Craig McKie, I alone designed and implemented a rather unorthodox methodology for identifying a thesis committee.

In addition to my temporary supervisor, Craig McKie, I owe a debt of gratitude to a number of people who helped me get this project to the stage that you now see it. Thanks both to John de Vries and Rob Shields from the Department of Sociology and Anthropology who both agreed to serve on my thesis committee. Their valuable assistance guided me to write a reasonable thesis proposal; to write a 216 page first draft, and then to get that draft revised to the 100 page shape which you now see. Thanks also to Marvin Glass, from the Department of Philosophy, who made the valuable suggestion that Hal Draper's work might be useful in reviewing 'lumpenproletariat', and to Marc Tyrrell, a Ph.D candidate in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, who volunteered his valuable time to act as proofreader at a busy time in the year.

There are others to whom I say 'thanks'. My colleagues in the M.A. and the Ph.D. programmes helped to 'socialize' me during my fulltime studies after a 12 year absence and always made me a full member of 'the grad group'. Ken Hatt made my two years of service as a T.A. most enjoyable; the approximately 110 first year students, who got to my T.A. groups for those early 8:30 am and 9:00 am meetings on Thursdays, also helped for they taught me some valuable skills. And thanks also to CUPE Local 2323 for printing assistance, and to George Pollard who has helped 'keep me sociable' even when I was 'below standard'. All of these people - and more - at Carleton University helped to make my M.A. programme of studies a very good experience.

CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Contents	vi
List of Appendices	viii
1. Background	1
2. Method	9
3. Current Applications of Concept Lumpenproletariat	14
The Convenience of Label Approach	16
The Meaning of Label Approach	25
(a) The 1970s Era: Intellectual Confrontation	25
(b) The 1980s and Beyond: New Life?	29
Beyond Sociofile: Did We Miss Anything Important?	33
4. Forming a Proletariat Before a Lumpenproletariat	35
The Development of the Concept Proletariat in	
France	36
Marx and Engels' Intervention in the Debate	
Over Proletariat	43
5. Out of Proletariat Emerges a Lumpenproletariat	52
What Marx and Engels Meant by the Concept	
Lumpenproletariat	53
What Marx and Engels Did With the Concept	
Lumpenproletariat	67

6. The Lumpenproletariat Gone Wrong?	77
A Differing View of the Concept: Far From the	
Madding Crowd?	77
The Lumpenproletariat: If Only We Knew - And	
Used - Thee!	91
7. Implications of the Old Concept Lumpenproletariat	93
Immediate Implications	93
Broader Implications	97
Endnotes Listed by Chapter Title	101
Appendices	175
Bibliography	211

LIST OF APPENDICES

NUMBER 1.1	175
Sociofile Data Base on the Lumpenproletariat:	
From January, 1974 to December, 1995.	
NUMBER 1.2	179
Frequency Distribution of Use of Lumpenproletariat in Sociofile	
Data Base Year of Use of Word in Article Publication	
By Language in Which Article is Written.	
NUMBER 1.3	180
Frequency Distribution of Use of Lumpenproletariat in Sociofile	
Established Sociology Subfield Abstracts By Language	
in Which Article is Written.	
NUMBER 2.1	181
The Marx and Engels Lumpenproletariat Appears in Documents:	
From August of 1846 to December of 1890.	
NUMBER 2.2	185
The Number of Documents and Number of Uses Wherein the Concept	
Lumpenproletariat Appears By Six Year Interval Since	
Creation of the Concept.	
NUMBER 2.3	186
Number of Documents Wherein Each Writer Used The Concept	
Lumpenproletariat.	
NUMBER 3	187
The Definition of the Concept Lumpenproletariat Within Some	
Dictionaries of Concepts.	
NUMBER 4.1	189
The Discourse on the Proletarian-Proletariat Among French	
Language Writers from 1748 to 1848.	
NUMBER 4.2	193
Marx and Engels Join the Discourse on Proletarian-Proletariat:	
From 1839 to 1845.	
NUMBER 5.1	195
French Language Writers Who Used Proletarian or Proletariat:	
From 1748 to 1848.	
NUMBER 5.2	197
French Language Writers Debate the General Qualities of the	
Proletarian-Proletariat: From 1748 to 1848.	

How dull and how insensible a beast
Is man, who yet would lord it over the rest?
Philosophers and poets vainly strove
In every age the lumpish mass to move

John Dryden (1631-1700)
(English poet and critic)

NEEDED

General labourers, movers and lumpers, also drivers AZ, DZ and G with freight experience and good knowledge of Ottawa, Hull and surrounding areas. Cash paid daily. Please register at Handyman Personnel, 52 1/2 Lebreton St. North, Ottawa.

'Help Wanted' Advertisement
The Ottawa Citizen (Page G2)
Saturday, March 30, 1996

Chapter 1: BACKGROUND

During the world-wide observances of the 50th Anniversary of the atomic bombing of Japan on August 6, 1995, the 100th Anniversary of Frederick Engels' death on August 5, 1895, was lost⁽¹⁾. With his death 100 years ago, the promise of a world-wide revolution against capitalism probably died with him.

By August of 1895, a small but hopeful group of revolutionaries still held firm to that vision of a world-wide revolution. After Karl Marx had died 12 years earlier, Frederick Engels maintained among a small group of people the vision of an end of capitalism brought about by the heroic proletariat. Among the most trusted by Frederick Engels in that small group were Laura and Paul Lafargue, Wilhelm Liebknecht, August Bebel, Karl Kautsky and Eduard Bernstein.

While the promise of revolution died on August 5 of 1895, the funeral ceremony was lengthy. Indeed, the best line in the graveside eulogy proclaiming its death was delivered by one of those most trusted of proletarian revolution believers over three years later in 1898; a member of 15 years, Eduard Bernstein.

That best line in that graveside eulogy formed part of a debate which ended the revolutionary solidarity of August, 1895 as the Revisionist Debate of 1896-1903 had unfolded to October of 1898.

Speaking against a vision of a revolutionary proletariat, Eduard Bernstein (1898a:241; 1898b:326) simply called "imaginary" any homogeneous proletariat acting with common purpose⁽²⁾.

A variant of this 1898 best line lives in the late 20th century. In 'Society of the Spectacle', Guy Debord (1977:114) repeats: "'Subjectively', the proletariat is still far removed from its practical class consciousness".

But why does this graveside best line continue to be used nearly 100 years after this articulation? Numerous writers have been interested in an answer. After looking at the literature which dealt with this question, Jean L. Cohen (1982:3) suggests there are at least "four basic types of neo-Marxian (class) theory ... developed to address the ... workers' movement". These four neo-Marxian approaches sought to move beyond the question: 'Why is the proletariat not revolutionary?' They accept the graveside best line as an unalterable given and try to step beyond this constraint by then altering Marx and Engels' class theory.

First, there are theories which seek a new revolutionary subject to either behave as a substitute for the proletariat or to activate that proletariat into action on their assigned mission (Cohen, 1982:3-6). Writing within this school of thought was Herbert Marcuse⁽³⁾.

Second, there are theories which argue that the structure of work has changed so much that we must declare that an old working class - presumably an old proletariat - must be distinguished from a new working class - presumably a new proletariat as well (Cohen, 1982:6-9). Someone who had adopted this approach in his earlier writings was Andre Gorz⁽⁴⁾.

Third, there exist theories which reject the philosophical or subjective aspects of Marxian class theory but still accept the structural or objective aspects of that same theory of class (Cohen, 1982:9-14). Erik Olin Wright⁽⁵⁾ was among those writing within this perspective.

And fourth, some theories change the internal composition of the revolutionary proletariat from their former make-up as workers to a new make-over as the new intellectuals (Cohen, 1982:14-21). This school of thought features Alvin Gouldner⁽⁶⁾.

In accepting the graveside's best line as a given, a restricting of theoretical exploration took place in these four neo-Marxist class theory styles. Not only do the four groups side with Eduard Bernstein in the Revisionist Debate, intellectually these writers have also shut themselves off from alternate responses to his perceived problem of a 'passive proletariat'. One who did respond to this restriction was Jean L. Cohen (1982).

Her response to these 'Bernsteinists' was radical indeed. Cohen (1982:52) concluded: "Only an immanent critique of the last dogma of Marxism, the class concept, could pave the way for a solution" to the 'passive proletariat' problem⁽⁷⁾. She (1982:211) then suggests abandonment of class analysis in favour of the analysis of "social movements"⁽⁸⁾.

The emergence of the new social movements literature is not a new phenomenon. Under the subtitle 'Shopping for an Agent', Gouldner (1985:22-27) noted the existence of a search for a historical agent with a proper consciousness to change the world; the social movements phenomenon just continued this tradition⁽⁹⁾.

The embracing of social movements is but the latest response to an ongoing search for a change agent; the evident failure of the 'passive proletariat' raises a question: 'Why?' As we put aside a sociological concept dating from the Roman Empire, the discarded agent should be re-examined. Questions arise from our accepting Bernsteinism which suggest an error in judgement⁽¹⁰⁾.

Despite a 15 year acquaintance, did Bernstein misread a model put forward by a Marx and Engels who never analyzed class structure in a single unique document? Such confusion was possible. After reading Karl Kautsky, Engels (1895:533-534) wrote him back to find two "main faults" in his interpretation⁽¹¹⁾. Given that Kautsky had misread Marx and Engels, Bernstein may have also.

By misreading their model, Bernstein may have caused two problems for any later literature. The first relates to the meaning of 'proletariat'; the second relates to the resulting meaning of 'lumpenproletariat'. In short, a misunderstood 'proletariat' led to a misunderstanding of 'lumpenproletariat'.

First, Marx and Engels' concept was assigned behaviour not given to it. When Bernstein (1898a:241) suggested that "the proletariat as a class acting with a common purpose and outlook is largely a figment of the imagination", the meaning given by Marx and Engels was extensively altered. One impact of this misreading was that Bernstein and followers viewed 'proletariat' and 'working class' as the same conceptual entity with common properties. Rather than associate any undesirable working class behaviour with a Marx and Engels 'proletariat', Eduard Bernstein should have applied another label to the entity, that of 'lumpenproletariat'.

Second, then, Bernstein's mislabel of 'proletariat' has misled his followers on the meaning of 'lumpenproletariat'. The mislabel of 'proletariat' induced others (see below) to repeat the mistake and to extend the misread's impact to include the new concept lumpenproletariat. As meaning was sought in the originals, the instincts and training of researchers⁽¹²⁾ betrayed them; the desire to distinguish 'proletariat' cum 'working class' from 'lumpenproletariat' drove these later users to seek the latter concept's meaning somewhere outside of the 'working class'.

The current meaning of 'lumpenproletariat' results from a search for a definition of it as being outside of the 'working class'; a view vaguely found in some work by the creators. As I understood from my undergraduate curriculum, the concept referred to the irregularly employed and immoral people ranked below the moral and regular employed, wage-earning working class; this view is preserved by Bertell Ollman (1968:575)⁽¹³⁾. Given the Bernstein view of 'proletariat', 'lumpenproletariat' was assumed to be positioned outside of the 'working class'⁽¹⁴⁾.

Another aspect of the misreading of 'proletariat' and of 'lumpenproletariat' relates to their origins. The Oxford English Dictionary 20 volume 1989 2nd edition notes that 'proletariat' was created before Marx and Engels existed (Simpson and Weiner, 1999d:606) while 'lumpenproletariat' originated from the work of Marx and Engels themselves (Simpson and Weiner, 1989c:102).

So a concept created by Marx and Engels fell victim to different interpretation; this may account for the marginalized use of 'lumpenproletariat'. Jonathan Turner (1991:20) argues that concepts must be abstract and wide in scope⁽¹⁵⁾, rather than contain "direct empirical referents", and only a "delimited range of phenomena". While current users allow Bernstein's view of 'proletariat' cum 'working class' to dominate its meaning and use, 'lumpenproletariat' may have been marginalized as but a limited empirical phenomenon⁽¹⁶⁾.

The starting point of this project is a definitional labelling process of two concepts gone wrong⁽¹⁷⁾. My argument is that Bernstein missed the point; that he identified the obedient yet opportunistic behaviour of the 'lumpenproletariat' rather than the behaviour of the revolutionary 'proletariat', and that his view led to the association of the latter concept with 'working class' and the former with non-working class elements.

This project approximates what George Ritzer (1991:5-6) termed the "metaconceptualization"⁽¹⁸⁾ of a concept; one created by two founders of sociology. This is a study of a sociological concept⁽¹⁹⁾; my argument is centred around 'lumpenproletariat' and its contested definition.

I look at 'lumpenproletariat' to answer two questions; first, how did Marx and Engels create 'lumpenproletariat', and second, what has been done with the concept in sociological literature by current users? First, I review how 'lumpenproletariat' was formed⁽²⁰⁾. And second, I examine how current sociologists apply the concept lumpenproletariat.

Another way to see this project's mission is that I hope to find whether or not the concept is applied by today's sociologists as it was created. My argument is that the current sociological concept lumpenproletariat has been so changed that it is misdefined by the relatively few current users of the concept.

Such redefinition from an originally abstract concept to a more empirical concept - as Turner (1991:20) feared - helps account for a lack of current use of 'lumpenproletariat' in sociology.

Central to the working argument is the relationship between 'proletariat' and 'lumpenproletariat'. The position here is that Bourdieu's (1987:1) recognition of certain concepts as "common oppositions, paired concepts, or ... 'epistemological couples' ... used to construct social reality" describes rather fairly the relationship between these two concepts.

In this thesis, I discuss the project in several stages. After my chapter 2 on method, chapter 3 shows how 'lumpenproletariat' was used from 1973 to 1994. My chapter 4 informs how the concept proletariat evolved in two stages: (1) among French language pre-Marx-Engels users who developed the concept as possessing general qualities, some of which are disputed, and (2) a review of how the Marx and Engels intervention into that 'proletariat' debate took place. My chapter 5 shows how 'lumpenproletariat' evolved to fill a theoretical gap in their view of 'proletariat'. Chapter 6 features a challenge of a supporter of Ollman's (1968:575) view of 'lumpenproletariat'. Finally, in chapter 7, I examine some implications of the argument advanced here for the original definition of this concept lumpenproletariat.

Chapter 2: METHOD

This project on a concept⁽²¹⁾ can be seen within Comte's (1830b:42,54) "ladder of knowledge" - "established by the relative generality and dependence of phenomena"⁽²²⁾ - as my attempt to unveil historically⁽²³⁾ the qualities comprising 'lumpenproletariat'. Since I argue that a close 'proletariat-lumpenproletariat' linkage exists, I gathered four databases via literature searches to unveil the meaning of this relationship. The two 'proletariat' databases reflect: (1) a subpopulation of users active in the pre-Marx-Engels debate on the concept, and (2) a subpopulation of the Marx and Engels use of 'proletariat'. The two 'lumpenproletariat' databases are used to compare the 'before' and 'after' meaning of the concept: (1) the 'after' are represented by a subpopulation of late 20th century users of the concept, and (2) representing 'before', is a population of the Marx and Engels writings which use the concept.

A step-by-step review of the method used to examine the meanings of 'lumpenproletariat' and of 'proletariat' now follows.

First, I gathered the documents for the 'after' database of 'lumpenproletariat'. I started with this database because I knew nothing of the geographical location of the primary documents using the term. This gathering was a multi-step process.

The first issue was, just what form of population, subpopulation or representative sample of literature could be accessed to construct a database of current users?⁽²⁴⁾ Since material using 'proletariat' dominates the literature, access to documents that use 'lumpenproletariat' for the 'after' database became a critical research issue. Since the Library of Congress does not list 'lumpenproletariat' in its catalogue of subjects⁽²⁵⁾, searching within authored books and in edited books featuring numerous articles became difficult. This absence made the collection of a population, subpopulation, or representative sample of such documents virtually impossible.

The academic journal as a primary source was then assessed. The Sociofile database, or Sociological Abstracts, CD-Rom package provides access to an extensive set of searchable journal abstracts. This Sociofile database enabled me to conduct a keyword search from which I obtained journal articles which use the concept lumpenproletariat⁽²⁶⁾. Yet this Sociofile database does have certain limitations⁽²⁷⁾.

From the CD-Rom package of Sociofile, 34 abstracts from January of 1974 to December of 1995⁽²⁸⁾ were found containing the term 'lumpenproletariat'; these referenced 38 journal articles⁽²⁹⁾ (see Appendix 1.1). More use of the term 'proletariat' than of 'lumpenproletariat' was also found⁽³⁰⁾.

Next I gathered the articles. I collected all 26 articles written in English⁽³¹⁾; I did not gather the other 12⁽³²⁾.

The gathering of primary sources for the 'before' database became the next stage in the research process. The identification and retrieval of this database was less time consuming; three major sources of writings by Marx and Engels were researched in order to uncover the use of 'lumpenproletariat'⁽³³⁾.

The search of the three major sources unveiled a number of uses of the term 'lumpenproletariat'. Resulting from the index search of each available volume of the three major sources, 88 uses of 'lumpenproletariat' were uncovered within 50 documents. These 50 documents were quite evenly split between Marx and Engels in the role of author (see Appendix 2.1).

The examination of the 'after' database was a two stage process. During the first, the 26 English articles were divided into two distinctive approaches on the basis of how a user applied the concept. Some users adopted the term as a convenient label by which to characterize the qualities or behaviour of some human group, while other users took up the term in order to examine the meaning of the concept. The former, I label as the 'Convenience of Label' approach of concept usage wherein 17 articles were classified; the latter approach, I label as the 'Meaning of Label' approach wherein 9 articles were found.

During the second stage, the 26 articles of the two groups were further examined. First, the 17 'Convenience of Label' approach articles were dissected to select the concept characteristics which were published. While the level of disclosure of the qualities of the concept varied⁽³⁴⁾ the characteristics of 'lumpenproletariat' were drawn from the articles and classified according to its definition in each article. These qualities were then placed side-by-side to find if the property was agreed-to or was subject to controversy among current users. And second, the 9 articles in the 'Meaning of Label' approach were then examined chronologically to find a pattern of meaning which current users uncovered while examining the concept⁽³⁵⁾.

With the examination of the Convenience of Label approach and the Meaning of Label approach complete, I looked to other current users beyond the Sociofile database to find a 'control group' to help protect against potential bias in the Sociofile database. I found some dictionaries of concepts featuring 'lumpenproletariat' in their pages (see Appendix 3).

Looking at the 'before' database was also a two stage process. A look at Marx's and Engels' use of the concept suggested that the relationship between 'lumpenproletariat' and 'proletariat' was not as suggested in the current user literature. This prompted me to do additional research into 'proletariat'.

Prior to examining 'lumpenproletariat', 'proletariat' was. Given use of 'proletariat' prior to Marx and Engels; given its use in European societies, and given that a full review was time and space consuming, and since "the term acquired its modern social meaning in France" (Bussard, 1987:678), only the French language users of 'proletariat' were gathered (see Appendix 4.1) to establish the most 'advanced' thought on the concept to which Marx and Engels would be exposed. These French users disclosed 12 general qualities attributed to 'proletariat' (see Appendix 5). These qualities were then examined by me to find which were and were not the subject of controversy.

The French debate over the meaning of 'proletariat' was then contrasted with Marx's and Engels' view of it; a look at their use of the term 'lumpenproletariat' then followed. Their use of 'proletariat' (see Appendix 4.2) was then compared and contrasted with the 12 general qualities found in the French literature. I found that the theoretical 'gaps' in the Marx and Engels version of 'proletariat' corresponds with the theoretical 'space' filled by their 'lumpenproletariat'. But before I close with comments on the implications of my findings, Hal Draper's (1972; 1977; 1978) opposed stance^(*) is used as a 'test' of my uncovered view of 'lumpenproletariat'.

Chapter 3: CURRENT APPLICATIONS OF CONCEPT LUMPENPROLETARIAT

In examining current usage of 'lumpenproletariat', I contrast its use with the related 'proletariat'. Two data sources are used to review the two concepts.

First, Sociological Abstracts⁽³⁷⁾ can be used to contrast the sociological importance of the two concepts. A review of the subject index of the Sociological Abstracts volumes since 1953 indicates that the subject 'proletariat' was first identified in its January of 1959 issue⁽³⁸⁾, where 5 entries were noted; here the subject 'proletariat' has often appeared since then. The same index review indicated that the subject 'lumpenproletariat' never appeared between 1953 and 1995. Thus the 43 volume Sociological Abstracts subject index shows 'proletariat' as more important than 'lumpenproletariat'; these volumes are thus an inadequate source to identify recent use of 'lumpenproletariat'.

Second, the Sociofile CD-Rom shows a good contrast of the concepts; this database is thus the major source used to examine the concept. The Sociofile database⁽³⁹⁾ shows a count of 986 abstracts containing the term 'proletariat', while only 34 had used 'lumpenproletariat'. This ratio of 96.7% to 3.3% for the frequency of these two terms within 21 years indicates that the word 'proletariat' is more widely referred to by article writers than was the term 'lumpenproletariat'.

The 38 journal articles obtained from the 34 abstracts that use 'lumpenproletariat' are not evenly distributed from 1974 to 1995. As Appendix 1.2 shows, in Sociofile noted articles, the median year of publication was 1980 for the total, 1979 for the English, and 1980 for other languages used in the 38 articles. Evidently, the use of 'lumpenproletariat' has declined since the 1970s.

Further evidence from the 38 articles shows that users of the term cannot even agree on its proper spelling! Of the 38 noting the term's usage, 26 spell it as 'lumpenproletariat' while the remaining 12 spell it as 'lumpen-proletariat'.

But the low usage issue is counterbalanced by the rather widely known reputation of the concept. I found the 38 articles using 'lumpenproletariat' were written in nine western languages⁽⁴⁰⁾. Thus this little used concept is rather widely known.

While 12 of 38 articles were covered by 8 languages other than English, the 26 English articles comprise the majority of the work using the term 'lumpenproletariat'. The English writers approached the concept through two means. 17 of them applied the concept as a convenient label to help characterize the behaviour of some group of people that they were examining. The other 9 writers examined the concept to gain understanding of what its label meant. Therefore, a review of the two approaches highlights how current users apply 'lumpenproletariat'⁽⁴¹⁾.

I should point out that my inclusion of only 26 English articles may bias my subpopulation of users in academic journals. A review of Sociological Abstracts⁽⁴²⁾ suggests 'lumpenproletariat' is used differently among the substantive areas or subfields of sociology depending on whether or not users write in the English language (see Appendix 1.3). Such language differences may bias my findings on 'lumpenproletariat' usage⁽⁴³⁾.

The Convenience of Label Approach

The Convenience of Label approach of 17 articles use the concept as a convenient label to describe phenomena via three levels of disclosure. First, there were the 'definitionally ambitious' users⁽⁴⁴⁾. Second, there were the 'definitionally more modest' users⁽⁴⁵⁾. And third, there were the 'definitionally deficient' users⁽⁴⁶⁾. Thus, article readers encounter a variety in the level of detail in the definitions of 'lumpenproletariat'.

There is a fourth category of writers worth comment. Such users never apply a label to a collection of characteristics⁽⁴⁷⁾. This fourth category includes one of the 17 writers given and is not considered here⁽⁴⁸⁾.

Within the Convenience of Label, there is very little consensus among current users on the boundaries of 'lumpenproletariat'.

Consensus is often contested; even the most basic qualities seem controversial. To complicate matters, some writers are so vague that it is difficult to distinguish whether they see a quality (such as age) as a correlate or as a defining characteristic (see below). A review of any consensus and the controversy may help us appreciate why 'lumpenproletariat' is used much less by writers than its companion 'proletariat'. The contested nature of this little used concept may reflect a distinction made by Pierre Bourdieu (1987:9) of why the latter concept became a popular "folk category" while the former could only be regarded as an "analytical construct"⁽⁴⁹⁾.

In the 16 English sociological articles, 'lumpenproletariat' and 'proletariat' are contested concepts. One area of contention concerns the presence of a class hierarchy and differentiation as shown by four unique approaches in thought.

A first mentions a class hierarchy wherein both class concepts seem to appear below the 'bourgeoisie'. Reflecting this hierarchical viewpoint is Laurence A. French (1978) who had differentiated a French "proletariate" and "lumpen-proletariate" from 'bourgeoisie', but never distinguished between the two first noted out-groups⁽⁵⁰⁾.

A second form of thought does not mention a class hierarchy but does differentiate between 'proletariat' and 'lumpenproletariat'.

Three writers were from this approach⁽⁵¹⁾. The two concepts appeared to possess similar characteristics of some unknown yet common spatial quality, but writers believed that they still warranted spatial differentiation.

There are two other forms of thought. A third mentions a class hierarchy but does not clearly differentiate 'lumpenproletariat' from 'proletariat' within the vertical class structure⁽⁵²⁾. In the fourth, two authors argued that 'proletariat' were to be placed above 'lumpenproletariat'⁽⁵³⁾.

Other users claimed 'lumpenproletariat-proletariat' differences. One user saw the former class as useless and the latter as useful⁽⁵⁴⁾; another suggests that the former were unemployed while the latter were employed workers⁽⁵⁵⁾. The 'proletariat' versus 'lumpenproletariat' contrast was not viewed universally as containing separate physical people; some saw the contrast differently. Viewing 'proletariat-lumpenproletariat' as made up of the same people, Richard Wright (1980:135) saw 'proletariat' as an 'ideological construct', while 'lumpenproletariat' was simply judged to be 'the reality' out there.

So a 'lumpenproletariat' versus 'proletariat' relationship is not consistently applied among the current users within the database. While some users defined a clear boundary between the two concepts, other users questioned the existence of those borders.

Reflecting the concept's marginality, one user challenged the idea that 'lumpenproletariat' is a genuine class concept. Peter Woodward (1978:160) held that "lumpen-proletariat ... lacked the coherence of a developed class ... (by) their behaviour".

But the idea that 'lumpenproletariat' should not be granted the label of class concept was not suggested elsewhere among the articles. The view of Kenneth Tunnell (1990:41) that "the lumpenproletariat is a class" is a more widely accepted stance for the marginal concept. Indeed, Charles Valentine (1975:9) held that 'lumpenproletariat' were a "marginal" class⁽⁶⁾.

The most frequently applied characteristic among users of the concept was that those labelled as 'lumpenproletariat' were either unemployed, underemployed, or somehow irregularly employed⁽⁷⁾. However, one user did question the boundary attributed to the concept by the qualities of unemployment, underemployment or irregular employment; the team of Form and Hanson (1985:243) held that the label 'lumpenproletariat' should also include those who were regularly employed.

Others placed further limits on the employability quality of the label 'lumpenproletariat'. Kenneth Tunnell (1990:49) suggests the class has no relationship to the means of production. Richard Wright (1980:130) held that new recruits to 'lumpenproletariat' may never become permanently employed.

An 'urban poor' theme appeared among some users. A defining characteristic of 'lumpenproletariat' either exclusively included or also included those in urban areas who were poor⁽⁵⁸⁾. But this theme was also contested; David Kowalewski (1991:137) held that a defining characteristic of 'lumpenproletariat' included rural migrants to urban areas.

Disproportionately included, for some users, were people of a specific gender and age group. To some, 'lumpenproletariat' appeared exclusively to be unemployed young men⁽⁵⁹⁾.

Some hold that the concept may exclusively include those of a certain ethnic group alongside the quality of poverty. Thus, to be either poor or to be a black - or both - qualified you as a 'lumpenproletariat' (Form and Hanson, 1985:243)⁽⁶⁰⁾.

Another user held that the density of 'lumpenproletariat' varied among similarly settled countries of the world. An implication of this claim is that 'lumpenproletariat' can be created via governmental action or inaction⁽⁶¹⁾.

Still another user suggested 'lumpenproletariat' were constructed in a particular manner within a country. Within 1980s United States, Form and Hanson (1985:243) stated that "the poor and blacks (lumpenproletariat) constitute an internal colony".

Also contested among users was the claim that they were victims. One user said 'lumpenproletariat' were the victims of criminal or military oppression (David Kowalewski, 1991:137). But this 'lumpenproletariat' as victims view was in the minority; more often it was a noted characteristic that the class was made up of criminals⁽⁶²⁾. Linked to criminality, was the view of 'lumpenproletariat' as being immoral in their behaviour (Gary McDonogh, 1991:326-327). To some, they included those who took part in undesirable social and economic activities⁽⁶³⁾. Another user saw 'lumpenproletariat' as fraught with serious social problems (Gary McDonogh, 1991:334).

One user of 'lumpenproletariat' even suggested that the concept was emotionally loaded. This was judged to be the case since the term was of a 'Marxist' origin⁽⁶⁴⁾.

Also contested is whether 'lumpenproletariat' can bring about social change. Arguing the 'negative', Wright (1980:131) said any attempts by 'lumpenproletariat' to improve their life condition are useless. In arguing the 'positive', some writers saw 'lumpenproletariat' trying to improve their condition; contested, however, was just how they improved themselves. Three styles of thought appeared on just how to move towards change⁽⁶⁵⁾. Thus there is some disagreement as to the political consciousness of 'lumpenproletariat'. Three disagreeing categories were identified among the 16 English articles⁽⁶⁶⁾.

Among some users there is controversy over the political power and influence of 'lumpenproletariat'. Again two opposing styles of thought have emerged between the 'power 'haves' versus the 'have nots' (⁶⁷). This debate raised an issue; 'does violent activity bring power and influence to those who are violent to others?' There is a controversy among users over the nature of rebellious activity among 'lumpenproletariat'; is rebellion an individual act or a collective action? (⁶⁸) The debate implied that collective violence brings power and influence to those who do that violence upon others, and so those who will carry out that violence collectively are further recognized.

Controversy also existed over the re-employment attitude of those labelled as 'lumpenproletariat' who are both unemployed and criminals. Cynthia Mahabir (1988:323) suggests that they do not seek employment; Kenneth Tunnell (1990:43) said that they do.

The characteristics offered by Tunnell (1990) and Mahabir (1988) show a polarized view of a criminal-like lumpenproletariat. The contested concept offered to readers by these two authors - as outlined above - shows five polarized qualities. First, can the class effectively seek self-betterment? Second, does the class have stable political consciousness? Third, does the class have economic and political power and influence? Fourth, does the class rebel? And, fifth, is the class resistant to dominant western practices such as the seeking of employment?

There is a divide between current users who view the concept as representing now extinct conditions, and those stating that 'lumpenproletariat' represents conditions recently created. This 'past-present' divide in conditions arises within two of the articles discussing conditions in the third world and, unfortunately, both of these authors were reluctant to fully define their view of the concept⁽⁶⁹⁾.

The 'lumpenproletariat' was seen as possessing a historically discontinuous diachronic quality by some users. Thus a debate took place over whether the concept reflects a moment in time which has passed us by years ago or, rather, a moment in time just recently appeared. This debate raised a question: 'Is the concept of a 'lumpenproletariat' pertinent today?'

On the other hand, the historically-discontinuous property of a 'lumpenproletariat' is further contested. One of the more meticulous of the current users suggests that the concept may also possess a historically-continuous diachronic quality (Gary McDonogh, 1991:326-327).

Finally, there is even debate as to whether a particular mode of production can create 'lumpenproletariat'. Two positions can be found within the English language articles; in short, we have 'denialists' versus 'affirmativists'⁽⁷⁰⁾.

The Convenience of Label approach reflects a concept subject to consensus and contest among users. Its applied characteristics reflect a concept void of agreed upon definitional meaning. These 16 articles suggest that 'lumpenproletariat' had meant just about anything that a current user had wished it to be; as long as a user somehow acknowledged that the concept referred to some class of people hierarchically below 'bourgeoisie', it could mean anything just short of something that would bring a colleague's displeasure down upon the user. The concept was applied as an afterthought; as a frequently unresearched, and thus 'cooked up', label used to embrace some characteristics summarized in a single word. But is the variety of meaning in the alternate Meaning of Label approach any different?

The Meaning of Label Approach

The Meaning of Label approach of nine articles had its own conventions for 'lumpenproletariat'. These writers were certainly more thorough in defining their concept of a 'lumpenproletariat' than users within the Convenience of Label convention just outlined above. I examine the nine Meaning of Label articles chronologically, to help highlight the flow of activity of the concept's development. In so doing, I found two fairly distinct historical eras of that development in the concept of a 'lumpenproletariat'.

(a) The 1970s Era: Intellectual Confrontation

Unveiled in the nine Sociofile articles in the Meaning of Label approach was a contest over the objective 'lumpenproletariat'; this 1970s era was a contest over textual content. The first article was penned by C.J. Munford⁽⁷¹⁾ (1972:11) who saw "black America ... as the domestic colony of the world's most powerful and rapacious imperialism"⁽⁷²⁾.

With the benefit of 20+ years of hindsight, we see that his vision of 1960s black American class structure is a blending of functionalist and Marxist class structure terminology. At best, the Munford (1972) design was of a two-tier black American class structure each with its own sub-tiers⁽⁷³⁾.

The Munford (1972) model saw 'lumpenproletariat' having unique qualities. As the lowest of subclasses, Munford (1972) argues, 'lumpenproletariat' was different from the other three oppressed and non-revolutionary subclasses comprising his "popular masses" class of the second and bottom tier⁽⁷⁴⁾. His version of the 'lumpenproletariat' did not include all the negative characteristics⁽⁷⁵⁾ of a last class. Further, the borders of his fourth and bottom subclass in the bottom tier (the 'lumpenproletariat') were restricted to a portion of the black people in the United States of America.

Appearing side-by-side with Munford's (1972) article in volume 4, number 3 of Black Scholar was one by Cleaver (1972). These articles contained similarity in their arguments⁽⁷⁶⁾. But Cleaver also had a unique argument; 'lumpenproletariat' had misunderstood their condition⁽⁷⁷⁾. Thus he agreed and disagreed with the vision of Munford (1972) over the definition of 'lumpenproletariat'.

The side-by-side appearance of the Munford and Cleaver articles were not appreciated by the first author. C.J. Munford (1973) reacted negatively to the placement of the articles⁽⁷⁸⁾ and penned a response⁽⁷⁹⁾.

This Munford-Cleaver disagreement did not help build the academic acceptance of a concept structured around the black people of the United States. However, this was not the concept's only problem blocking its academic acceptance; it was now linked to the activist Black Panther Party, of which Eldridge Cleaver was an imprisoned, yet still prominent, official⁽⁸⁰⁾.

Eldridge Cleaver seemed to be remaking 'lumpenproletariat'. This Black Panther leader seemed engaged in a process of changing the concept from a mere academic 'analytical construct' into a new, popularly used 'folk category' in a manner quite similar to Pierre Bourdieu's (1987:9) categorization.

Just after the Munford-Cleaver disagreement, Wallerstein⁽⁸¹⁾ was

looking for a Meaning of Label. He objectively defined 'lumpenproletariat' as "a group of floating, unstable urban poor, living on uncertain income from marginal occupations". There were also subjective borders for the concept; he suggested that Marx had applied moral judgement when declaring 'lumpenproletariat' to be from "unproductive occupations"⁽¹²⁾. Thus he would hold that "Marx termed ... the 'lumpenproletariat' and gave to the term an odor of scorn" (Wallerstein, 1973:25).

Ethnic origins explained its historical development according to Wallerstein (1973); he went beyond the narrow objective borders of Munford-Cleaver to uncover a more subjective concept⁽¹³⁾. This 'lumpenproletariat' - which most users had interpreted as a synchronic concept to this point - now had a diachronic element; this was rooted in specific historical ethnic origins which differed from the other non-identified synchronic class concepts.

The recognition of dominant versus servile ethnic groups creates an image of hierarchical conflict between ethnic groups⁽¹⁴⁾. I return to the implications of this ethnic conflict model below.

Given the Munford-Cleaver disagreement, Wallerstein's (1973) contribution to building a textual analysis of the concept must be seen as positive to the general body of knowledge. His article widened the boundaries of just what is 'lumpenproletariat'.

Another reviewer defined the concept more simply. For Mark Naison (1976), a 'lumpenproletarian' was any willingly unemployed criminal⁽⁵⁾. He (1976) rejected any view of the concept which included the marginally employed⁽⁶⁾ or the radical⁽⁷⁾.

Against Naison (1976), a wider view of the concept was advanced. Charles Valentine (1976) defended the concept against its critics⁽⁸⁾. He rejected Naison's (1976) assertion that 'lumpenproletariat' willingly rejected employment. Instead, Valentine (1976:60) wrote that "the human beings who became the lumpenproletariat were rejected by the labor market".

Nevertheless, some claims by Naison (1976) on 'lumpenproletariat' were later upheld by Valentine (1976). On the claim for a narrow definition of the concept, Valentine (1976:61) wrote that "the earliest Marxist definitions of the lumpen are too narrow and restricted for the realities of our time". On Naison's (1976) claim that a non-revolutionary 'lumpenproletariat' existed, Valentine (1976:61-63) said "changing ... capitalism" has made the 'buying off' of 'lumpenproletariat' more likely⁽⁹⁾.

The textual analysis articles of the 1970s now came to an end. Activity on 'lumpenproletariat' after the Munford-Cleaver disagreement, and its 1975-76 aftermath, stopped after 1976. But would this early 1970s concept - now caught up in narrow textual debate - die, or would it be given new life in the 1980s?

(b) The 1980s and Beyond: New Life?

Early in the 1980s, a partial answer appeared within the Meaning of Label style which just could not be ignored. It was not from textual interpretations, as was the 1970s practice, but from empirical research into the events and the people to whom Marx and Engels applied the label of 'lumpenproletariat'.

Unlike the Meaning of Label users in the 1970s, Mark Traugott (1980:697-705) looked at the 1848 French Revolution and examined the official "enlistment records" of the Mobile Guard - whom Marx saw as 'lumpenproletariat' - to uncover their occupational background. He then compared that background with the background of the "general Parisian population" - from whom the Mobile Guard was recruited - and compared both groups with the occupational background of the "insurgents" - whom Marx had labelled as 'proletariat'. After carrying out this research and then making the necessary analysis, Mark Traugott (1980:710) wrote: "I am forced to conclude that the Mobile Guard, far from comprising a 'predominantly' lumpenproletarian body 'sharply differentiated' from the working class, in fact constituted a reasonable cross-section of the Parisian population of the times and, in its class composition, differed little from the insurgents themselves". Thus 'lumpenproletariat' and 'proletariat' were objectively similar in their occupational background.

Mark Traugott's (1980) article marks for us a new and important understanding of 'lumpenproletariat'. Its contribution to the Meaning of Label approach was noted within an article by Frank Bovenkerk (1984:27) who acknowledged Traugott's findings on the background of the concept. But Bovenkerk (1984:15) also noted that "according to modern academic criteria, Marx's and Engels' use of the term lumpenproletariat .. (was) used ... in the very strangest of ways".

Bovenkerk (1984:17-20) argued that 'lumpenproletariat' was used within five differing contexts⁽⁹⁰⁾ by Marx and Engels which justified the concept's failure. After a look at their use of the concept, he (1984:34) declared that "I must conclude, then, that the efforts on the part of Marx and Engels to describe the political activities of the lumpenproletariat were systematically off the mark". He (1984:37) suggests that "their line of argument ... was more like: 'There is something counter-revolutionary going on here, so it must have been the lumpenproletariat that did it'". Bovenkerk (1984:38) said the Marx and Engels misuse of their new concept was due to its having to embrace people not in a regular pattern of 'Marxist' class structure; this new class was not part of the regular 'Marxist' class structure⁽⁹¹⁾.

Peter Hayes (1993) included 'lumpenproletariat' in his study of Marx's class structure. He (1993:116) recognized the earlier empirical findings concerning the concept⁽⁹²⁾.

Hayes (1993:101) argued Marx had both a "linear" view - which I call 'hierarchical' - as well as a "circular" view of class structure⁽³⁾. While the oppositional characteristics inherent in the linear view of class structure existed, the author claims Marx also presented a circular view of class structure wherein the major classes shared a number of characteristics. So the 'lumpenproletariat' shared qualities with: (1) "proletariat" since neither "owned property", (2) "big bourgeoisie" for both were "degenerate", (3) "surplus population" for neither "owned property" or were "productive", (4) "finance aristocracy" for both were "unproductive" and "degenerate", and (5) "bourgeoisie" for both are "the most impoverished" in "group" (Hayes, 1993).

The existence of 'lumpenproletariat' was judged important in uncovering the circular class structure of Karl Marx. According to Peter Hayes (1993:99) the key elements which finally ensured the presence of a model of a circular class structure had "centered around the finance aristocracy and lumpenproletariat".

Nevertheless, with the major focus of the article being on the classes according to Marx, the picture presented to us of 'lumpenproletariat' is controversial given existing empirical findings. In opposition to Traugott (1980; 1985), Hayes (1993) still declared that there were five 'lumpenproletariat' characteristics⁽⁴⁾. Thus Hayes (1993:116) openly dismissed the empirical findings of Traugott (1980; 1985).

Thus concludes the contested vision of 'lumpenproletariat' as seen through the eight Sociofile writers in the Meaning of Label convention. Following its near death in the 1970s, the concept was given new life in the 1980s and beyond.

When we link the projects within the Convenience of Label style with those in the Meaning of Label style we witness a most wimpy intellectual struggle for objective clarification. The battle to classify the characteristics of 'lumpenproletariat' has brought about a most frustrating confusion within the Sociofile literature which still raises the question: 'Just what is 'lumpenproletariat' anyway?' Judging Bovenkerk's (1984:15) assertion that "Marx's and Engels' use of the term lumpenproletariat ... (was) in the very strangest of ways", I think his assertion should be 'turned on its head' and applied to current users who handled the term strangely.

Beyond Sociofile: Did We Miss Anything Important?

The recovery of 'lumpenproletariat' in the Meaning of Label Sociofile articles is evident in some other social scientific literature. Before beginning the next section on 'proletariat', a review is warranted of a 'control group' of definitions of 'lumpenproletariat' versus these findings from Sociofile.

I investigated several dictionaries of sociology for part of the 'control group'. Not only do some have a definition, but there is a pattern in those containing a definition and those which do not. Of nine dictionaries (see Appendix 3(A)), six do not have a definition of 'lumpenproletariat'(⁹⁵) and the remaining three do define 'lumpenproletariat'(⁹⁶). In general, the term appears in the more recently published dictionaries.

The word 'lumpenproletariat' was defined within the dictionaries of sociology much like some articles abstracted by Sociofile. Michael Mann (1984:211) saw a need for a 'lumpenproletariat' versus 'proletariat' contrast(⁹⁷); Anonymous (1986:164) saw the concept in a hierarchical and economic activity mode(⁹⁸), while Gordon Marshall (1994:297) saw the concept within a moralist mode(⁹⁹). These 'control group' definitions are generally consistent with the findings in the Sociofile articles.

Since a 'control group' of three seemed too small, I examined another set of dictionaries for a definition of the term. There were other dictionaries (see Appendix 3(B)) by James Russell (1980)(¹⁰⁰), J. Wilczynski (1981)(¹⁰¹), Gerard Bekerman (1983)(¹⁰²), Tom Bottomore (1983)(¹⁰³) and by Terrell Carver (1987)(¹⁰⁴). The concept's definitions within these five dictionaries also set a small arena of what 'lumpenproletariat' is; these definitions were generally consistent with the findings above as obtained from Sociofile.

So what was accomplished in this review of current users? This review highlights the variety of conceptual definitions available among current users; it also makes the brief note that empirical findings (Traugott, 1980) can be seemingly dismissed (Bovenkerk, 1984; Hayes, 1993), presumably in light of some preconceptions of a more widely accepted general body of knowledge or of some seemingly 'familiar' concept. Current users applied the concept within a variety of contexts which might suggest that the meaning of 'lumpenproletariat' is either highly contested or just plainly overlooked as a serious 'scientific' concept. While the relatively few uses of the term - when compared with the term 'proletariat' - suggests the latter, further interpretations of the concept are needed to bring resolution to this variety, to perhaps challenge the differently inspired notions concerning the concept, and to help popularize the current usage of this now marginal concept. To move to this goal, I now turn to re-examine the creation of 'lumpenproletariat'.

Chapter 4: FORMING A PROLETARIAT BEFORE A LUMPENPROLETARIAT

After this review of 'lumpenproletariat' literature, we must see if today's use is consistent with its original use. But first we look at the formation of the better known 'proletariat'.

Why look at 'proletariat' when the goal is to examine 'lumpenproletariat'? Two reasons arise. First, I argue that the latter concept's original versus current usage is not the same. And second, I argue that the link between 'proletariat' and 'lumpenproletariat' is less different than assumed by current users of 'lumpenproletariat' ⁽¹⁰⁵⁾. The two are sister concepts which Bourdieu (1987:1) referred to as "common oppositions, paired concepts, or ... 'epistemological couples'".

The term 'proletariat' existed among European intelligentsias long before the term 'lumpenproletariat' was created. The rather well-known origins of 'proletariat' have been noted by Goetz Briefs (1937:52-83), R.B. Rose (1981), David Lovell (1988:57-94) and Tim McCarthy (1978:71-78) ⁽¹⁰⁶⁾.

The importance of a changing view of 'proletariat' should not be dismissed. As illustrated below, some 19th century debates among users of 'proletariat' virtually demanded that a new complementary concept - a 'lumpenproletariat' - be created!

The term 'proletariat' has an intellectual history which is at least 2,000 years old. The Roman orator, Cicero, used the term for his 'sixth class' within the class structure of 6th century B.C. Rome. He identified five general qualities of the concept 'proletarian' (¹⁰⁷) which were: First, 'proletarian' was a label used to describe a large-sized group within a city. Second, it was hierarchical; non-members were either above or below it in a social structure. Third, it applied to those with too few financial resources to support the state; they were the 'have-nots' rather than the 'haves'. Fourth, it was made up of those who could still produce children as a duty to the state. And fifth, 'proletarians' have other specific political duties to a state apparatus besides the production of children or the paying taxes (Cicero, 60BC:149-151).

The Development of the Concept Proletariat in France

The term 'proletarian' was not part of the intellectual tradition of France until Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu had read Cicero's old work on Rome's class structure. As well as affirming Cicero's five general qualities of 'proletarian', Montesquieu's interpretation of the concept suggests he had now found two additional general qualities of this 'sixth class' of Rome - the 'proletarian'.

A sixth general quality was that 'proletarians' were not the lowest of the classes in Rome's hierarchical class structure. Montesquieu (1748:527) suggested that the class structure of Cicero's Rome contained a seventh class below the 'proletarians', the 'Caerites' or 'aerarii', who were the untaxed and degraded lowest class of Rome⁽¹⁰⁸⁾.

The seventh general quality specified that 'proletarians' were a class taxed differently than were the classes who owned more property than they did. So Montesquieu (1748:527) argued that 'proletarians' as a class with little property were taxed by the individual head while the first five classes were taxed by the amount of their property⁽¹⁰⁹⁾.

Montesquieu's sixth general quality was affirmed 14 years later by Jean Jacques Rousseau. In defense of Montesquieu, Rousseau (1762:95) noted that the next to lowest 'proletarian' class had almost no property while the lowest class, the 'capite censi', had nothing at all⁽¹¹⁰⁾.

The term 'proletarian' was now intellectually legitimated by its resurrection and conceptual approval by Montesquieu and Rousseau, but yet another event also helped to legitimate the word. The term appeared on page 549 of Volume 27 of the Encyclopedia by Denis Diderot and Jean D'Alembert as published during their lifetime in 1778 (Briefs, 1937:55).

The concept was at a critical moment in its development. It was still a little-known "analytical construct" (Bourdieu, 1987:9); a historical event in late 18th century France helped propel it to become a better-known "folk category" (Bourdieu, 1987:9) used beyond the small intellectual circles of France where it was judged to have just seven general qualities.

The 1st French Revolution of 1789 moved 'proletarian' from a mere analytical construct to become a wider-known folk category. R.B. Rose (1981:285-286) found 'proletarian' used beyond the small intellectual circles of France just once in 1788⁽¹¹¹⁾ and then on four occasions in 1789⁽¹¹²⁾.

The concept's association with revolutionary activity affected the frequency of use of 'proletarian'. R.B. Rose (1981:286-289) found little use of 'proletarian' from 1789 to 1824⁽¹¹³⁾.

Yet this France of 1790-1797 saw the articulation of an eighth general quality of 'proletarian' as a class from below in conflict with a class located above. The articulator of this quality was Gracchus Babeuf. Having authored a biography on him, R.B. Rose (1978; 1981:288) found⁽¹¹⁴⁾, in a 1794 pamphlet by Babeuf, that he had also articulated a new eighth characteristic; that of a propertyless 'proletarian' in hierarchical class conflict with the oppressive property-owners conceptually located above them.

From 1794 we jump to 1820. Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon fought Babeuf's conflict politics by pursuing a harmonious⁽¹¹⁵⁾ politics of cooperative abilities (Ionescu, 1976:34-42). His young follower, Auguste Comte, loyally attacked Babeuf's eighth general quality and the concept 'proletarian', arguing the class was not engaged in conflict. Comte (1820:102) even denied the continuing existence of a modern 'proletarian'; in so doing, ironically, he identified a new ninth general quality of 'proletarians' as being a historically discontinuous class at the macro level⁽¹¹⁶⁾.

But Saint-Simon confirmed⁽¹¹⁷⁾ Babeuf's eighth general quality with a vengeance in his last year of life. He (1824a:240) found that 'proletarians' were faced with class conflict⁽¹¹⁸⁾. In a larger subsequent article, he (1824b:222-237) used "proletarian" on 25 occasions; he also mentioned a new tenth general quality of 'proletarian' which declared that the class were morally competent⁽¹¹⁹⁾. According to this tenth quality, 'proletarians' were not some rabble worthy of scorn.

Some followers of Saint-Simon later popularized the concept. One was Barthelemy Prosper Enfantin who exposed an eleventh general quality of 'proletarian'. In 1829, he saw 'proletarians' as having a historical micro level continuity; they were a class prolonged through individual relationships, in particular, through their personal inheritance⁽¹²⁰⁾.

Two events in France helped the concept go from an analytical construct to truly become a folk category (Bourdieu, 1987:9). First, in his public lectures of 1829, Prosper Enfantin publicly used 'proletarian'. And second, in July of 1830, there was a 2nd French Revolution which was followed in 1831 by a demonstration by 60,000 French factory workers at Lyon. In commenting on this, R.B. Rose (1981:293) declared that "from this time, ... 1830, references to the 'proletarians' begin to fall thick and fast".

After the revolution of July, 1830, Charles Beranger articulated a twelfth general quality of 'proletarian' conscious empowerment. His Petition of a Proletarian to the Chamber of Deputies article was the first to include 'proletarian' in a title⁽¹²¹⁾. Within its content, Beranger (1831) said: "Nothing is more dangerous than an eloquent proletarian!" Proletarians were not helpless; this was a class realizing its condition and struggling to come to terms with that condition and as a group consciously seeking empowerment through its improved eloquence.

Thus, by early 1831, French writers had identified 12 general qualities as belonging to the concept 'proletarian'. From 1831 to 1848, a growing debate among users of 'proletarian' and 'proletariat' took place over the 12 general qualities. This active debate is summarized (see Appendix 5) to help establish the concept prior to the Marx and Engels intervention in the debate on 'proletarian'.

The growing French debate over 'proletariat' (see Appendix 5.2), while I do not claim a full population of its 100 year use in France from 1748 to 1848, raises a number of issues for the term.

First, the concept 'proletariat' had twelve general qualities. These 12 formed the intellectual tradition wherein Marx and Engels created their concept. The general qualities fell into two approaches; in a first, the general quality was usually subject to user consensus⁽¹²²⁾, but in the second, the general quality was subject to user contests⁽¹²³⁾. Thus the 12 general qualities of 'proletariat' are unevenly marked by controversy; while some were laden with debate, others were uncontested in their usage or simply fell into disuse.

Second, this review has demonstrated that the terms 'proletarian' and 'proletariat' have had a long history of use and even abuse! The key point is that Marx and Engels did not invent the concept; rather, they inherited a well-debated concept and they took up the term and added their own viewpoint to an existing 100 year old French debate over its qualities. As argued below, it was their position within these controversies which forced them to finally create their 'lumpenproletariat'.

Third, noticeably absent is reference to the concept's origins among authors who wrote in either English or German. This seems to be a glaring omission.

On this omission of English or German writers who used the term 'proletariat', I defer to others. To understand the relations between two of the groups, that of German versus French, I am indebted to Perkins (1993:31-32) who said the intellectual origins of 'proletariat' in Marx should be viewed materially; that is, Marx's background set his view of 'proletariat'.

A 'reason-based' group argues the origins of 'proletariat' within the thought of Marx came from writers primarily of the German language which he read. Both Robert Tucker (1961:114-116) and Shlomo Avineri (1969:52-62) placed their focus on the origins of Marx's 'proletariat' upon his more theoretical discoveries while he was being critical of German writers which he read.

An 'empirical-based' group argues the origins of 'proletariat' within Marx came from French writers and other contacts while he lived in France. Both David McLellan (1980:155-158) and Hal Draper (1977:136-138) placed their focus on the origins of Marx's proletariat upon his more empirical discoveries within France. To dramatically highlight an empirical view of a proletariat, Draper (1977:137) characterized the impact of Marx's move from Germany to Paris in October of 1843 as: "All in all, it was as if an aspiring young actor moved from the high school dramatic club of Dubuque to the midst of Broadway". Although clearly an overdramatization of the impact of Marx's move from Germany to Paris, Draper makes his point.

I position myself in the second French camp. As shown below, it was while Karl Marx lived in Paris that he first adopted and applied 'proletariat' in his writings.

Marx and Engels' Intervention in the Debate Over Proletariat

Folklore associates 'proletariat' with the work of Marx and Engels. But given a 100-year French history of 'proletariat', and given that Marx and Engels often responded negatively to others' works, what position would they take in the debate over the concept's 12 qualities?

Marx and Engels inherited the concept, but they did not adopt the term quickly. In Germany, Marx and Engels had to overcome the common usage of the term 'estates' - used to describe social stratification - before using 'class'. First Engels, in 1839, and then Marx, in 1842, came to use the term 'class' (¹²⁴).

By 1842, both men had used the term 'class'; but Engels (¹²⁵) (1842a:303) also began to use the term 'proletarian' (¹²⁶). His 'proletarians' were the poor in this first use - thereby affirming the third general quality - but they were not morally competent - a rejection of the tenth general quality - nor were they consciously empowered - a general denial of the twelfth general quality of the 'proletarians'.

On November 29, 1842, Engels (1842b:368-369) again used "proletarian"⁽¹²⁷⁾. He denied the sixth general quality - that proletarian are not the lowest class - but now supported the tenth general quality - the class was morally competent - as he witnessed their abilities to build a political party.

In his article of the next day, Engels (1842c:373-374) again wrote "proletarian". The move to England allowed him to gain confidence in the 'proletarian' ability to grow as a class; he now suggests the class possessed the twelfth general quality - they are a class becoming consciously empowered⁽¹²⁸⁾.

After settling into a job in Manchester, Engels (1842d:375-376) began linking together some of the qualities of 'proletarian'. In this new article, some 20 days later, he linked the first general quality - its size - to the twelfth general quality - its conscious empowerment⁽¹²⁹⁾. Here the synchronic entity, 'working class' - that is, an ahistorical class concept without human capacity - is in the process of transforming itself into a diachronic entity, that is, as a historical class concept with human capacity, in the form of 'proletarian'. In now affirming the twelfth general quality, he also supported the ninth general quality - its historical, macro level discontinuity - for 'proletarians' were now being formed. But at this early phase of the concept's use, Engels had yet to create a label for conscious 'look alike' who were not class conscious 'proletarians'.

The day after publishing on the macro view, he had published the micro view on where the 'proletarians' could be formed. In looking for diachronic 'proletarian' capacity in the 'working class' at a micro-synchronic level, Engels (1842e:378-379) saw 'possibilities' in the "textile worker", as well as in the "coal-miners" and the "iron-workers" of Manchester. He began to see, at the micro level, the very roots of the first general quality of class size, traditionally, a macro exercise.

After a delay of five months in these impressionistic articles from England⁽¹³⁰⁾, in May of 1843 he resumes testing the first general quality of size. Now Engels (1843a:379) affirms a synchronic-diachronic linkage: "Chartism has its strength in the working men, the proletarians". He (1843a:390) then suggests that culture may have an impact upon the definition of the first general quality; the size of 'proletarian' ⁽¹³¹⁾. In exploring a link between class size and conscious empowerment, he seeks an answer to: 'What type of behaviour is acceptable in order to earn the label 'proletarian'?' His (1843a:390) answer appears to be that: 'Violence can be rational 'proletarian' behaviour'. In effect, Engels is building a 'proletarian code of behaviour'.

After fleeing to Paris in October of 1843 and after meeting some apparently 'genuine' Parisian 'proletarians', Marx finally used the term 'proletariat' in February, 1844⁽¹³²⁾. This supports the 'French origins' argument I defended above.

By February, 1844, Marx pulled together the thoughts of those who influenced him on the concept and addressed many of the general qualities of 'proletariat' which he now used for the first time. Marx (1844a:185-187) outlined, at some length, what constituted his concept; here he states his view on half of the 12 general qualities of 'proletariat' (¹³³).

Thus his adoption of 'proletariat' is accompanied by an extensive definition of where he stood on the qualities (¹³⁴). Yet there were omissions in his first use; he had yet to take a position on the controversial first general quality of the concept's size.

After eight months, Engels again uses the concept to solve three issues in February of 1844. First, he reaffirms the ninth quality of macro level historical discontinuity (¹³⁵). Second, he first affirms the fifth general quality of duty (¹³⁶). And third, he first uses the term "proletariat" (Engels, 1844:487).

By now Marx (1844b:200) aggressively articulated his concept. When using it at the macro level, he saw the class as able to save humanity even when faced by oppression (¹³⁷). His view of a triumphant 'proletariat' became a study in how the twelfth general quality of conscious empowerment was linked to the first quality of size as well as to the ninth quality of being historically discontinuous at the macro level (¹³⁸). Thus some consciousness was a prerequisite for a successful 'proletariat'.

At the micro level, a 'proletariat code of behaviour' was also being tested by attempts to distinguish 'correct' from 'incorrect' behaviour for a class conscious 'proletariat'. On identifying an incorrect act, Marx (1844b:202) worried about violence as a means to winning 'proletariat' struggle⁽¹³⁹⁾.

Here is a reluctance to give the label 'proletariat' to those who behave poorly. As Marx (1844b:202) wrote "the 'proletariat' - at any rate at the beginning of the movement - ...", he shows displeasure with the behaviour discussed. He placed much optimism in his 'proletarian' and is thus reluctant to address the more pessimistic issues confronting his concept.

Yet Marx (1844b:202) used literary devices to distinguish the 'good' from the 'not so good proletariat'. He separates the 'not so good' via two literary devices wherein this 'proletariat': (1) is identified by 'quotes' around the term, and (2) is qualified within the '- at ... the beginning of the movement -' which follows the concept and provide readers with some commentary of hope for better events to follow. Here the 'proletariat code of behaviour' was not sufficiently violated to punish a theoretical hero for some behaviour that was 'not so good'; the writer did not banish the 'not so good' to some other undesirable, as yet uncreated theoretical concept. Yet he neatly clarified 'proper proletariat' behaviour - with some caution - for the first time only six months after first using the concept⁽¹⁴⁰⁾.

When the July, 1844 article was written, Marx (1844c:241) was also engaged in writing on synchronic economics which enabled him to solidify the synchronic-diachronic relationship. While using synchronic concepts - worker, working class, etc - he links the diachronic to the synchronic by noting that economists only use synchronic concepts to avoid confronting human beings⁽¹⁴⁾.

While sealing the synchronic-diachronic relationship between 'working class' and 'proletariat', Marx (1844c:258) declares: "So does the interest obtained from the vices of the ruined proletarians. (Prostitution, drunkenness, pawnbroking.)"

The intellectual insignificance of this brief encounter with the 'bad' proletarian shows the difficulty he has with the issue. Again, by using some literary devices to show that there is a problem, he just: (1) substitutes 'proletarians' for proletariat; (2) adds the prefix 'ruined' to reflect a failed proletariat not totally at fault for their failure, and (3) makes a list of the three specific avoidable vices within '(...)' to highlight the violations to his 'proletariat code of behaviour'.

Marx now had two encounters with 'less than desirable' behaviour of some who should be labelled as his 'proletariat'. He had not been interested in degrading his conceptual hero for small violations of the micro level 'code of behaviour' which he had created for them. Yet, some micro level 'undesirable' qualities of 'proletariat' were being acknowledged by him.

The importance of these brief encounters for his 'proletariat' lays in his proposed 'code of behaviour'. As Marx's view of 'proletariat' matured, he was forced to confront the consequences of his position on the twelve general qualities. In linking the twelfth general quality of conscious empowerment to other qualities such as size, he was forced to acknowledge those who did not meet the standard of his 'proletariat code of behaviour'. His literary devices were but a first response to any encounters with those who had failed the test of his 'code of behaviour'.

By August, 1844⁽¹⁴²⁾, Marx and Engels (1844:35-37) coauthored a definition of 'proletariat'. They took a macro view in this first joint position. Having yet to confront the materially similar 'undesirables' among 'proletariat', they only set the class against its hierarchical opposite 'bourgeoisie'⁽¹⁴³⁾.

There are some new aspects to the 12 general qualities. Important is the second general quality - hierarchical positioning - that confirmed Marx and Engels as radical liberals. Like other liberal radicals of the era, they adhered to the view that class struggle is compatible only with the second general quality of class hierarchy. But by then asking just what is 'proletariat', this liberal radical view was subtly being questioned by them.

By December, 1844, the two writers reviewed others' work⁽¹⁴⁴⁾; at about this time, Engels led them to become nature-Marxists. This

change was made possible by Engels' interest in empirical observation. By March of 1845, he had completed a book which would give a clue to a pathway towards a more mature-Marxist view of class struggle⁽¹⁴⁵⁾. In this empirical work on conditions in England, Engels (1845:507) observed: "If the competition of the workers among themselves is destroyed, if all determine not to be further exploited by the bourgeoisie, the rule of property is at an end". Articulated here were the 'two conditions' which had to be overcome before a 'proletariat' might successfully achieve the desired goal of emancipation.

These stopped 'proletariat' from victory⁽¹⁴⁶⁾; these two conditions show two views of class struggle. First, he restated the eighth general quality of macro class struggle - from Babeuf 50 years earlier - where a class above struggled with a class below. And second, in using the term 'competition', he recognized anti-hierarchical conflict as another form of class struggle; one not vertical but horizontal in nature. Since 'real proletariat' do not 'compete' against other 'proletariat' (they only work together), Engels implies the presence of another not as yet unveiled or named diachronic class label. The horizontal macro class struggle - along with the vertical - is a starting point from where Marx and Engels begin to become mature-Marxists; it is also the intellectual point at which they also uncover a new 13th general quality of 'proletariat' - they are a class in horizontal class struggle also with a class beside or among them.

Marx and Engels still held a radical-liberal view of class struggle as articulated by Babeuf in 1794; their 'working class' had to be more fully accounted for then by their 'proletariat'. Their diachronic 'proletariat' accounted for a too small portion of their synchronic 'working class' to constitute a theoretically sound model of class structure (Marx's and Engels' model of class structure, in theory, assigns people to a synchronic non-human, as well as a diachronic human, class location). The remaining portion of the synchronic 'working class' had to be articulated through some form of diachronic concept; one that supported 'private property' on the 'positive' side of their antithesis but which, like 'proletariat', also lacked any private property.

This was difficult for Marx and Engels who viewed 'proletariat' optimistically. To make it yet more difficult, a short document by Marx (1845:5) included a sentence re-enforcing their optimist view - the 11th thesis: "The philosophers have only 'interpreted' the world in various ways; the point is to 'change' it". The Marx and Engels belief in changing the world via their writings ensured they would spend little time interpreting how to prevent change. They were more likely to write about their change agent, 'proletariat', at the expense of attending to anyone preventing change. Such is the agenda of two writers more interested in changing the world than to just 'interpret the world'.

Chapter 5: OUT OF PROLETARIAT EMERGES A LUMPENPROLETARIAT

In the previous section on the development of 'proletariat' I had three principal findings⁽¹⁴⁷⁾. Thus I saw the requirement for yet another diachronic concept to account for the remainder of the synchronic 'working class' not covered by Marx's and Engels' vision of 'proletariat'.

Marx and Engels had yet to confront the problem of theoretical gaps, but they indirectly dealt with the issue when articulating their 'proletariat'. Their 'proletariat code of behaviour' at the micro level as well as their articulation of antithetic class struggle direction at the macro level, had meant that some theoretical gaps required intellectual mending.

By August of 1846, they finished a second joint project which proved to be a defining work⁽¹⁴⁸⁾. They create a diachronic concept to resolve those theoretical gaps encountered earlier⁽¹⁴⁹⁾. They create 'lumpenproletariat' to suggest both similarity and difference with their older 'proletariat'.

How does 'lumpenproletariat' resolve gaps in earlier projects? To answer this, we must understand just what was meant when they used their diachronic concept. This will be accomplished as I trace the historical development of 'lumpenproletariat' beginning from its first written appearance in 1845-1846⁽¹⁵⁰⁾.

What Marx and Engels Meant by the Concept Lumpenproletariat

Marx and Engels (1846) first used the concept in The German Ideology on two occasions. A review of both now follows.

The concept first appeared in a discussion of the Empire of Rome. Marx and Engels (1846:84) established the diachronic-synchronic linkage⁽¹⁵¹⁾ between synchronic 'plebeian' and diachronic 'lumpenproletariat'. Due to their position on proletariat's ninth general quality, the 'lumpenproletariat' referred to a class without property - yet above the slaves - prior to the factory system of the 18th century, while 'proletariat' are a class created alongside the factory system in 18th century England. To complete another gap, the concept applied to the second lowest urban class - slaves being the lowest - in pre-industrial Europe. So their 'lumpenproletariat' endorsed the second general quality - part of hierarchical class structure - and the sixth general quality - not being the lowest class.

The concept next appeared as they discussed a recent work by Max Stirner (1844). Marx and Engels (1846:202) now reaffirmed the synchronic-diachronic relationship as synchronic 'workers' were used metaphorically by them to suggest a transformation of an existing class into a new class working for communism against 'bourgeoisie'⁽¹⁵²⁾. 'Proletariat' are real workers for change.

This supports the ninth general quality; 'lumpenproletariat' was historically discontinuous at the macro level.

Reflecting on 19th century Europe events in April of 1847, Engels (1847a) used 'lumpenproletariat' a third time. On the basis of his observations on 'proletariat' in Paris, Engels (1847a:83-84) justified the continuing existence of the 'lumpenproletariat' arguing that geographical dispersal ensured their continuance⁽¹³⁾. They labelled 'lumpenproletariat' obediently carried on their duties to the bourgeoisie, nobility and police, as suggested in the fifth general quality. And due to geographical dispersal, 'lumpenproletariat' lacked conscious empowerment as in the twelfth general quality. Engels also gave a clue as to his position on the first general quality - the size of 'lumpenproletariat'; they may be found in the service sector.

Here the ninth general quality - that 'lumpenproletariat' was historically discontinuous at the macro level - was refuted. Here Engels (1847a) changes his view on the ninth quality; he says 'lumpenproletariat' is macro level historically continuous due to the eleventh general quality - micro level historical continuity. Since "their division and dispersal makes nothing else possible for them but restriction to their immediate, everyday interests", Engels (1847a) argues that 'lumpenproletariat' cannot become a consciously empowered 'proletariat'⁽¹⁴⁾.

The April of 1847 use was followed by the first publication of 'lumpenproletariat' on September 16 of 1847 when Engels (1847b:246-247) identified a German poem which nicely defined the concept⁽¹⁵⁵⁾. This poem confirmed the first quality - size; in this fourth use, Engels clearly saw the concept in service sector workers who lived in the pre-welfare state urban areas of Europe.

Then in January of 1848, a major document was completed⁽¹⁵⁶⁾; in it, Marx and Engels (1848a:494) again deny a twelfth general quality of conscious empowerment in their 'lumpenproletariat'. While they re-stated the proletariat's mission, their 'lumpenproletariat' was, for the first time, judged as a positive antithesis - a bribed tool of reactionary intrigue - against their negative antithesis 'proletariat'⁽¹⁵⁷⁾.

As the 1848 European revolutions unfolded⁽¹⁵⁸⁾, their use of 'lumpenproletariat' increased and changed contextually⁽¹⁵⁹⁾. The revolution in Italy in May of 1848 was the first conflict to which the concept was applied. Engels (1848a:25) wrote on Italy's 'lumpenproletariat'⁽¹⁶⁰⁾: First, he gave 'lumpenproletariat' a 'code of behaviour' at the micro level; they were political fence sitters, opportunistic, and vicious when victorious in battle. And second, when contrasting the first general quality of size of the 'proletariat' and 'lumpenproletariat', Engels admits that the latter is the larger sized class ready to fight.

The revolution in France in June of 1848 was the second site of revolutionary conflict wherein the concept was applied. Engels (1848b:142-143) wrote on France's 'lumpenproletariat' and further outlined his views⁽¹⁶¹⁾. First, on the first general quality, again 'proletariat' are outnumbered by 'lumpenproletariat'. Second, the lumpenproletariat's 'code of behaviour' was added to; this class were bought off by the highest bidder and preferred to serve those with the best chance of winning a contest⁽¹⁶²⁾.

Another characteristic of the 'lumpenproletarian code of behaviour' was added in July of 1848. Marx and Engels (1848b:259) noted that they were void of any political principle⁽¹⁶³⁾.

Media coverage of the 1848 revolution was not overlooked. In quoting and making additions, Engels (1848c:406) associated the synchronic 'working class' with a diachronic 'lumpenproletariat' and took a position on the first general quality - the size of the 'lumpenproletariat'⁽¹⁶⁴⁾.

To date Engels was the most frequent user of 'lumpenproletariat'; but from November, 1848, to January, 1849⁽¹⁶⁵⁾, Marx used the term as well. In an article of November 6, 1848, Marx (1848a:505) saw the "lazzaroni" as a "hired and armed" section of the 'lumpenproletariat'⁽¹⁶⁶⁾. Then in a November 12, 1848 article, Marx (1848b:17) saw the "lazzaroni" as a hired but unarmed 'lumpenproletariat'⁽¹⁶⁷⁾.

Then new occupations were added to 'lumpenproletariat'. In December of 1848, Marx (1848c:210,597) named a moderate liberal journalist as being a 'lumpenproletarian' (¹⁶⁸). His journalism colleagues fit the 'lumpenproletarian code of behaviour' (¹⁶⁹).

Having named 'journalists' the month before, in January of 1849, the list of occupations grew. Marx (1849:267) was more specific; 'lumpenproletariat' held ideological authority within a social structure through positions such as lawyers, government consultants and even specific academic professors (¹⁷⁰).

Changing from 'lumpenproletariat' to 'proletariat' was not overlooked. In March, 1849, Engels (1849:44) saw the 'lumpenproletariat' to 'proletariat' transformation as difficult in Switzerland; so the ability of 'lumpenproletariat' to be a good positive antithesis was seen (¹⁷¹). So the ninth quality of macro level historical discontinuity was rejected, while the eleventh quality of micro level historical continuity was not.

11 months later (¹⁷²) in February of 1850 (¹⁷³), the concept was used. On conflict in Germany (¹⁷⁴), Engels (1850a:165-168) noted that the 'codes of behaviour' of 'lumpenproletariat' and of 'proletariat' were opposites; the former were "gin-happy" and the latter were "recently freed from the slough of gin" (¹⁷⁵). Thus one's alcohol habits were set in the 'codes of behaviour' which helped set one's class position.

Later in April of 1850, Marx and Engels (1850a:317) suggest that 'lumpenproletariat' can become 'proletariat'. So the eleventh general quality - micro level continuity⁽¹⁷⁶⁾ - was rejected.

In October, 1850, 16th century Germany was addressed. Here Engels (1850b:407) affirmed the second general quality of hierarchy and noted the first general quality of 'lumpenproletariat' size by confining them to urban areas⁽¹⁷⁷⁾. Then he (1850b:407) says they also defy the ninth general quality, its macro level historical discontinuity; the class occurs "in all the so far known" societies⁽¹⁷⁸⁾. Not finished, Engels (1850b:408) suggests when compared to their 19th century counterparts, culturally the 16th century 'lumpenproletariat' were a better lot⁽¹⁷⁹⁾. Over time, 'lumpenproletarian' culture worsened!

Even in 16th century Germany, 'lumpenproletariat' were hostile to collective behaviour. According to Engels (1850b:450), the 'lumpenproletariat' favoured self-gratification or enjoyment over any form of collective discipline⁽¹⁸⁰⁾.

A month later a review was done. Marx and Engels (1850b:512-513) claim 'lumpenproletariat' in Great Britain could belong to a certain religion or ethnicity⁽¹⁸¹⁾. On France, Marx and Engels (1850b:523) wrote on the 'lumpenproletarian' occupations of political activists⁽¹⁸²⁾; these were the policy advisors, speech writers and public relations experts⁽¹⁸³⁾.

In that November⁽¹⁸⁴⁾, Marx (1850) completes a 11 month series of articles on 1848-1850 France for book form⁽¹⁸⁵⁾ where reason lost to passion as he notes the 'lumpenproletariat' role. Since this 1850 project is a major source for finding meaning of 'lumpenproletariat' among current users⁽¹⁸⁶⁾, imagine the impression gained by current users as they read (or misread) Marx's (1850:50-70) anger and rage at the positive antithesis concept, the 'lumpenproletariat'⁽¹⁸⁷⁾.

By November of 1850, Marx had used a major published work to rant and rage against the atrocities committed by those he labelled 'lumpenproletariat'. Yet, amid his rage, Marx (1850:50-70) suggested other restrictions limiting the first general quality of class size; 'lumpenproletariat' might more likely be the "young" in age and the "malleable" in character.

The 'lumpenproletariat' reappeared in August, 1851⁽¹⁸⁸⁾; it was through its first known appearance in personal letters that it occurred. In a letter to Marx, Engels (1851a:421) grouped 'lumpenproletariat' alongside 'proletariat'⁽¹⁸⁹⁾. But Marx continued to despise the former class; later that month, in a letter to Engels, he (1851a:446) personalized the concept at the micro level when documenting a meeting⁽¹⁹⁰⁾. As well as being angry with them, Marx did not demonstrate much respect for the class labelled as 'lumpenproletariat'.

Indeed, he was encouraged to see 'proletarian' supporters battle against this positive antithesis 'lumpenproletariat'. In a September of 1851, letter to Engels, Marx (1851b:456) reported: "Willich, however, is conducting a campaign against the 'lumpenproletariat' among the refugees"⁽¹⁹¹⁾.

The concept was continually judged as being the undesirables. In a September of 1851, letter to Marx on events in Italy, Engels (1851b:459) suggests that other classes could offset the bad influence of 'lumpenproletariat' ⁽¹⁹²⁾.

Marx was not finished with punishing 'lumpenproletariat'. In a major examination of Louis Bonaparte, finished in March of 1852, Marx (1852a:110-195) again turned loose his rage and anger in this major project⁽¹⁹³⁾, as he hurls insult upon insult at the conceptual class⁽¹⁹⁴⁾. This degradation of the positive antithesis, 'lumpenproletariat', preoccupied Marx into 1852.

Marx and Engels continued to clarify the characteristics of their 'lumpenproletariat code of behaviour'. In an April, 1852, letter to Marx, Engels (1852:88,694) reported - while noting that 'lumpenproletariat' did not objectively mean 'vagrants' - that a lawyer-journalist was judged to be so useless, so incompetent, so unable to become a 'proletarian', that the 'lumpenproletarian' filled 'Society of December 10' organization of Louis Bonaparte would not even hire and employ him⁽¹⁹⁵⁾.

Yet they maintained their interest in conceptually transforming those judged to be 'lumpenproletariat' into 'proletariat'. In June of 1852, they (1852:313) wrote that some ideological component is important to building a diachronic concept⁽¹⁹⁶⁾.

Marx then noted the tenuous nature of the micro level 'code of behaviour' relationship between the two diachronic classes. In an August, 1852, letter to Engels, he (1852b:155-156) noted the tenuous class solidarity; one could easily "tipsy" across the borders of the 'proletariat-lumpenproletariat' divide⁽¹⁹⁷⁾.

The next use of the concept occurred more than a year later in October of 1853⁽¹⁹⁸⁾. Again, Marx (1853:388) insults and displays more anger at Louis Bonaparte's corrupt 'lumpenproletarian' government in France⁽¹⁹⁹⁾.

A next use occurred in May of 1854 within a Marx letter; whether one met the concept's 'code of behaviour' now depended on macro level conditions. As Marx saw a link between micro behaviour and macro environment, his anger was replaced by sympathy; those who once were good 'proletariat' and fought in 1848, but who now digressed due to economic conditions were worthy of pity. Thus, Marx (1854a:448-449) wrote of a decaying 'proletariat' - a former army officer who fled due to revolutionary activity⁽²⁰⁰⁾. Thus individual 'proletarian' could be degraded into a 'lumpenproletarian' by their economic conditions⁽²⁰¹⁾.

But it was towards a class of 'lumpenproletariat' - rather than an individual - that most anger was directed. On events in Spain, Marx (1854b:437) said that 'lumpenproletariat' liked to be led by an upper class and the church; not by the middle class⁽²⁰²⁾.

In February of 1855, Marx and Engels again look at an occupation viewed as belonging to 'lumpenproletariat'; the soldier. Thus on turning England's civilians into soldiers, they (1855:42) suggest that it took some time to instill army discipline into a 'lumpenproletarian' motivated by self-gratification⁽²⁰³⁾.

By July of 1855, another occupation was viewed as attached to 'lumpenproletariat'; the police. On the after-effects of a Sunday demonstration in a London park, Marx (1855a:325), said that 'lumpenproletariat' were recruited into police service⁽²⁰⁴⁾.

This view of 'lumpenproletariat' as also including those who engaged in enforcement-like activities was re-enforced again that month. On events in Italy, Marx (1855b:541) wrote Engels that domestically, 'lumpenproletariat' act as law enforcers⁽²⁰⁵⁾.

'Lumpenproletariat' was again used a year later. In a letter to Engels, Marx (1856:80) said 'lumpenproletariat' are created by "purely economic factors"; when a peasant fails to climb in Poland's class structure, that peasant then becomes part of the 'lumpenproletariat' who then serves aristocracy⁽²⁰⁶⁾.

Two years later, the concept returned within a major synchronic economics project⁽²⁰⁷⁾. Marx (1858:203) now saw the 'lumpenproletariat' as employed in the service sector⁽²⁰⁸⁾.

Karl Marx endorsed Adam Smith's distinction between productive and unproductive labour⁽²⁰⁹⁾. Smith's bourgeois theoretical creation allowed Marx to answer a synchronic versus diachronic question: 'How are the diachronic classes of 'proletariat' and 'lumpenproletariat' created and maintained in a synchronic moment in time?' Marx's (1858:203) answer: 'The diachronic 'proletariat' is created and maintained through synchronic activity in productive labour, while the diachronic 'lumpenproletariat' is maintained via its synchronic preoccupation with unproductive labour where one's daily survival is immediate and subject to the conditions of providing a service'⁽²¹⁰⁾.

With this economic insight in mind, Marx lessened his anger at 'lumpenproletariat' for their activities. He (1858:203) even referred to them as "honest" and, in quotes, "working" which was but an allusion to the point that only productive labour is real work; unproductive labour was but only the act of work⁽²¹¹⁾.

In the same work, Marx (1858:216) said "the lumpenproletariat, the rogues, etc., ... grow in proportion to demand". Not only are rogues distinguished from 'lumpenproletariat', but the size of the latter depended on the supply and demand laws⁽²¹²⁾.

The next use was more than a year later in November of 1859. On journalists in a letter to Ferdinand Lassalle, Marx (1859a:537) wrote "of the 'Hermann', whose 'editors' are all recruited from the literary 'Lumpenproletariat'". Then in a December, 1859 letter to Engels, he (1859b:547) again noted his colleagues: "I presume you saw the 'Hermann' of a week ago today containing ... a self-portrait of the scoundrelly bunch of lumpenproletarians which has gathered". Clearly, Marx knew his colleagues and once again, despite his developing economic insights, could not refuse to once again use the term through his morally laden judgments.

The next three uses, when completed in November of 1860, are not original appearances⁽²¹³⁾; the manuscript featured a fourth, original use of the term. Here Marx (1860:155) affirmed the power of "the class of the lumpenproletariat"⁽²¹⁴⁾; at this point, he is not as angry at the class as in March of 1852.

After 1860, the concept suffered a seven year drought in usage; but this ended in a big way⁽²¹⁵⁾. Marx (1867:518; 1887:557) now pointed out that the "paupers" and the "surplus-population" were separate from the 'lumpenproletariat'⁽²¹⁶⁾.

A next use occurred a year later in October of 1868. Karl Marx (1868:27) was again angry at the "literary" occupations belonging to 'lumpenproletariat', and again, the consumption of alcohol was noted in the 'lumpenproletarian code of behaviour'⁽²¹⁷⁾.

Having last used the concept in 1852, Engels (1870:98-99) applies it twice in a short article. While Marx's exposure to economics inspired moderation with the 'lumpenproletariat' - in particular against the lower elements of the class - Engels was not so inclined. To him, the class still embraced large numbers within the cities who were morally unable to do good, moral work; thus his 'lumpenproletariat' lacked the tenth general quality of moral competence held by the 'proletariat' ⁽²¹⁸⁾.

The concept's alternate term was also put to use. Karl Marx (1871b:529-530) indirectly used 'lumpenproletariat', when writing on the Paris Commune of 1871 in May of 1871, via its alternate term - the armed 'lazzaroni' ⁽²¹⁹⁾.

In July of 1873, 'lumpenproletariat' is last used in a joint work in its relation to 'proletariat'. Here Marx and Engels (1873:454) use "declassé" as a moral judgment of the 'lumpenproletariat' compared to 'proletariat' ⁽²²⁰⁾.

The concept would not appear in their writings for almost 9 years. Coming just before his death, Karl Marx's last use of the concept was in a June of 1882 letter to Engels from Cannes, where he recovered from illness. At this time, Marx (1882:272) noted the service sector workers in the hotels and cafes of Cannes "who belong to the lumpenproletariat" ⁽²²¹⁾.

After 4 years of non-use, Engels returns to using the concept. In a 1886 letter to Laura Lafargue, Engels (1886a:334) used the term to label the assembled at London's Trafalgar Square⁽²²²⁾. Here he (1886a:334) notes a synchronic-diachronic divide⁽²²³⁾. In a letter to August Bebel in 1886, he again used the concept to label those at Trafalgar Square. For Engels (1886b:447), 'lumpenproletariat' did not consist of the "unemployed"⁽²²⁴⁾.

Then, in an article completed in December of 1886, he used the concept - twice in discussing the old Roman Empire. Here Engels (1886c:603) again confirms the existence of 'lumpenproletariat' before the factory system was created and also reaffirms their freedom seeking, and "useless" unproductive nature as well as their general lack of "any effective power"⁽²²⁵⁾.

Some 15 months later in March of 1888, Engels returned to Italy. Here Engels (1888:498) used the concept in a metaphorical sense to describe some group who did no productive labour⁽²²⁶⁾.

The concept was next used in two letters from August, 1889. The first, in a letter to Eduard Bernstein from Engels (1889a:261)⁽²²⁷⁾. The second was in a letter to Laura Lafargue; Engels (1889b:304) noted the London dock strikers; the phrase "lowest stratum" here is a reference to the strikers' ability to find collective class consciousness, rather than any location of the strikers in a class hierarchy⁽²²⁸⁾.

The last use of 'lumpenproletariat' would arrive four months later. Engels (1890:509) used the concept in a December, 1890 letter to Holland's Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis⁽²²⁹⁾.

In summary, 'proletariat' and 'lumpenproletariat' both shared⁽²³⁰⁾ and did not share⁽²³¹⁾ the 12 general qualities derived in the ongoing debate over these diachronic class concepts. Ultimately, the concepts were, as Pierre Bourdieu (1987:1) had noted, a conceptually "paired couple".

This brings to an end the use of 'lumpenproletariat' by Marx and Engels. Now required is a review of the frequency of its use.

What Marx and Engels Did With the Concept Lumpenproletariat

Between its first use in August of 1846 and its last use in December of 1890 - just over 44 years - the concept was applied on 88 occasions within 50 documents (see Appendix 2.2). On average, the concept was used twice a year. We should note that 58 of these 88 uses occurred within the first 6 years.

This level of use during the 44 years may account for why the 'lumpenproletariat' never rose to any intellectual status beyond a mere Marx and Engels analytical construct within their writings to become a publicly used and truly prominent folk category. Why?

Since scientific methodology promotes speculation, I suggest two rationales for this infrequency of use; the first is objective, while a second is more subjective.

Objectively, the writings of Marx and Engels shifted away from their diachronic and political early works to a more synchronic and economic based writing about the time that they begin to use 'lumpenproletariat' less frequently. Since the diachronic 'lumpenproletariat' would not be appropriately used in their synchronic writings, the opportunity to use the term declined and even disappeared⁽²³²⁾.

Subjectively, Marx and Engels slanted their writings to bringing about social change for a better world; sensing that any inappropriate use of 'lumpenproletariat' might deter from their mission of change, they rationally chose not to extensively display their counterrevolutionary creation⁽²³³⁾ - I will enlarge on this subjective rationale below.

Their use of the concept changed. Their first six years had shown more use than in the other 38 years (see Appendix 2.2). By August of 1851⁽²³⁴⁾, the term's appearance in documents shifted from being a concept used exclusively in documents intended for public audiences, to be used more frequently within their private documents, that is, personal letters (see Appendix 2.2, Appendix 2.3).

By the time Marx and Engels had fled to England, they had changed how they would use the concept. Since I was unable to find any discussion in their writings which articulated a strategy of just how - or under what conditions - Marx and Engels would publicly or privately use the term, their reasoning for the change may be uncovered via other exploratory evidence.

By April of 1850, Marx and Engels were using the conceptual idea of a 'class' differently because of the language in which the document was written. Sometimes the term denoting a 'class' was changed; where the German original used 'lumpenproletariat' and 'proletariat', the English translation became 'mob' and 'working class' respectively⁽²³⁵⁾. Sometimes the term meaning a 'class' was missing; when the German article used 'lumpenproletariat', the English original lacked a comparable term⁽²³⁶⁾.

The 'quick and dirty' response to why 'lumpenproletariat' and 'proletariat' were not used in English is that these terms did not exist in English. In partial support of this reasoning, Gertrude Himmelfarb (1984:287) suggests that English speaking radicals openly "resisted the label 'proletariat'"⁽²³⁷⁾ due to its 'negative connotations' which still persisted in England since the 17th century⁽²³⁸⁾. Such reasoning is false; Marx (1871a:445; 1871b:521; 1871c:323) continued to use "proletariat" in English writings, perhaps - if Himmelfarb was correct - even 'imposing' the term upon English speaking radicals⁽²³⁹⁾.

While 'proletariat' was used - and perhaps imposed - in their English writing, such was not the case with 'lumpenproletariat'. What seemed appropriate for a German audience was not the case for an English audience never receiving 'lumpenproletariat'.

Why did Marx and Engels do this? I contend that they were very sensitive in ensuring that their work would address their audiences in the most inoffensive manner possible; driven by their belief in the 11th thesis, Marx and Engels were concerned that the cultural sensibilities of their audience - that is, potential recruits to their 'proletariat' - should not be exposed to the excessive 'fear mongering' that other ranters had brought to the process of recruiting a populace to their 'cause'. Thus one of their 'recruitment tools' - if you will - was to ensure that their terminology was appropriate for their audience.

Being in the 'social change business' - if you will - they used 'marketing strategies' designed to recruit 'proletariat' to their perspective. Their activities in the International Working Men's Association was but one concrete expression of those strategies. Their journalistic activities were another such approach to achieving thesis eleven results from working for social change.

This 'salesperson' theme in the material of Marx and Engels may be underappreciated. Indeed, a mixture of marketing 'know-how' and empirical research led Marx (1844b:202) to this observation:

"It has to be admitted that the German proletariat is the 'theoretician' of the European proletariat, just as the English proletariat is its 'economist', and the French proletariat its 'politician'". This marketing insight - possibly a 'holdover' from their association with Moses Hess - influenced how they wrote material for public consumption. Since the English were the 'economists', they would be addressed through synchronic class concepts; as the French were 'politicians', they could be exposed to diachronic class concepts, but since the German public were 'theoreticians', they could cope with a mixture of both theoretical forms of class concepts within context⁽²⁴⁰⁾.

So English audiences received a class struggle model unlike that marketed to German audiences. The English audience was exposed to a synchronic hierarchical model of class struggle (bourgeoisie or capitalist class versus proletariat or working class) but German audiences received a more complex diachronic multidirectional model of class struggle (bourgeoisie and lumpenproletariat versus proletariat 'plus' capitalist class versus working class).

There are other well known works wherein they repress the more theoretically complex 'enemy among us' model in their writings for an English public audience. These include translations from German of their best known works, two of which were intended for a wide readership - The Manifesto of the Communist Party of 1848 and Capital of 1867⁽²⁴¹⁾.

The term 'lumpenproletariat' was used in the first The Manifesto of the Communist Party of January, 1848, in German⁽²²⁾. But within the November 16, 1850, edition of England's The Red Republican the first English manifesto appeared; the term 'lumpenproletariat' was translated here by Helen Macfarlane to the more synchronic term "mob" (Marx and Engels, 1850c:171). Later in 1888, an Engels' supervised English translation of the manifesto appeared; now the term 'lumpenproletariat' was translated by Samuel Moore⁽²³⁾ not as one word, but as five: "dangerous class, the social scum" (Marx and Engels, 1888:92).

The repression of this diachronic concept continued in Marx's great economic work; namely, volume one of Capital. While the term 'lumpenproletariat' appeared in the first German version of Das Kapital (Marx, 1867:518), as well as in subsequent German editions (Marx, 1872:586; 1883:604; 1890:578), the concept was repressed in the later editions destined for an 'economic' English audience and for a 'political' French audience accustomed to diachronic terminology. First in Le Capital (Marx, 1875:566) and then in Capital (Marx, 1887:557), 'lumpenproletariat' was replaced by the more synchronic "les classes dangereuses" and "the dangerous classes" respectively.

The 'inferior' synchronic model of class structure which Marx and Engels gave to their English speaking audiences was a theoretical problem which they may have tried to partially correct or adjust.

Their 1850s to the 1870s move away from using the term 'mob' to using the terms 'dangerous classes' may be accounted for by a theoretical preference for a diachronic model of class structure over the synchronic model. While both were synchronic terms, in England the term 'mob' - a bourgeois centred word which referred to the 'working class' - had a much 'broader' meaning than did the terms 'dangerous classes' - which are reformer centred terms not associated with the 'working classes' (²⁴⁴). In effect, a combination of salespersonship (their 'target audience' - the radical - was more 'receptive' to the reformer terms than to the bourgeois term 'mob') and the desire to attempt to convey the multidirectional class struggle model (even if in a more limiting synchronic manner) may have motivated Marx and Engels to abandon 'mob' in favour of the terms 'dangerous classes'.

Thus 'lumpenproletariat' did not appear to English audiences. The English original of The Civil War in France by Marx (1871c:309) was an "address" by the "International Working-Men's Association" to a broad readership "in various European countries and the USA" (Marx, 1871c:308); so the concept was simply suppressed (²⁴⁵). As salespeople who accommodated the preferences of their clients, Marx and Engels did not wish to 'frighten off' prospective 'proletariat' with the idea that they would also be forced to confront - in addition to the more 'client friendly' idea of an enemy 'up above', the 'bourgeoisie' - yet another, and larger, 'enemy among them' in the form of 'lumpenproletariat'.

Rather than 'lumpenproletariat', the terms 'dangerous classes' were 'saleable' to an English audience. Since English radicals had long understood 'dangerous class' to mean a small sized group ('street' criminals), Marx and Engels accomplished two goals by using the terms. First, they found terms to 'substitute' for 'lumpenproletariat' which convey to their audience the essence of the 'enemy among us' model of class structure. Second, and more interestingly, the 'substitute' terms 'lessened' any impact that the 'enemy among us' idea might have on an audience of potential recruits; after all, what 'proletarian' would be 'frightened off' by a few 'criminals'. By using these terms, the message between 'sender' and 'receiver' was 'clouded'; what was 'sent' out in 'dangerous class' was not what was 'received' by the audience. In short, the 'enemy among us' idea was conveyed but 'downplayed'.

Besides replacing diachronic 'lumpenproletariat' with synchronic concepts, how else did Marx and Engels alter their concept? At least two other tactics were undertaken.

First, their work shifted from diachronic based projects towards more synchronic projects in economics. The effect of this shift was to lessen a need for 'lumpenproletariat' without necessarily abandoning an examination of them. Their adoption of Adam Smith's model⁽²⁴⁶⁾ of productive labour and unproductive labour had lessened a need to use 'lumpenproletariat', for, it was argued, they are unproductive labour⁽²⁴⁷⁾.

Second, they frequently used personalized judgements of people within their private correspondence rather than apply the label 'lumpenproletariat' in assessing character. This is shown in a letter from Engels (1872:296) to Wilhelm Liebknecht: "The facts about the Belgians are these: De Paepe is the only one who is worth anything, but he is not very active. Steens is a jackass, a schemer and perhaps worse, and Hins is a Proudhonist who by that very fact, but even more because of his Russian wife, has leanings towards Bakunin. The others are puppets". The use of such judgments of people was a common feature of their personal correspondence; these assessments were an important part of their thesis eleven mission to bring about social change⁽²⁴⁾.

In summary, the Marx and Engels successful repression of 'lumpenproletariat' was achieved via three marketing strategies. These are now summarized.

First, Marx and Engels only used 'lumpenproletariat' on 88 occasions within only 50 documents over a 44 year period from 1846 to 1890. This lessened public exposure to the term.

Second, they removed the term 'lumpenproletariat' from writings that were intended for a wide public readership from which they hoped to recruit a future 'proletariat', specifically, the English readers whom they judged to be 'economic' thinkers. This linguistically restricted their public's exposure to the term.

And third, Marx and Engels searched for alternative ways to explain the idea of an 'enemy among us' to the 'proletariat'. This search to explain the existence of that 'enemy among us' was done through two ways and means: (1) via theoretical schemes such as the borrowing of Adam Smith's synchronic model of productive labour versus unproductive labour, and (2) via their private correspondence which was often busy with a 'sorting out' of 'worthy proletariat' from 'unworthy lumpenproletariat'.

These strategies proved to be highly successful. First, Eduard Bernstein (1898a; 1898b; 1898c; 1899) apparently missed the point for I could find no use of 'lumpenproletariat' in his writing. Second, they had the side-effect of producing the scientifically disastrous contrast in 'lumpenproletariat' as used by current English language users versus the original vision for the concept by Marx and Engels.

Given the contrast between the concept's current users and its original vision, it seems necessary to discuss these differences. This is the intended aim of the next section.

Chapter 6: THE LUMPENPROLETARIAT GONE WRONG?

As shown, views of 'lumpenproletariat' differ between current users and its creators. If we accept Turner's (1991:20) wish to develop concepts which are abstract and wide in scope, the original concept is more satisfying. This original-current divide plus a general lack of definitional discipline by current users accounts for a difference in the use of 'lumpenproletariat' compared with that of 'proletariat'. In light of my findings on current users, some remarks are warranted; thus, some opposing work on 'lumpenproletariat' is examined.

A Differing View of the Concept: Far From the Madding Crowd?

I will examine my differences over the concept's original vision with an author whose writings are authoritative. The work of Hal Draper (1972; 1977; 1978) on the concept was selected for two reasons; first, it shows awareness of many of the original uses, and second, it has been noted by other users⁽²⁴⁹⁾.

Draper (1972; 1977; 1978) is from the Meaning of Label school. He (1972:2304) held that Marx and Engels used 'lumpenproletariat' in three contexts⁽²⁵⁰⁾. He accepted or did not accept a number of general qualities as belonging to the Marx and Engels vision of 'lumpenproletariat'. Some general qualities were not accepted.

Draper's (1972:2285) definition "did not mean any sector of the modern proletariat"; indeed, the concept also "did not mean unemployed workers, or pauperized workers, or indeed any kind of genuine workers at all".

Other qualities were accepted. Draper's (1972:2303; 2294; 2296) definition of 'lumpenproletariat' included "vagabonds, criminals, (and) prostitutes" and were also "an anti-revolutionary tool" who were "drawn from the midst of the working masses in the sense of being 'precipitated out of them'". In sum, "(t)he lumpen-class is the catch-all for those who fall out, or drop out, of the existing social structure so that they are no longer functionally an integral part of society" (Draper, 1972:2309).

Thus Draper's interpretation is not in agreement with mine; this difference is shown through his last noted vision and my view. While he believed 'lumpenproletariat' are no longer an integral part of society and are outside the existing social structure, I see them as an integral part of society located at the core of the existing social structure. They form part of the positive antithesis⁽²⁵¹⁾; they are a large populace who accept, support and obediently labour for a 'bourgeois' capitalist society against the negative antithesis embodied in 'proletariat'. Our divergence on 'lumpenproletariat' can be traced to written work before the term was even created; Marx and Engels (1844) were somewhat critical⁽²⁵²⁾ of a novel by E. Sue (1842)⁽²⁵³⁾. Praver

(1976:87) notes⁽²⁴⁾ that this Marx and Engels study of Eugene Sue (1842) would "be the most elaborate critique he was ever to devote to a single work of fiction".

In dispute is whether Draper's view of the concept can be found in Sue's novel⁽²⁵⁾. When arguing that Sue inspired Marx and Engels to create the concept, Draper (1977:228) writes 'lumpen': "Sue's novel was ... concern(ed) with the subterranean hordes of the People. ... There is scarcely a worker in the book. Sue's People consists of criminals, prostitutes, and other social disjecta; ... society consists mainly of parasites, the lumpen-world". This view of 'lumpen' is compatible with the image of 'lumpenproletariat' which Draper (1972; 1978) tries to construct; an image being that of an urban 'dropout' or 'fallout'.

By introducing the concept through Sue (1842), Draper attempts to support his position. But my reading leads me to ask: 'Are Eugene Sue's people really just some 'urban dropouts' from society?'

I am not convinced of Draper's success in linking Sue to his vision of 'lumpenproletariat' therein for Marx and Engels; I prefer a positive antithesis for the concept. Sue's "subterranean hordes of the people" (Draper, 1977:228) are not urban dropouts; in reality, they are the accepting urban 'drop-ins' that prevent 1840s Paris society from dissolving into anarchy. My complying 'lumpenproletariat' thus opposes the aims of the 'proletariat'.

Sue (1842) portrays a people surviving - without consciousness of class struggle - in a pre-welfare state, service sector of Paris; Sue upholds my view and refutes Draper's. In the first paragraph of the scene-setting chapter 1 of book 1, Sue (1842a:11) outlines an urban district located between two major service sector institutions of high moral aims - a dispenser of law and a dispenser of religion⁽²⁵⁶⁾. Sue (1842a:11-17) then turns to the district's industry; all businesses were service sector firms in a pre-welfare state, low income area where property protection was paramount and even the novel's most shady of people are seen as disciplined not to steal local bourgeois property⁽²⁵⁷⁾.

Sue wrote of a property-respecting people; his theme about urban 'drop-ins' who prevented 1840s Paris society from dissolving into anarchy is evident in his characters' occupations. Draper's (1977:228) "there is scarcely a worker in the book" complaint is extreme! Sue (1842a:28-42) assigns service occupations to all of his characters; their jobs are consistent with a work history in a service sector offering low wages and he even notes they dislike work in the goods-producing industries⁽²⁵⁸⁾.

In the novel's first four chapters, Sue (1842a) even establishes the historical importance of how service sector work affects the character of people. The central characters of this novel are workers⁽²⁵⁹⁾; not in the goods-producing sector⁽²⁶⁰⁾, but within the urban-based service-producing sector.

Hal Draper had misread Sue (1842) on the presence of workers; but he also correctly read the novel⁽²⁶¹⁾. Although inaccurate in assessing 'lumpenproletariat' by Marx and Engels, Draper was close in noting its moment of creation⁽²⁶²⁾. In response to Stirner (1844), Marx and Engels (1846:84,202) wrote The German Ideology wherein 'lumpenproletariat' was first used.

The German Ideology marked the change in Marx from a radical liberal to a 'marxist'⁽²⁶³⁾. "Marx developed his critique ... in response to the challenge of Max Stirner" (Lovell, 1988:132). In facing Stirner (1844G) and his "lump" or "lumpen", a 'marxist' and a 'lumpenproletariat' are both made by Marx and Engels.

This simultaneous creation of marxism and concept is critical. As noted above, use of the term 'proletariat' was common; the creation of 'lumpenproletariat' made new insights possible. Class struggle was more than conflict between those above and below; class struggle could now also be viewed as conflict with 'the enemy among us, who are like us'.

The inspiration for 'lumpenproletariat' is not clear; yet we know the intellectual spirit wherein The German Ideology was made. It was never published despite attempts to do so in 1846-1847; publishers refused to publish the sarcastic, witty and large manuscript for it attacked other 'socialists'⁽²⁶⁴⁾. The Marx and Engels writing of The German Ideology was a happy occasion; the

joint effort was filled with wit and "irreverence" (Padover, 1978:215) for Marx and Engels⁽²⁶⁵⁾. Their 'lumpenproletariat' was jointly written a first time within a context of joy, wit and "parody"⁽²⁶⁶⁾ perhaps at 3am when waking their children!

There is a further context within which 'lumpenproletariat' was created by Marx and Engels. The prefix 'lump', 'lumpen' or some other form of the term was commonly used among most of Europe's various Germanic based languages⁽²⁶⁷⁾.

Yet, Hal Draper (1978) still argues for a German origins inspired 'accidental slipping out' hypothesis for 'lumpenproletariat'. Since Marx and Engels had both read Stirner (1844) about the same time they first wrote the term, Draper (1978:629) says that "there can be little doubt that the Stirner material ... was already in Marx's mind when he began writing". Draper (1978:630) also notes that Stirner (1844) "does not happen to prefix 'lumpen' to the word 'proletariat', but his failure to do so is almost accidental, (for) so often do the two elements flirt with each other ... (in) Stirner's rhetoric".

This is the German inspired 'accidental slipping out' hypothesis. It is based on circumstantial evidence that Marx and Engels read Stirner (1844) - which did not contain 'lumpenproletariat' - and also on the claim that 'lumpen' no longer meant 'people in rags' but had now meant 'bad people'⁽²⁶⁸⁾ Draper's (1978:628-632)

'accidental slipping out' position gives the prefix 'lumpen' a subjective, morally loaded meaning; it also assigns to the 'scientific' Marx and Engels a most unsatisfying 'unscientific' methodology wherein they created this new concept⁽²⁶⁹⁾.

The circumstantial evidence offered by Draper (1978) on the German inspiration for the term 'lumpenproletariat' demands further research⁽²⁷⁰⁾. I am unimpressed by his 'accidental slipping out' hypothesis for several reasons.

First, the German inspired 'accidental slipping out' argument rests on the assumption that Marx and Engels were unilingually German in ability. While they were predominantly fluent in German, they also possessed a capability to use other languages such as English. Marx was also fluent in French and also possessed ability in Dutch - I will return to this point below. Indeed, Engels possessed significant multilingual abilities; "by the time he had reached middle age, he had mastered, to the point of reading and writing, nearly two dozen languages, including ... Gothic, Old Nordic, and Old Saxon" (Padover, 1978:187-188).

Second, the German inspired 'accidental slipping out' argument rests on the assumption that Marx and Engels lived their entire lives within a single nation and culture wherein they made their observations on events; Germany. This is not the case. By the time that they first wrote 'lumpenproletariat' while in Brussels,

Marx and Engels had both either lived, worked, or observed a number of different nations and cultures such as Germany, France, and England, which Marx had visited, and where Engels had worked within the family firm in Manchester. The likelihood that they had encountered the term 'lumpen' in Germany, as well as in England, is - as will be noted below - plausible.

Third, the German inspired 'accidental slipping out' argument rests on the assumption that Marx and Engels created their new concepts solely through a subjective, and morally loaded basis. Hal Draper (1978) assigns to the self-proclaimed 'scientific' socialists a rather unsatisfactory 'unscientific' methodology. Since the argument advanced above suggests Marx and Engels had designed a simultaneous synchronic-diachronic model of class struggle, further research should investigate possibilities that the concept labelled as 'lumpenproletariat' also features a more objective basis for the name assigned to it.

And fourth, the German 'accidental slipping out' argument rests on the assumption that Marx and Engels (1846) wrote The German Ideology only through basic rational and objective lenses. Draper (1978) had not accounted for the intellectual spirit of wit and humour in which this work was made by Marx and Engels; he sends contradictory 'signals' to readers by suggesting that the 'subjective' prefix 'lumpen' as 'bad people' was accidentally attached to the concept through unreflective 'objective' reason;

2

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

it just 'slipped out' he claims. It seems to me that if a joint work is written in a spirit of wit and humour, the writers are likely to spend time reflecting - or brainstorming - on that wit.

This wit and humour was applied to the name of their new concept. When Marx and Engels assign the prefix 'lumpen' to their concept to mean, as Draper (1978:628) argued "bad people", they had many German alternatives available to them which - like 'lumpen', also meant "rascal, rogue, scoundrel or villain" (Scholze-Studenrecht and Sykes (1990i:491). Thus they could attach to the concept another label which might alternatively be called, in German, a further nine names including the 'Bosewichterproletariat', the 'Gaunersproletariat', the 'Halunkenproletariat' or the 'Schlingelproletariat' (⁷¹). The subjective German prefixes do not stop here; had they wished the term to mean Draper's (1972:2309) "drop outs", they could have been named as the 'Aussteigernenproletariat' (⁷²).

But perhaps Marx and Engels were more objective. Maybe Draper's (1978) German concept referred to the poor who lived in rags. Instead of 'lumpen', which also meant "rags" (Scholze-Studenrecht and Sykes (1990i:491), they might also pin to the concept a further four German name labels; the 'Armutproletariat', the 'Fetzenderproletariat', the 'Kaseblattproletariat', or the 'Schluckersproletariat' (⁷³).

But Marx and Engels did not accept any of these names for their new concept; none of these exclusively subjective or exclusively objective labels were appropriate. They settled for 'lumpen' which, in German at least, combined the subjective "rogue" or "scoundrel" with the objective "rags" (Scholze-Studenrecht and Sykes (1990i:491). Thus Hal Draper's (1978) 'accidental slipping out' hypothesis on the origins of a concept judged to be the subjective 'bad people' or a 'drop-out' is now contested by my 'deliberate construction' hypothesis which brings synthesis to the 'subjective' and 'objective' meanings of the term⁽²⁷⁴⁾.

There is, I think, sufficient circumstantial evidence - requiring still further research - suggesting that an alternate language source beyond German exists which Draper (1978) overlooked. As an equally plausible alternative, I suggest that further research be done on the possibility that a Dutch language inspiration as well as an English language inspiration (both Germanic) might exist. These additional sources further enhance the wit and joy of Marx and Engels when they jointly wrote The German Ideology⁽²⁷⁵⁾.

These alternatives offer new explanations for the inspiration of 'lumpenproletariat'. Against the German, the Dutch origin and the English origin alternatives offer a wider meaning to the concept. There are two reasons - an objective and a subjective - which give the English source particular merit. First, it restores Engels' importance in the projects of Marx and Engels⁽²⁷⁶⁾.

Second, it subjectively shows the disdain which Marx and Engels had for Stirner⁽⁷⁷⁾. If these have merit, it is easier to imagine the authors laughing at their witty multilingual skill when composing The German Ideology, at Stirner's expense.

By suggesting the concept simply 'slipped out' when created, Draper creates a further problem: 'If the term simply 'slipped out', when did this morally laden term finally become a fully 'worked out' and 'mature' class concept?' According to Draper (1978:453), Marx 'worked out' the meaning of 'lumpenproletariat' about six years after its creation⁽⁷⁸⁾. Draper's Marx appears to be a 'dunce'; he took a long time to learn and 'work out' the conceptual meaning of 'lumpenproletariat'.

The six year learning curve of the 'accidental slipped out' hypothesis challenges the credibility of the 'deliberately thought out' hypothesis I prefer. Marx and Engels' situational process, wherein a new concept is fitted into their larger theoretical model to help fill some theoretical 'space', is the intellectual material of a 'thought out' rationale; theirs was not an offhand, 'accidental' use of a newly 'slipped out' term just innocently named as 'lumpenproletariat'⁽⁷⁹⁾.

How did Draper suggest 'lumpenproletariat' was created by Marx and Engels? The answer is found in how he (1978) viewed - or did not view - the debate over the 12 qualities of 'proletariat'.

When viewing the 12 general qualities debate, Draper (1978:456) said that the major fight was over the "classification ... distinguished among four groups making up the 'proletariat'" at the time⁽²⁰⁾. By the 1840s, the intellectual packaging of these groups within 'proletariat' required change; Draper's (1978:456) solution was to label one group "proletariat" and the other three groups as "lumpenproletariat"⁽²¹⁾.

To understand Draper's synchronic 'lumpenproletariat', one has to note his exclusive focus upon only one of proletariat's 12 general qualities in the French debate. He failed to appreciate the debate's richness, and underestimated Marx's and Engels' ability to intervene in its controversies. Those in the debate often accepted 'above' versus 'below' class struggle; after accepting hierarchical conflict, Marx and Engels redirected class struggle to also include the 'enemy among us' element of 'proletariat' versus their neighbours in 'lumpenproletariat'.

To challenge Draper on all 75 located uses of the concept within all 40 documents is excessive. Two uses during the years of anger and rage at the 1848-1852 revolution require questioning. The first deals with the 'proletariat-lumpenproletariat' relationship and the impact of Draper's view of these classes as synchronic concepts; the second deals with 'lumpenproletariat' composition and the impact of Draper's view of this use as 'the best definition available' of the concept⁽²²⁾.

Next, I look at uses overlooked by Draper (1972; 1977; 1978). Would a look at the other 13 uses in another 10 documents have altered Draper's position on the concept?⁽²³⁾ The impact of these uses' implications for Draper's position varies.

In a first group, three references are a moral judgment of the competence of the armed 'lumpenproletariat' made while angry at the class⁽²⁴⁾. Had Draper acknowledged these, he should reference the subjective competence of the 'lumpenproletariat'.

In a second group, there is an admission that 'lumpenproletariat' possess genuine political power⁽²⁵⁾. Due to his class as 'dropouts' position, Draper did not subjectively appreciate the political power that this core class of 'drop-ins' held in urban France. This use refuted Draper's view of them as dropouts.

In a third group, there is the presence of class consciousness among the diachronic classes issue. In a big book on classes, Draper (1978:744) makes no reference, in the "index", either to "consciousness" or to "class consciousness". Draper had no interest in subjective class consciousness⁽²⁶⁾.

Draper should have altered his concept if these references were considered. The political power and class consciousness issues, in particular, highlight the centrality of 'lumpenproletariat' in maintaining the positive antithesis against the 'proletariat'.

Since they have political power but lack class consciousness, the 'lumpenproletariat' advanced here differs from Draper's version.

Empirically, Draper's concept was refuted by other writers looking at a 'proletariat' versus 'lumpenproletariat' contrast. Here Traugott (1980a; 1980b; 1985) finds that the occupational distribution of 'proletariat' and 'lumpenproletariat' in the Paris of June, 1848, had a "remarkable similarity"⁽²⁸⁷⁾.

The diachronic-synchronic nature of class concepts cannot be downplayed. This can be traced to the productive labour versus unproductive labour controversy within the synchronic 'working class' concept as Marx and Engels attempt to find correspondence with the two diachronic classes⁽²⁸⁸⁾. A diachronic-synchronic divide was problematic for some observers⁽²⁸⁹⁾.

While Marx and Engels preferred not to mix concepts, there were occasions when it was appropriate to link them relationally. The relations between the synchronic workplace activity of workers and diachronic historical exploitation by their bourgeois masters was done in an empirical study on England by Engels (1845:507) in his 'two conditions for a good proletariat' model⁽²⁹⁰⁾.

Others believe Marx and Engels wrote in synchronic and diachronic modes of thought⁽²⁹¹⁾ but while these modes were important in understanding why 'lumpenproletariat' is now misread by users,

the treatment given the concept - that is, its suppression - is also central to why it is of marginal use today. It is to the resurrection of the original concept that I now turn.

The Lumpenproletariat: If Only We Knew - And Used - Thee!

'lumpenproletariat' is not a synchronic concept; it is diachronic. The concept does not include either 'proletariat' nor 'bourgeoisie' which reflect other historical classes. Nor does 'proletariat' represent an older historical class than does 'lumpenproletariat'; the former class was born with the factory system of the industrial revolution while the latter existed as far back as the early Roman Empire.

To view 'lumpenproletariat' is to contrast it with 'proletariat'. The most concise definition of 'lumpenproletariat' is to define it as the mirror image of 'proletariat' ⁽²⁹²⁾. This new concept is the dark side - the hidden side - of Marx and Engels; it is the accusations, the judgments, the assessments of people they contacted and wrote about in personal correspondence. They publicly sold a 'proletariat-bourgeoisie' class struggle to supporters and potential recruits; they privately suppressed their 'proletariat-lumpenproletariat' model of class struggle. However, they did become the first to attach a label to the latter diachronic group ⁽²⁹³⁾.

Yet a further question remains: 'What form of concept is 'lumpenproletariat'?' Four forms of concepts are considered from a macro perspective; is it a status, or an identity, or a class, or a social class? At the macro level, 'lumpenproletariat' is more of a social class than an identity⁽²⁴⁾.

And what are the implications of labelling concepts? First, there is the concern with the impact of labelling upon those being labelled. Should an individual be labelled, the self-image of the labelled could be changed by using the label upon them. Second, there is the concern with the impact of labelling upon those who apply the label. As this project illustrates, label users can become misled as to the meaning of a label. The concept examined here reflects no similarity of meaning between those current users identified on Sociofile, and the two founders who actually invented 'lumpenproletariat'.

This project has uncovered a labelling process gone badly wrong. The meaning of 'lumpenproletariat' was so altered that the original meaning can no longer be fully uncovered in the concept. But what might be the implications if we were to halt using the current view of 'lumpenproletariat' and dramatically rethink the concept as originally proposed? To this question I will turn.

Chapter 7: IMPLICATIONS OF THE OLD CONCEPT LUMPENPROLETARIAT

The implications of the old view of the concept are dealt with under two subheadings. The immediate implications deal with the empirical impact of the concept, while the broader implications deal with the concept's theoretical impact upon the literature. It is to the former that I now turn.

Immediate Implications

Most disciplines calling themselves 'scientific' standardize the meaning of basic concepts⁽²⁹⁵⁾. While some current writers using 'lumpenproletariat' acknowledge other efforts, it is worrisome to witness disregard for articles which present basics to a topic when all writers implicitly share a common aim; the collective understanding of 'lumpenproletariat'. Yet, if we appreciate what is going on - confusion over a concept - it may be possible to change the way that we produce knowledge to help us standardize even the most basic concepts of sociology.

The problem of standardization touches even writers who laboured to create concepts. Marx and Engels produced a concept which - if examined from original sources only during a specific few years when its creators were filled with anger - could have easily been interpreted quite differently than they had intended.

As the 1848 revolutions of Europe unfolded, the Marx and Engels attitude towards their creation had changed. Memories of a 'lumpenproletariat' Mobile Guard murdering 'proletarians' from the National Workshops in the Paris of June 1848, drove them to alter how they used the concept. Not used in its basic meaning, Marx and Engels applied 'lumpenproletariat' in a more extended meaning⁽²⁹⁶⁾ from 1848 to about 1854 due to the bad memories.

Since 58 of the 88 uses of the concept were during the six years embracing these 'days of anger and rage' at 'lumpenproletariat', it is easy to appreciate how the meaning of the concept could be misread by later users who only referred - in their research - to the more popular (or conceptually unpopular) documents using the concept for their verification of its meaning - that is, those two major public documents which focus on the 1848 revolution in France (18% of all the concept's uses across 50 documents took place in The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850 and The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte).

Indeed, further research is needed on the influence of the 1848 revolutions upon their thought. The change in their attitude may have been so severe that we should consider this question: 'Was Marx's and Engels' realization of 'lumpenproletariat' power an influence in their turning away from pursuing further political-historical studies surrounding the diachronic 'proletariat' in the 1850s, in favour of the synchronic economic writings which led to their major work Capital in 1867?'

In addition to changing the meaning of 'lumpenproletariat' at a critical moment, another hindrance to appreciating the concept was its frequency of use throughout their lifetime. After the first six years of use in August of 1852 (by which time 58 of a total of 88 uses had occurred within 26 of the total of 50 documents) the use of 'lumpenproletariat' continued but declined. Did this occur because they believed in their 11th thesis - the need to bring about social change - as I suggest?

The Marx and Engels drive to bring about social change affected their use of the concept as they began to publicly suppress their use of 'lumpenproletariat'. Among the 50 documents containing the concept, the first 18 using it were all within public writings. From August, 1851, the concept began appearing in their private letters; of the remaining 32 documents containing the concept, 14 were intended to be writings for a public audience, while 18 were in private letters. The move from public use to private use of the concept, along with its less frequent use after the first six years of its use, may reflect one or both of two rationales. First, their move towards more frequent examination of synchronic economic issues that may impact on diachronic social change in their writings after 1852 would make the diachronic concept 'lumpenproletariat' largely non-usable. And second, their general unwillingness as salespeople to 'market' to recruits a powerful reactionary class that just might prevent the success of the 'proletarian' revolution which they hoped to gain⁽²⁷⁾.

During the 44 years of its use, the concept never rose to prominence since Marx and Engels were more interested in slanting their work in a direction aimed at bringing about social change. Perhaps worried that an overemphasis on using the concept would detract from their mission, they did not publicize their counterrevolutionary creation beyond a small and trusted public audience. This new concept became yet another theoretical 'party' allied to 'bourgeoisie' in class struggle against 'proletariat'.

This look at the creation of a concept by two writers judged to be founding sociologists highlights some problems associated with the standardizing of some of the discipline's basic concepts. Here we have a concept that was genuinely created by two founders of sociology and yet it still remains of only marginal importance to the discipline. It is this marginality of the concept that probably 'says it all' when the issue of standardization arises.

A comparison of the 'before' and 'after' use of the concept seems to support some of the preferences of Jonathan Turner. You will recall that Turner (1991) preferred sociological concepts to be abstract rather than concrete in definition. The version of 'lumpenproletariat' presented here from an examination of the 'before' database of Marx and Engels writings suggests that this concept is indeed more abstract than is assumed by current users within the recent 'after' literature examined here.

Broader Implications

The best line of Bernstein's October 1898 graveside eulogy on the death of the revolutionary 'proletariat' is a misreading of the Marx and Engels 'proletariat'. If we set aside the argument that perhaps Bernstein adopted a pre-Marxian vision of 'proletariat' with 12 general qualities, the creation of 'lumpenproletariat' makes it clear that he was talking more about 'lumpenproletariat' than of 'proletariat' when his eulogy was delivered.

The 'why don't the proletariat spark a revolution' literature of the neo-marxists - or Bernsteinists - noted earlier has suffered from the misreading of the concept 'lumpenproletariat'. While these writers quite innocently may have believed that they were examining 'proletariat', the unfortunate misread has clearly sent Bernsteinists looking at 'lumpenproletariat' instead.

The richness of the Marx and Engels model of class structure makes the teaching of 'class' to introductory students more interesting. Synchronically, Marx's and Engels' model helps to illustrate the distributional aspects of 'class' on a hierarchical basis. Diachronically, their model also illustrates the relational aspects not only on a hierarchical basis, but also on an anti-hierarchical basis; thus on a multi-directional basis. Therefore this model of class structure also shows use of either a distributional or a relational model as the context demands.

Thus introductory sociology texts benefit by using their model of class to show the difference between point-in-time and point-through-time analysis. Otherwise, introductory students may be confused as to the need for a simultaneous usage of the concepts 'working class' and 'proletariat'.

But a question remains which centres around the very existence of the sociological literature of class: 'Can a concept of class be defended in light of Jean Cohen's (1982:52) call for an end "of the last dogma of Marxism, the class concept" and its replacement by the social movements literature?' My appreciation of 'lumpenproletariat' invites an answer of 'perhaps'.

In an era stressing the modernity versus postmodernity debate, the concept of class may still have relevance. Within the context of the modernity-postmodernity divide, Charles Lemert (1993:27) wrote: "Modernity could be defined as that culture in which people are promised a better life - one day". If ever there was an overriding theme to Marx's and Engels' 'proletariat project', it is this: 'Synchronic working class, if you promise to become a diachronic proletariat, I promise you a better life - one day'.

If there is merit in the modernist promise, then we can raise a number of questions. Was a condition of modernity a successful proletariat? Was the failure of the synchronic working class to become a proletariat not also the evident failure of modernity?

And further, if the failure of the majority of the working class to become a proletariat had meant they would remain an obedient lumpenproletariat, would not modernity fail into a powerlessness and obedient postmodernity? If a failed proletariat was the class of promise of a failed modernity, might a more successful lumpenproletariat be the class of promise of a successful postmodernity? Could a reaction against postmodernity also be a reaction against a lumpenproletariat? Is not the search for alternatives to a powerlessness postmodernity also a search for alternatives to an obedient lumpenproletariat? Is not a backlash against postmodernity also a desire to find a new alternative to a proletariat as suggested by Jean Cohen's (1982) review of the four types of neo-marxist class analysis; perhaps a new class of 'rightsproletariat' comfortable with new social movement theory, and who are sparked not by class consciousness but by a 'rights consciousness' or a "discourse of rights" (Brown, 1991:690) which Bernstein⁽²⁹⁸⁾ would clearly have supported⁽²⁹⁹⁾? These musings are speculations solely intended to inspire further inquiry; may they also spark some thought designed to keep 'class' in the debate surrounding the concept of culture.

For me, 'lumpenproletariat' are attached to the postmodernist condition. The concept represents the Engels (1847a:83-84) class of "immediate, everyday interests", detached from any 'class consciousness' yet attached to some condition of 'obedience consciousness' to a now postmodernist 'bourgeoisie'.

Marx and Engels left open the possibility that the concerns that upset 'lumpenproletariat' were related to issues like ethnicity or religion. They did not waver from referring to the lack of class consciousness among 'lumpenproletariat' but did refer to the quality that they had held in some regard; their religion or their ethnicity. While often staying clear of such terminology, at one point Marx and Engels (1850b:512-513) did not shy away from referring to some 'lumpenproletariat' as consisting of those "of Irish origin ... (and) Catholic by descent".

To confront a fear of 'lumpenproletariat' bigotry, some writers search for a 'new hero' as Alvin Gouldner (1985) suggested. Perhaps a postmodernist 'rightsproletariat' wishing to build new social movements and who are motivated by 'rights consciousness' against some enemy as Cohen (1982) implies? By engaging in what Lyotard (1984) called a "language game", perhaps an analytical model which includes class structure and which acknowledges the importance of 'lumpenproletariat' could be constructed to help enrich the modernity versus postmodernity debate⁽³⁰⁰⁾.

In closing, throughout this project I have shown that the concept 'lumpenproletariat' has been altered from its original Marx and Engels 'societal drop-ins' meaning by recent writers who applied it in a most 'non-consensual' manner, including Hal Draper's (1978) connotation of 'societal dropouts'.

ENDNOTES LISTED BY CHAPTER TITLE**BACKGROUND**

1. Best reflecting this 'lost' condition are two frequently published journals which addressed issues that Marx and Engels examined; they are the 'New Left Review' and 'Monthly Review'.

(1) As editor of 'New Left Review', Robin Blackburn placed the cover page label 'Marx Centenary' on issue Number 138 covering March-April of 1983 wherein the 'Themes' pages 1-3 addressed the 100th anniversary of Marx's death in April of 1883. However, in issue Number 212 covering July-August of 1995, Engels and his death on August 5, 1895, was absent from the 'Themes' pages 1-2; yet, note was made of the death of Ernest Mandel on July 20, 1995 by the continuing editor Robin Blackburn.

(2) As editors of 'Monthly Review', Paul Sweezy and Harry Magdoff wrote the lead cover article 'Marxism and Revolution 100 Years After Marx' on pages 1-11 in Volume 34(10) of March, 1983. However, the 100th anniversary death of Engels issue in Volume 47(3) of July-August of 1995 was given by editors Sweezy and Magdoff to guest editors - John B. Foster of the University of Oregon and Ellen M. Wood of York University - to produce a large 160 page special issue on the subject of postmodernism. In the next issue, Volume 47(4) of September of 1995, an article by Michael Lowy on pages 26-28 notes the 50th anniversaries of both Auschwitz and Hiroshima. Still no mention of Engels' death! However, Sweezy and Magdoff did not forget; about four months after the date, in Volume 47(6) of November of 1995, a reprint of an Engels' article on pages 1-15 appeared to commemorate the 100th anniversary in the regularly published 'Monthly Review'.

2. On these occasions Eduard Bernstein wrote about 'proletariat':

First: "The proletariat as the sum total of wage-labourers is a reality; the proletariat as a class acting with a common purpose and outlook is largely a figment of the imagination" (Bernstein, 1898a:241).

Second: "There is no homogeneous proletariat any more than there was a homogeneous people or homogeneous third estate" (Bernstein, 1898b:326).

3. Herbert Marcuse (1964:xiii) finds that today there is an "absence of demonstrable agents and agencies of social change". The diachronic problem, Marcuse (1964:25-29) contends, is that:

The proletarian of the previous stages of capitalism was indeed the beast of burden. ... Thus he was the living denial of his society. In contrast, ... in ... technological society (he) lives this denial less conspicuously and ... he is being incorporated into the technological community of the administered population. ... The machine process in the technological universe breaks ... labour in one unconscious, rhythmic automatism. ... Changes in the character of work and

the instruments of production change the attitude and the consciousness of the labourer, which become manifest in the ... 'social and cultural integration' of the labouring class with capitalist society.

An unconscious proletariat makes change difficult; so it seemed necessary to find a new agent to spark the proletariat. For Marcuse (1964:208), skilled people had to make "the distinction between true and false consciousness become meaningful" for the proletariat via existing language and thought practices.

4. Andre Gorz (1964:105-106) holds that while the proletariat remains oppressed, its diachronic class content has changed:

The impossibility of living which appeared to the proletarians of the last century as the impossibility of reproducing their labour power becomes for the workers of scientific or cultural industries the impossibility of putting their creative abilities to work. Industry in the last century took from the countryside men ... their health ... in a hostile ... world. The industry of the ... twentieth century increasingly tends to take men from the universities and colleges, men who have been able to acquire the ability to do creative or independent work ... which spins in a vacuum and runs the risk of perishing for lack of an opportunity to be usefully put to work.

This change in oppressive conditions was to manifest itself in a different kind of proletariat. The old proletariat has become a new proletariat whose new workplace experiences of "mass action" will "provoke" them, wrote Gorz (1964:32), to "a heightening of consciousness ... (by) shifting the struggle away from the purely economic level toward the level of the class struggle".

This argument from 1964 was not maintained by Andre Gorz. In summing the revolutionary potential of the proletariat some 16 years later, Andre Gorz (1980:64) would write: "By its nature the proletariat is incapable of becoming the subject of power".

5. Erik Olin Wright (1978:31) wanted to "explore the problem of understanding class boundaries in advanced capitalist society". In his version of the concept class, Wright (1985:28) holds:

... that classes have a structural existence which is irreducible to the kinds of collective organizations which develop historically (class formations), the class ideologies held by individuals and organizations (class consciousness) or the forms of conflict engaged in by individuals as class members or by class organizations (class struggle), and that such class structures impose basic constraints on these other elements in the concept of class.

This view tended to be a synchronic interpretation of the concept class. Conceptual properties such as the diachronic class consciousness and class formation were generally not important to the boundaries of Wright's (1978, 1985) projects. Indeed, the

words 'class consciousness' had disappeared from the "Subject Index" of a recent book by Erik Olin Wright (1994:265-271).

6. Alvin Gouldner (1979:20) argues the diachronic proletariat, as a universal class, has become transformed from an "old working class" to a "new class":

The New Class 'is' a 'new' class: it is neither identical to the old working class nor to the old moneyed class; while sharing elements of both, it also has characteristics possessed by neither. Like the working class, the New Class earns its living through its labour in a wage system; but unlike the old working class, it is basically committed to controlling the content of its work and its work environment, rather than surrendering these in favour of getting the best wage bargain it can negotiate. The New Class's consciousness is thus not 'economistic'. It is committed to producing worthy objects and services and to the development of the skills requisite for these. It is, therefore, not simply a proletariat alienated from work which is experienced as a process in which the dead products of past human labour dominate its own living labour in the present. Aspiring to produce worthy objects and services, the New Class ... thus embodies any future hope of working class self-management.

In the face of the Marx and Engels belief in the decline of all remaining classes during the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, this reconstruction of the proletariat seemed to be justified. Since Marx and Engels looked only to the working class, Gouldner (1985:9) argues "that far from being a declining class, intellectuals were a growing one".

7. For Jean Cohen (1982:21) a class-based solution to a 'passive proletariat' seemed to be "the obvious response to such confusion ... (in) the concept of class, whether in the form of a refurbished, revised, or distorted Marxism".

8. Jean Cohen (1982:211) would write that "an alternative to this approach is to make collective actors and their forms of struggle the starting point of the analysis of society and to enter thereby directly into interpretation of the nature, projects, and stakes of social movements".

9. On the point that there exists a search for a historical agent with a proper consciousness to desirably change the world, Gouldner (1985:22-27) noted that for Machiavelli it was a 'Prince', for the Enlighteners it was an 'Enlightened Monarch', for Claude Henri Saint-Simon it was the 'industriels', for Auguste Comte it was the 'positivists', and for Marx and Engels that historical agent was the 'proletariat'.

10. Such questions might be: Was Bernstein right on proletariat? Did we dismiss other explanations? Might Bernstein's rejection of the Marx and Engels 'proletariat' be based on a misunderstanding of the Marx and Engels concept of class?

11. Engels (1895:533-534) wrote back to Karl Kautsky to find in his project two "main faults. ... A very inadequate examination of the ... 'pre'proletariat. ... You speak of proletarians ... and bring in the weavers. ... Only in so far as these existed, can you make them into your proletariat".

12. On this betrayal of the instincts and training of later researchers, additional comment is warranted on concepts.

Herbert Blumer (1969:148-149) distinguished a "sensitizing concept" from a "definitive concept" as: "Whereas definitive concepts provide prescriptions of what to see, sensitizing concepts merely suggest directions along which to look".

Whereas this project is an attempt to view lumpenproletariat as a definitive concept; it will become evident below that many current users tended to view it as but a sensitizing concept.

13. More fully defined, Bertell Ollman (1968:575) referred to the lumpenproletariat as:

... the 'dangerous class' ... composed of 'the social scum, that passively rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of old society' ... as 'a recruiting ground for thieves and criminals of all kinds, living on the crumbs of society, people without a definite trade, vagabonds, people without a hearth or a home' ... a gathering place for all the unemployed poor ... (who) sell their services to the bourgeoisie, who use them as strike-breakers, labor spies, and fighters against the workers in times of revolution.

14. The 'Bernsteinist' lumpenproletariat, as noted by Ollman (1968), reverberates through Canadian sociology 26 years later. About 400 first year sociology students in Carleton University in 1994-1995 were invited to read Carl Cuneo's (1993:104-138) 'Chapter 6. Class Structure and Process' during their studies which relies on Ollman's (1968) view of Marx's use of class. The Canadian text 'Foundations of Modern Sociology', 5th and 6th editions by Metta Spencer (1990:220; 1993:154-180) - the latter used on students of sociology at Concordia University during 1994-1995 - and a third text 'Sociology Revisited: Basic Concepts and Perspectives' by Murray Knuttila (1993), all uphold Ollman's (1968) view of lumpenproletariat. Thus Cuneo (1993:113-115) reproduces the Marx and Engels use of class that is exemplary of the Bernsteinist orthodoxy among people who even bother to refer to the concept for introductory students to sociology.

This seems critical of Canadian introductory textbooks who recognize the existence of the concept lumpenproletariat. I argue it is better to be critical of Canadian introductory textbooks

which ignore the concept. About 430 first year sociology students in Carleton University in 1993-1994 were invited to read 'Chapter 7. Social Stratification' by Edward G. Grabb (1992:195-235) which ignored the concept. Instead, Grabb (1992:199-202) treated these 430 Carleton University souls to a Bernsteinist revision of a Marx and Engels reformed proletariat.

It is tradition in Canadian introductory textbooks to ignore lumpenproletariat; likewise in the United States. Even the use of the concept class within introductory textbooks of sociology in the U.S. was fraught with problems. In a content analysis of 15 introductory textbooks on sociology in the U.S., Betsy Lucal (1994:147) found that "introductory textbook authors generally employ the traditional multiperspective approach when discussing topics, but they do not do so in discussions of class stratification". Employing a derivative of a model suggested by Stanislaw Ossowski (1963), Lucal (1994:146) writes "in conclusion, the discussions offered in these (15) introductory textbooks overwhelmingly favor distributional over relational models of class stratification".

Thus introductory students experience distributional rather than relational class stratification models in U.S. textbooks. As with the other orthodox interpretations, Canada's Metta Spencer (1990:220; 1993:163) by twice writing "7. Proletariat ... 8. Lumpenproletariat ..." leaves the introductory student with the impression the proletariat and lumpenproletariat relationship is only vertically distributional.

A question arises; as with other sociological topics, can a multiperspective approach be employed in teaching introductory class stratification with a greater application of the relational model? Specifically, can the work of Marx and Engels be used to discuss the relational model, and more specifically, can the differences between the distributional model and the relational model be illustrated to students through the work of Karl Marx?

The projected findings here say yes to finding a possibility of a better method to illustrate the distributional-relational interpretative divide in class stratification. In a review of Marx's social theory, Keith Graham (1992) suggests that his approach possessed both a "synchronic materialism" as well as a "diachronic materialism". It is suggested that when working with class models, distributionally, or synchronically, the concepts 'upper class', 'middle class', and 'working class' are mostly applied; relationally, or diachronically the concepts 'bourgeoisie', 'declassé', 'proletariat' and 'lumpenproletariat' were usually applied by Marx and Engels. This project's projected findings on 'lumpenproletariat' may help clarify the relational nature of the concept of class for introductory students.

15. Turner (1990:123) says "to develop parsimonious and inclusive theory in general, the goal should always be to raise the level of abstraction. That is, we should redefine concepts in generic terms so that they pertain to all times and places rather than only to some specific historical or empirical context".

Jonathan Turner's (1990; 1991) view of how concepts should be constructed has been endorsed by others. Harry Bash (1995:12) more elaborately conveyed to us the same points:

When we speak of concepts we refer to logical constructions that have symbolic significance within a specified context. As such, they ... are, themselves, nonempirical but can usually be empirically grounded, because they are comprised of selectively abstracted and generalized properties that are held in common by various, otherwise discrete, empirical objects or events. As abstractions, they make it possible for us to express, control, and process ideas about things, rather than our having to physically manipulate the things themselves.

Then after this outline of the importance of concepts, Harry Bash (1995:12) issues this warning:

We use concepts so readily and regularly and almost unconsciously that it is easy to fall into some habits of thought that, at least in science, have serious consequences that must be avoided. One such error can result from a failure to appreciate adequately that concepts really are 'abstractions' and 'generalizations' from particular empirical events. This can lead to a confounding of concepts with the actual things they symbolize, and thus the fallacious ascription to the 'concept' of properties that are really attributes of the 'phenomena' being conceptualized. ... Concepts are not intended to be isomorphic with, or faithful replicas of, the phenomenal world.

16. Bernard Cohen (1989:131-136) argues there exists "three primary objectives in concept formation" which amount to an intellectual tension among these objectives so concepts must be:

- (1) communicated precisely so as to avoid surplus meaning;
- (2) of empirical import to aide in operationization, and
- (3) of theoretical fertility which permit a broad usage within a variety of contexts.

In the tension between empirical import and theoretical fertility, Jonathan Turner (1991) favours the latter.

17. Beyond a sociological concept gone wrong, there is the issue which asks 'just what is sociology?'

At issue is Auguste Comte (1798-1857) who defined sociology. Comte (1830a) said the subject matter of sociology is bounded by the way in which the human mind worked. Comte (1830a:20-21) held that "human intelligence" developed with experience; as children, individuals think theologically by looking internally for absolutes and cause-effect relations, while as youth they think metaphysically, where abstract forces begin to be transitionally observed, and then as a mature person they think positively via reason and observation without major internal concern for cause-effect relations in a relative manner.

Thus Comte (1830a) hoped to develop a positive system of

inquiry that saw sociology among the most advanced of subjects within his "great synoptic table" (Comte, 1830b:64). Comte (1830a) believed a positivist method helped the intellectual division between the various sciences to dissolve. This method, Comte (1830a) argued, enabled mature people to think consistently about all sciences rather than continue existing inconsistencies of methodological thought among sciences. Comte (1830a:33-34) was concerned with the failure of psychology which seemed closer to a metaphysical or a theological "metaphor mistaken for reasoning".

Thus the mission entrusted to positivism was to make the subject of sociology a 'hard science'. The failure of Comte's dream is at issue; rather than develop into an 'adult science' of relatives, sociology remained a 'child's theology' looking for cause-effect relations as well as for absolutes. Arguably, this failure is articulated in a contest between a 'Comte positivist', or 'traditionalist', and someone who was an 'experimenter'.

FIRST, the experimenter. Steven Seidman (1994:2) complains of excessive use of the scientific method in sociology: Sociological theory is in crisis. One chief reason is the scientization of sociology. ... Unfortunately, sociologists have been unable to achieve anything approaching consensus about the core premises, concepts, and explanatory models that would provide the foundations of a science of society. ... Moreover, sociology's drive to be scientific has engendered a preoccupation with arcane conceptual and methodological debates among sociologists, especially theorists.

These words reflect a questioning the overuse of the scientific method in sociology. In a 361 page history of sociological theory, Seidman (1994:6) "identified three prominent styles of theory: philosophical, scientific, and moral. ... Most theorists combine these three styles of social analysis. ... To the extent that theorists make use of different theoretical styles, we can expect their writings to exhibit tensions and strains". To counter scientific method overuse one had to recapture some features of the Age of Enlightenment; "I believe", Seidman (1994:324) wrote, "that most critics are looking for ways to preserve the Enlightenment values of autonomy, tolerance, equality, and democracy". So Seidman (1994) wants theory style balance - philosophy, science, and morality.

SECOND, there was the traditionalist. Jonathan Turner (1989:420-421) declared:

... Sociology is clearly disintegrating. ... It ... reveals no real consensus ...; it can articulate few abstract laws, and even those that are articulated will be challenged; and its practitioners do not ... share goals, procedures, discursive forms, or standards of adequacy. ... Sociology will not ... be important ... outside academia in 'the real world'. ... In contrast, ... (other social science disciplines) are ... more ... unified ... and ... they have been far more successful than sociology in influencing policy

decisions in the real world.

These words reflect some thought upholding use of the scientific method as part of sociology most of modernity. In covering sociological theory, Turner (1974; 1978; 1991) wanted the scientific method to remain vital to sociology. The 1st, 2nd and 5th editions of 'The Structure of Sociological Theory' by Jonathan Turner (1974:1-12; 1978:1-15, 1991:1-30) reveals an increase in the physical volume of the subsequent edition's introductory chapter which outlined patterns in current theory, from 12 to 15 and then 30 pages - the latter in smaller size lettering - among the three editions. To counter scientific method underuse, one must recapture features of Comte's thought; Turner (1989:431) wrote, "could sociology rise again and realize the promise that Comte saw for a natural science of society?"

DILEMMA: Their two positions reflect a late 20th century divide in sociology. We have too much science versus too little science, and the Enlightenment versus Comte.

What was this positivist method which Turner defended? Through 17 years, Turner's (1974; 1978; 1991) writing stressed a four elements of theory ideal type model which included concepts, variables, statements, and formats in all five editions. By comparing two Turner (1978:1-15, 1991:1-30) projects, two impressions are gained. The first is of the growth of activity taking place in the formats phase at the back end of the steps; the formats material had grown from just over three pages in 1978 to more than ten in 1991 reflecting an increase in theoretical formats from two to nine in but 13 years. The second sense one gets from Turner (1978:1-15, 1991:1-30) is that there is relative inactivity at the model's front end. Thus Jonathan Turner's (1978:1-15, 1991:1-30) rewriting of the concepts element at the front end from the 2nd to the 5th edition is status quo; the two page subsection entitled 'Concepts: The Building Blocks of Theory' in both editions 13 years apart is almost identical.

Among the seven new theoretical formats at the model's back end in Turner's (1991) review was the "metatheoretical" scheme. Since Gouldner (1970) wrote of a "sociology of sociology", this metatheoretical sociology has its own identifier - metatheory.

Turner's (1974; 1978; 1991) examination shows an imbalanced development in the four basic elements of theory ideal model. This imbalance between front end and back end is motivation to examine the front end elements. While inactivity in the front end element of concept may reflect scientific stability and activity within the back end element of formats may reflect scientific instability, a reverse view is troubling. Inactivity within the front end element of concept may reflect scientific neglect.

If Turner's dream of achieving consensus is heartfelt, it may also be problematic. In recognizing that concept has too little activity to warrant a book revision, Turner (1974; 1978; 1991) may be adding to scientific inaccuracy. This is important; if a concept is labelled with characteristics which are adopted but if these are inaccurate, does it make good science to continue to only link these properties with the concept?

18. Building on the idea of a sociology of sociology, George Ritzer (1991:5-6) suggests there exists a larger sociological umbrella called "metasociology" which not only included the subfield of metatheorizing - which was the systematic study of sociological theory - but this field of metasociology would also contain meta-data-analysis - the systematic study of data - and metamethods - the systematic study of methodology - and metasubstantivity - which was the systematic study of substantive sociology - and the metaconceptualization subfield which is the systematic study of sociological concepts.

19. It should be noted that Jonathan Turner (1980:9) would be unhappy with this project on a sociological concept:

Much of what is called theory in sociology involves concept formulation and reformulation. ... But all too often, theory in sociology becomes a game of definitions as the 'real meaning' of a concept is asserted. Moreover, this fetishism over concepts is frequently mixed with theory as the history-of-social-thought strategy, as scholars debate what Marx, Weber, Durkheim, or Mead 'really meant' by terms. ... Modern sociological theory is often little more than arguments over definitions. ... The result of this definitional approach is that theory is arrested at a very preliminary stage.

20. The Marx and Engels created 'lumpenproletariat' is a variant of reflexive sociology. Two dualisms exist on how to do it:

First, Alvin Gouldner (1970:481-512) suggests theory is the internal product of a reasoning person as an active agent.

Second, Pierre Bourdieu (1992:71-182) suggests theory is also the external product of limits placed on a passive agent.

This project is a mixture of both perspectives. While noting that an active Marx and Engels internally reasoned the necessity to create the concept lumpenproletariat, due to the theoretical space remaining as the result of their stand on the proletariat, this effort also holds that the restricting external product, the presence of the existing concept proletariat, also positioned both Marx and Engels as having to react as passive inheritors of a well established class concept - proletariat.

METHOD

21. Alternatively, George Ritzer (1991:5-6) might call this the systematic process of "metaconceptualization".

This is not the first time someone studied a sociological concept that was applied by Marx and Engels. The concepts of 'ideology' and 'proletariat' have been respectively examined by Etienne Balibar (1994:87-123; 1994:125-149). On the Marx and Engels use of the concept 'ideology', Balibar (1994:88-89) wrote:

Our starting point is marked by the odd distribution of the term 'ideology' in Marx's and Engels's texts themselves. Omnipresent in the writings of 1845-1846, reduced to a few peripheral appearances in the period 1847-1852, ideology is almost nowhere to be found after that until its full-blown restoration in the 1870s, chiefly from the 'Anti-Duhring' on. ... (I)t has actually been formulated 'twice', in disparate historical contexts and within problematics that preclude any immediate conflation; 'first', in 'The German Ideology' by Marx and Engels (mostly Marx), an unpublished text whose uneven yet insistent influence, brought to light by various rereadings and rediscoveries, can be traced throughout the entire history of Marxism; and 'second', in the group of historical and philosophical texts, mostly by Engels, designed to provide Marxism, for the first time, with the appearance of a system. Writing these texts over two decades, Engels at once gave historical materialism its name, rediscovered the term 'ideology' and (temporarily) covered over the problems it posed in the guise of an entirely coherent, indeed even positivistic, definition. ... (F)ollowing its massive use in 'The German Ideology', ideology almost vanished from the discourse of Marx and Engels. There are a few furtive appearances from 1846 to 1852, primarily as polemical references to the 'ideologists' of the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie (Proudhon et al), then nothing more. There is no mention of ideology in the great analyses of the conjuncture and the balance of power such as 'The Eighteenth Brumaire', which Engels nonetheless took as the model of a materialist account of historical events. ... Ideology does not appear in the preliminary work of 'Capital' (notably the 'Grundrisse'), nor even in the detailed critique of the economists ('Theories of Surplus Value'). ... Above all, there is nothing about ideology in 'Capital', which, whether one likes it or not, is the cornerstone on which the Marxist edifice rests. ... (Thus) conspicuous (is) the absence of ideology in the theoretical space of 'Capital' and generally within what can be called the moment of 'Capital' in the history of Marxism.

22. Auguste Comte (1830b:53) argued that his 'ladder of knowledge' should be organizationally classified:

... by the study of the most general or most simple phenomena ... proceeding by successive degrees to the most particular and the most complex ... in a truly methodical manner. ... For the order of generality or of simplicity, as it determines the sequence of the various fundamental sciences according to the successive dependence of their phenomena, determines also their degree of difficulty. At the same time ... the most general and simple phenomena being necessarily the most remote from man, will be studied in a calmer and more rational spirit, which is another reason for the corresponding (more general) sciences developing more rapidly. ... (Thus sequentially) the second class are obviously more complicated and highly individualized than the first; they depend on the first, while the first are not at all dependent on the second.

23. According to Auguste Comte's (1830b:49) early writing on the examination of a science:

Every science may be expounded in two essentially different ways, the historical and the dogmatic, any other being merely a combination of these two. In the first, knowledge is expounded in the order in which it has been acquired by humanity, following as much as possible the way in which it has been acquired. In the second, the system of ideas is presented as it could be conceived today by a single mind which sought, from a suitable point of view and with sufficient knowledge, to recreate the science as a whole. The first (historical) mode is obviously the one in which we begin the study of any incipient science; it is ... of its formation, and ... consist in the chronological study of the various original works that have contributed to its progress. The (second) dogmatic mode presupposes that all these particular (chronological) labours have been recast in a general system and present themselves in a natural logical order, and is therefore only applicable to a science which has already reached an advanced stage of development. As the science progresses, the 'historic' order becomes less and less practical, because of the long series of points that it is necessary to cover; while the 'dogmatic' order becomes ever more possible, as well as necessary, because new conceptions enable one to present previous discoveries from a more direct point of view.

This project is a combination of both methods. However, because the very creation of the concept being studied is at issue, the project leans as much as possible - space constraints remain an issue - towards the historical mode rather than the dogmatic.

24. The terms lumpenproletariat and proletariat are used in authored books, edited books which feature individually authored articles, and academic journals that also feature a number of individually authored articles.

25. The Subject Cataloging Division of the Library of Congress assign a "subject heading" of "proletariat" to some library space "HD4801-HD4854" (Anonymous, Library of Congress, 1989:3239), but did not assign a "subject heading" to 'lumpenproletariat' for any library space (Anonymous, Library of Congress, 1989:2371).

26. The Sociofile database, or Sociological Abstracts, is a population of all articles published from January of 1974 within European and North American journals whose title includes the word 'sociology' plus those journals catalogued by the Library of Congress under the subject 'sociology' as well as including a partial population of articles by some held to be sociologists.

27. Once 'lumpenproletariat' is typed as input to be searched, this action triggers all abstracts of articles within the Sociofile database of Sociological Abstracts to be scanned for the presence of the word lumpenproletariat in the abstract. Those journal articles which contain the term but whose abstract does not feature the word are overlooked by the scan. Yet those articles wherein the concept was judged to be sufficiently central to, or prominent enough to, an article's core content to warrant its inclusion within the abstract were all included.

28. Of 34 abstracts, 13 had 'sociology' in their journal title.

29. The 34 abstracts and 38 articles difference was due to multiple article references in some of the 34 abstracts.

30. So 34 abstracts contained the term 'lumpenproletariat', while 962 abstracts contained the term 'proletariat'.

31. The 26 written in English journal articles were gathered from their most accessible geographic location via the most efficient economic means available to me located in Ottawa.

32. Since I do not have command of any of the remaining eight European languages covering these 12 articles, only the 26 English articles were gathered and then reviewed to get a current interpretation of 'lumpenproletariat'.

33. Three primary source documents were gathered and researched for the use of the term lumpenproletariat:

FIRST, the English language translations of Marx and Engels' documents are available in 'Marx-Engels: Collected Works', published since 1975. By searching through each index in the presently available 44 volumes of the projected 50 volume series, the majority of the uses collected for the before database were

obtained through this first procedure. The major limitation with this source of documents is the absence of volumes 35, 36, 37, 48, 49 and 50 which have yet to reach the university library shelves in Ottawa, Ontario. These six missing volumes are being reserved for translations of the three volumes of 'Capital' as well as the post-1886 personal letters of Frederick Engels.

SECOND, another cross-check search for lumpenproletariat in documents in the German language 'Gesamtausgabe', published since 1972, was done. Since the English spelling of lumpenproletariat is the same as the German lumpenproletariat, a search through the indexes of existing 90 volumes of this yet to be completed German language series was done with the hope of gathering additional uses of the concept to supplement the evidence obtained through the indexes in the English 'Marx-Engels: Collected Works'. It was hoped this cross-check indexing research would ensure a more thorough collection of evidence for the before database. This proved to be successful; further uses of lumpenproletariat were found through this cross-check indexing of 'Gesamtausgabe'.

THIRD, a successful cross-check indexing of 'Gesamtausgabe' led me to a second cross-check indexing. Since 'Gesamtausgabe' was an incomplete set of Marx and Engels projects, a search for the term lumpenproletariat within the Marx and Engels' documents contained within the German language 'Marx-Engels: Werke', published since 1962, seemed a logical decision. Through the indexes of each of the 44 volumes of this now complete series, it was hoped to gather still more uses to supplement the evidence gained through each of the indexes of 'Marx-Engels: Collected Works' and of 'Gesamtausgabe'. It was hoped that this double cross-check of indexes of each volume would ensure a still more thorough collection of evidence for the before database. This notion proved to be successful; further uses of lumpenproletariat were found as the result of this double cross-check of indexes by examining the indexes of each volume of 'Marx-Engels: Werke'.

SUMMARY: The indexes of a total of 178 volumes of the written work of Marx and Engels in two languages were reviewed to uncover the use of the term lumpenproletariat.

34. Indeed, I uncovered three levels of conceptual disclosure by writers within 16 articles; these will be noted below.

35. The analysis suggests that since the early 1970s, current users in the Meaning of Label approach appear to have taken the use of the concept through two distinct stages of conceptual development which I characterized, firstly, as conceptual confrontation and near death in the 1970s, and secondly, as conceptual resurrection from near death in the 1980s and beyond.

36. This user writes from the Meaning of Label school; he was referenced by a few current users within the after database on the lumpenproletariat. These will be pointed out below.

CURRENT APPLICATIONS OF CONCEPT LUMPENPROLETARIAT

37. Sociological Abstracts is a complete population of abstracts of all articles in journals which include the word 'sociology' in their titles, plus an incomplete population of the abstracts of all journal articles on the subject sociology that were published since January of 1953 and continuing to December, 1995.

38. This is Volume 7, Number 1 of Sociological Abstracts. The first issue of Volume 1 appeared in 1953.

39. Sociofile is a complete CD-Rom package of all abstracts contained within the pages of Sociological Abstracts beginning from January of 1974 and continuing to December of 1995.

40. Western authors have applied the concept in articles written in Dutch (Bovenkerk, 1980), French (Berrocal, 1981; Kane, 1977), German (Knauder, 1984), Italian (Sarcinelli, 1994; Lelli, 1977; Florea, 1974), Polish (Nowakowski, 1975), Portuguese (Saffioti and Ferrante, 1983), Russian (Kozlova, 1993; Efirov, 1979) and Spanish (Kenworthy, 1975). Aside from the Dutch article - also written up in English - no translations were gathered.

41. On the 'convenience of label' versus the 'meaning of label'. Herbert Blumer (1969:148-149) saw a dualism between a "definitive concept" and a "sensitizing concept" as: "Whereas definitive concepts provide prescriptions of what to see, sensitizing concepts merely suggest directions along which to look".

Writers in the 'convenience of label' approach treat the term more as a sensitizing device; writers in the 'meaning of label' approach seek a definitive meaning to the concept.

42. The staff at Sociological Abstracts classify each abstract according to 94 subfields or substantive areas of sociology; the 34 abstracts with 'lumpenproletariat' fit into 17 of the 94 subfields of which 3 subfields contain 17 of the 34 abstracts (see Appendix 1.3). From 7 abstracts in the political systems subfield, to 6 in the stratification-mobility subfield, and 4 in the marxist-radical sociology subfield, 10 of the 22 English language abstracts are from these final 2 subfields of sociology, while 5 of the 12 other language abstracts originate from the first political systems subfield wherein they form the majority.

43. As Appendix 1.3 suggests, English language concept users apply it in the subfields of stratification-mobility, marxist and radical sociology, and the subfield of crime, while non-English writers use the term in the context of the sociological subfields of political systems, feminist studies, as well as the sociology of literature subfield. Thus some bias may exist in my findings.

44. The definitionally ambitious users take the time and written space to disclose to readers just how they defined the qualities of the concept as they saw it (Tunnell, 1990; Mahabir, 1988).

45. The definitionally modest users briefly define the concept to disclose only a few spatial boundaries (Kowalewski, 1991; McDonogh, 1991; Form and Hanson, 1985; Leontidou, 1985; Burnham, 1984; Wright, 1980; Pandey, 1978; Mason, 1977).

46. The definitionally deficient users simply apply the concept without much disclosure of its boundaries, effectively assuming that the reader somehow knows just what is meant by the term lumpenproletariat (Srinivasan, 1992; French, 1978; Woodward, 1978; Valentine, 1975; Miller, 1975; Gouldner, 1974).

47. These writers never apply a label to their collection of characteristics. These writers simply discuss the boundaries of the concept but they never apply the label lumpenproletariat to the collection of characteristics they disclose (Eckstein, 1984).

48. This fourth group has other writers, after reading the discussion of these characteristics, take written space to disclose something like, 'in their article, writer 'E' actually discussed lumpenproletariat' (Burnham, 1984). Since writer 'E' does not apply the label to his characteristics discussed, perhaps wishing to not apply a judgmental label to the qualities, the single article - the 17th - is not being considered here.

49. Pierre Bourdieu (1987:9) draws a divide between an "analytical construct", that is, a "scholarly vision" of a concept, and an alternative "folk category", that is, a "popular vision" of a concept which is, in effect, a "social fiction produced and reproduced by the magic of social belief".

50. The 1970s U.S. "judicial system is," French (1978:34) wrote, "an outgrowth of a larger social process whereby social groups are dichotomized into acceptable in-groups (bourgeois) and unacceptable out-groups (proletariat and lumpen-proletariat)".

51. The three users wrote:

(1) David Kowalewski (1991:135) noted that "unfavorable opinions ... among proletarian or lumpenproletarian classes" existed between these two similar groups.

(2) Lila Leontidou (1985:540) placed "the marginal poor ... casual labour ... and ... 'disposable' labour ... with the marxist categories of the proletariat, labour reserve, and lumpenproletariat".

(3) Writing on Marxist theory, Alvin Gouldner (1974:390) notes that "a proletariat, peasantry, or even lumpen-proletariat, may all commonly become objects of political mobilization".

52. On 'sameness' these two writers note:

(1) After noting the presence of hierarchical classes above them, Cynthia Mahabir (1988:335) says "the development of urban ... lumpenproletariat ... produced a special type of proletarian" implying that they are the same people.

(2) Richard Wright (1980:134-135) shows an "upper class" and "middle class", but within the "lower class" implies that "proletariat" and "lumpenproletariat" are the same.

53. These two definitionally modest wrote:

(1) Form and Hanson (1985:243) say lumpenproletariat comprise "only those in the lowest stratum of society ... wherein they are exploited ... (in) the worst and poorest paying jobs".

(2) Charles Valentine (1975:2) envisioned a reverse "class order consisting of (i) a lumpenproletariat, (ii) a proletariat or working class, (iii) a bourgeoisie making up the middle classes, and (iv) an elite or upper class". These two concept users saw the 'proletariat' as having spatial placement above the 'lumpenproletariat'.

54. Kenneth Tunnell (1990:40) wrote that "(t)he lumpenproletariat ... is ... the lifeless or useless proletariat".

55. Lila Leontidou (1985:542) saw "workers ... (versus the) lumpenproletariat" thus suggesting that the latter were unemployed and were somehow in opposition to employed workers.

56. On the 'marginality' of the class, Charles Valentine (1975:9) held that "all exceptions to the established order of social structure and supporting values appear 'marginal' - be they ... lumpenproletarians in a bourgeois and working class society".

57. Among this group of users, I include Kenneth Tunnell (1990:49), Cynthia Mahabir (1988:317), Richard Wright (1980:130), P.S. Pandey (1978:316), and Tim Mason (1977:67-68).

58. Among those identified as belonging to this group are David Kowalewski (1991:137), Gary McDonogh (1991:326-327), Cynthia Mahabir (1988:316), Form and Hanson (1985:243), Lila Leontidou (1985:540) and Tim Mason (1977:67).

59. Two users saw the importance of the age and the sex of the individual (Cynthia Mahabir, 1988:317; Tim Mason, 1977:67).

60. Having conceded the poor might work, the definitionally modest Form and Hanson (1985) may have meant that all poor people and all black people were to be exclusively included.

61. On the presence of lumpenproletariat within today's U.S., Burnham (1984:154) asked: "Why ... is the lumpen ... so much greater here than in other countries, even those which - like Canada - are also settler societies rather than nation states?"

62. Two writers who expressed this view were Kenneth Tunnell (1990:40) and Wilbur Miller (1975:94).

63. Two people who shared this view were Kenneth Tunnell (1990:40) and Cynthia Mahabir (1988:316,323).

64. Burnham (1984:153) noted that "like much else in Marx, there is an emotional charge in such terms which may distract from the recognition that there may be analytic merit in the distinction" between lumpenproletariat and any other concepts he put to use.

65. These three styles of thought can be outlined as:

(1) A first suggests that the lumpenproletariat attempt to better their life condition by joining official or legal collective organizations (Tim Mason, 1977:67-68).

(2) Another suggests that they attempt to better their life condition by joining unofficial or illegal collective organizations (Cynthia Mahabir, 1988:316).

(3) Yet another holds that the lumpenproletariat attempt to better their life condition without joining any of the collective organizations; rather, these people take individual actions toward self-betterment (Kenneth Tunnell, 1990:42).

66. These three categories are thus seen as:

(1) Some users of the concept suggest that lumpenproletariat lacked any stable political consciousness (Kenneth Tunnell, 1990:40-41; Tim Mason, 1977:68-69).

(2) Other users suggest that lumpenproletariat indeed had a stable political consciousness (Cynthia Mahabir, 1988:316,326).

(3) Still other users suggest that lumpenproletariat lacked any stable political consciousness but then suggest that certain conditions might bring that class towards a more stable political consciousness (Kowalewski, 1991:141; Alvin Gouldner, 1974:390).

67. The two styles on the 'power' issue are:

(1) Some say lumpenproletariat possess political power and influence (Wilbur Miller, 1975:94; Cynthia Mahabir, 1988:326).

(2) Others argue lumpenproletariat do not hold any type of political power or influence (Kenneth Tunnell, 1990:41; Richard Wright, 1980:131).

68. The two groups are: a first says the lumpenproletariat rebel individually (Kenneth Tunnell, 1990:41); a second suggests the lumpenproletariat collectively rebel (Cynthia Mahabir, 1988:326).

69. The two 'past-present' viewpoints are:

(1) the 'past' was noted by Lila Leontidou (1985:542) who called "the 'lumpenproletariat', which have the connotations of European class theory, ... a relic of the past, residual from other modes of production".

(2) the 'present' was used by P.S. Pandey (1978:316) who saw lumpenproletariat as "a new class" in a modern economy who were

now "released from the security of traditional (Indian) economy".

70. The two stances:

(1) The first 'denies' that a particular mode of production can create the lumpenproletariat. Reflecting this denialist stance but also overlooking the possible presence of a density of capitalist concentration independent variable in current U.S. capitalism is Walter Dean Burnham (1984:154).

(2) The second 'affirms' that a particular mode of production may create the lumpenproletariat. Somewhat reflecting this affirmative stance is Richard Wright (1980:131).

71. C.J. Munford was at the University of Guelph in Canada.

72. Thus "in order to comprehend and realize its revolutionary potential", Munford (1972:11-12) examined the "social hierarchy in contemporary black America".

73. This is the two-tier Munford (1972) model of black class structure in the U.S.:

At the very top of black America's class structure, sat a "tiny service stratum" composed of three main sub-strata: (1) the black 'professionals' who "served white America primarily, and the black community secondarily"; (2) the "traditional black business community", and (3) the "small but growing corps of black police officers" who "are now the white man's most faithful servitors in the domestic colony" (Munford, 1972:12-13). This was the top tier within the two tier model of black class structure.

Below the top tiny service stratum in black America's class structure is the second major tier. This tier comprises the "popular masses" which are further divided into four sub-classes which are "non-antagonistic" among each other (Munford, 1972:14). The first ranked subclass within popular masses is the "middle families" which "cling tenaciously to regular, but precarious employment" within the public sector (Munford, 1972:13). The second ranked popular masses subclass is the "proletariat" which are the regularly employed "black industrial workers" of the private sector (Munford, 1972:13). The third ranked subclass is the "semi-proletariat" which are the "irregularly" employed "manual labour" within the private sector disproportionately including many black women (Munford, 1972:14). The fourth and bottom subclass is the "lumpenproletariat" which are the "permanently unemployed and unemployable" (Munford, 1972:14). According to Munford (1972:14), many within this lowest class have "run afoul of the white man's repressive colonial laws" and "youth is one of this class' most outstanding features".

74. Munford (1972:21) said the "lumpenproletariat ... (is) a class whose objective material deprivation is being translated into a conscious awareness of the need for fundamental social changes". They are "the one class in black America whose collective social alternatives have been reduced to (either)

desperate escapism or revolutionary action" (Munford, 1972:21). Since they are "dispossessed and dehumanized, the ghetto lumpenproletariat has become the main implacably revolutionary social class in the country" (Munford, 1972:21). So "hegemony must rest with the 'lumpenproletariat' - the only class in the nation that is unwaveringly revolutionary" (Munford, 1972:23).

75. C.J. Munford (1972:22) argued "they are not ... degenerate" classes. Further, "a colonized 'lumpenproletariat' does not work because it is kept from working ... and ... are the stuff out of which urban guerilla soldiers ... are made" (Munford, 1972:22).

76. In agreement with Munford (1972), Cleaver (1972:7) wrote "(t)o be a man without a job or a woman ... without a job was to be lumpen(proletariat)". Also agreeing with Munford (1972), Cleaver (1972:9) wrote "(w)hen (proletarian) workers become permanently unemployed, displaced by the streamlining of production, they revert back to their basic lumpen(proletarian) condition". Likewise, Cleaver (1972:9-10) noted, "(t)he real revolutionary element of our era is the lumpen(proletariat) ... (because) (t)he basic demand of the lumpen(proletariat) - to be cut in on consumption in spite of being blocked out of production - is the ultimate revolutionary demand" of any class of people.

77. Saying they were misled, Cleaver (1972:7) wrote: "The system of relief, of charity, of welfare, ... elaborated into Social Security, is the best proof of the lumpenization of humanity. ... Instead of being plugged into the system through jobs, they are being plugged in through doles. ... Through the dole, ... so many people are bought off, the ... lumpen". On why were they bought off, he (1972:9) said "from the point of view of the lumpen, the dole plays the same function as a job - it allows them to get in on consumption (of goods and services)". Cleaver (1972:9) said "the lumpen(proletariat) has been sidetracked" and "ideologically confused, perceiving their true situation unclearly".

78. Wrote C.J. Munford (1973:48) in anger: "The seemingly common theme - the lumpenproletariat - ... (of both articles, can) in no way justify the association of two diametrically opposed political and philosophical world-views".

79. "In part, the overestimation of the importance of lumpenproletarians (in both articles) derives from a faulty definition of the lumpenproletariat which inflates a mere fraction of a social class into a full-fledged class in its own right" wrote a retreating Munford (1973:51).

80. Eldridge Cleaver was a former Minister of Information of the Black Panther Party in the United States of America.

81. Immanuel Wallerstein was at Canada's McGill University. Thus Canadian based scholars - Wallerstein and Munford - were 'front and centre' in the early 1970s dialogue on the lumpenproletariat.

82. Wallerstein (1973:25) said Marx used moral judgement by declaring lumpenproletariat to be from "unproductive occupations" who "are poor unfortunates whose psyches have been distorted as a by-product of the evils of the capitalist system, and have therefore become semi-criminals and potential renegades to the workers' cause". Then Wallerstein (1973:25) judged that "they remain thus a 'dangerous class' and would remain so until socialism removed the social roots of their existence".

83. Wallerstein (1973:25) wrote: "(T)he lumpenproletariat was not randomly recruited. No doubt in early 19th century Western Europe, as throughout the world today, there was a clear ethnic pattern to their recruitment, such that they came from 'lower ethnic classes', often migrants from farther points of the nation". Further, he (1973:27) noted that the "workers from lower ethnic groups ... provide a large part of the lumpenproletariat".

84. Wallerstein (1973:27) asked "under what conditions workers who de facto have, on an absolute level, a privileged position vis-a-vis other workers, might become more concerned with ending the exploitation by those above them rather than maintaining the differential advantage over those below them?"

85. In his interpretation of what Marxism meant, Mark Naison (1976:113) defined the lumpenproletariat simply as "referr(ing) to people who rejected the discipline of the labor market in favor of illegal economic activity and had a distinct, articulated value system which justified such a choice".

86. Mark Naison (1976:113) declared that "(n)o revolutionary organization in the United States currently views the lumpenproletariat as the cutting edge of social change". For Naison (1976:113) the lumpenproletariat seemed problematic for he interpreted the class as not embracing "the huge population of marginally employed people in capitalist countries. ... (Since) the lines that separate the unemployed and underemployed people from the 'working class' are so unclear that it may not be useful to impose upon them the historic weight of the term 'lumpen'".

87. Naison (1976:113) said that "to define 'them' (the willing criminal - ed) as a revolutionary vanguard can have disastrous social consequence." Naison (1976:114) said that "it is highly questionable whether any sizable number of ... [non-whites in the United States would] define themselves as revolutionary or would be willing to accept the hegemony of the lumpenproletariat".

88. Charles Valentine (1976:59) would argue that "most lumpen(proletariat) ... (1) battle constantly ... against the class system ... (2) are among the most aware and sensitive people in the community ... (3) are (not) more corrupt or corruptible than typical proletarians or bourgeoisie ... (and) ... (4) were highly disciplined in their activities".

89. The lumpenproletariat, according to Valentine (1976:61-63), was such that "the lumpen and proletarian responses to ... victimization are not the same ... (but were such that) relations between the lumpen and other classes have certainly been changing ... (for) the objective thrust of capitalism has always been toward the outcome that ... humankind would become lumpen. ... (Thus) the modern lumpen are more likely to be bought off by counterrevolutionary forces than are contemporary proletarians".

90. Frank Bovenkerk (1984:17-20) stated that lumpenproletariat was used within five differing contexts: (1) "as an historical remnant of an earlier society"; (2) "as a group of individual social degenerates"; (3) "as part of the general proletariat"; (4) "as category outside the economic system"; and (5) as "an odd mixture of miscellaneous other definitions".

91. In concluding, Frank Bovenkerk (1984:38) wrote, "(t)he lumpenproletariat was invented to cover the whole motley collection of people who did not fit into the class pattern anywhere and who behaved as political opportunists".

92. Peter Hayes (1993:116) wrote that "(h)istorians have found that the social composition of the (lumpenproletarian - ed) mobile guard made it indistinguishable from the (presumably proletarian - ed) working class".

93. Peter Hayes (1993:101) argues Marx also had a "circular" view of class structure wherein "(a)ll classes ... were defined through a configuration of characteristics held in common with adjacent classes (so that) (n)o classes ... held discrete characteristics (so that) (i)n fact ... classes ... shared certain class characteristics directly with each other".

94. According to Peter Hayes (1993), the five qualities of the lumpenproletariat included: (1) no direct involvement "in the productive process", that is, they did not work; (2) no ownership of property, that is, the means of production; (3) were "poorer than the proletariat"; (4) had "no aim to work"; and (5) having generally "thieving interests" or who were "morally corrupt".

95. These were prepared by Henry Pratt Fairchild (1944), G. Duncan Mitchell (1968; 1979), Thomas Ford Hault (1969), George A. Theodorson and Achilles G. Theodorson (1969), and by the trio of Nicholas Abercrombie, Stephen Hill and Bryan S. Turner (1988).

96. These were prepared by Michael Mann (1984), Anonymous (1986), and Gordon Marshall (1994).

97. Michael Mann (1984:211) stated that the lumpenproletariat were the "ragged or trash proletariat".

98. Anonymous (1986:164) saw the lumpenproletariat as "the lowest stratum of society, the unemployed or sporadically employed groups who live by tenuous means".

99. Gordon Marshall (1994:297) said they were "a class fraction ... (who were) marginal, unproductive, and also regressive".

100. James Russell (1980:68) saw the concept's boundaries having two parts: (1) "the petty criminal population" and (2) "the hobo population". Thus both groups lived "outside of the labor force". But they were unreliable because their "way of life made them unusually susceptible to becoming bribed agents of the state".

101. J. Wilczynski (1981:327) argued that the concept was "the worst elements ousted from different social classes and reduced to poverty by the conditions peculiar to capitalism" but are "not necessarily the poorest stratum of society and does not include the genuinely unemployed, invalids and old age pensioners" yet they are "too unstable, too demoralized and too eager to sell itself to the highest bidder ... usually the bourgeoisie".

102. Gerard Bekerman (1983:99) saw a moral concept; a "passively rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of old society" and as the "scum of the depraved elements of all classes".

103. Tom Bottomore (1983:292-293) held that the concept's features included the claims that it was the "refuse of all classes, a disintegrated mass" who would "form a free floating mass which is particularly vulnerable to reactionary ideologies".

104. Terrell Carver (1987:62) suggested that morally and politically the concept was "the dangerous class of ... ruffians who can be bribed to support the bourgeoisie".

FORMING A PROLETARIAT BEFORE A LUMPENPROLETARIAT

105. Previously, I documented a current concept not universally agreed to. Yet, the overall picture emerging is of a concept that theoretically tries to represent a synchronic underclass within a diachronic mode of analysis - I return to this point below. But the key point is that current users view the lumpenproletariat as representing some marginalized people not generally active in the labour force simply because the concept proletariat represents the working class which is generally active in the labour force.

106. Timothy McCarthy's (1978:71-78) work on the proletariat's origins was so indifferent - so seemingly unimportant - that he reduced his discussion on it to just an appendix.

107. According to Cicero (60:149-151), the proletarian was more specifically described as:

Servius ... called the rich 'money-givers', because they paid the expenses of the State, and named those who had less than 1500 denarii or nothing at all except their own persons, 'child-givers', to give the impression that offspring, that is to say, the progeny of the State, were to be expected from them. A number of individuals which was almost larger than that contained in the whole first class was placed in ... this proletarian class.

108. Montesquieu (1748:527) noted that below "those who were not enrolled in the first five classes, where one's placement depended on the amount of one's goods, were ... (a sixth class of proletarians; below this sixth were) those who were not enrolled in one of the six classes, ... who were called 'aerarii', ... or ... the Caerites ... ('In Caeritum tabulas referri; aerarii fieri': to be degraded to a citizen of the lowest class)".

109. Montesquieu (1748:527) said the sixth class of proletarians were not taxed in the same manner as were "the first five classes, where one's placement depended on the amount of one's goods, ... (and so they were taxed) on the amount of one's goods ... (but the proletarians) were taxed by the head".

110. Jean Jacques Rousseau (1762:95) wrote: "In this last class ... (of Cicero's, the) 'proletarians' were distinguished from 'capite censi'. The former not quite reduced to nothing, ... (while the latter were) (t)hose who had nothing at all, and ... were regarded as of absolutely no account".

111. This use was in a 1788 pamphlet written by a parish priest.

112. These four differing sources in 1789 were by: (1) a speaker in the National Assembly of France, (2) a lawyer's petition, and (3&4) in two written works by two article writers.

113. Rose (1981:286-289) said: "After 1789, French Revolutionary references to 'proletarian' are more marginal and scattered. ... I discover(ed) no public discussion of, and only a couple of public allusions to 'proletarians' between 1797 and 1824".

114. R.B. Rose (1981:288) wrote that "in a pamphlet circulated in the autumn of 1794 it was Babeuf who attached a new connotation, that of a propertyless class of 'proletarians' in 'economic' conflict with an aristocracy of property-owners, who used their dual power as owners of the land and employers of labour to keep the proletarians in perpetual subjection".

115. In preaching, Saint-Simon created concepts as "industry", "industrialist" and "industrial society" (Ionescu, 1976:30).

116. Auguste Comte (1820:102) saw an end to the proletarian class: "The abolition of slavery has of itself rendered all men proprietors, and since that time proletarians, in the rigorous acceptance of the word, have not existed".

117. Saint-Simon realized that his teachings were defeated "by the crass resistance of the upper classes" (Ionescu, 1976:8).

118. Saint-Simon (1824a:240) finally wrote: "It is by the use of force that the proletarians have been contained until now, and prevented from disrupting the social order".

119. In the 20 pages, "this mass of proletarians", Saint-Simon (1824b:222) said, had "proved and established a major political fact, which is, that the ... class ... is today composed of men whose intelligence is sufficiently developed and whose capacity for foresight is sufficiently strong for the law to be able to give up the tutelage it has exercised over them, without any disruption of public order".

120. Prosper Enfantin (1829:82-83) wrote that "in reality ... the advantages and disadvantages proper to every social position are transmitted through inheritance. ... (O)ne aspect of this fact, namely 'hereditary misery', ... (is) recognized within ... the existence of a class of proletarians".

121. The article by the clockmaker Charles Beranger (1831), entitled 'Petition of a Proletarian to the Chamber of Deputies', was published in 'The Globe' in February of 1831.

122. Seven of the 12 general qualities were uncontroversial.

Consensus existed within the second general quality of proletariat - they are part of a hierarchical structure, where non-members were either above or below them - and in the third general quality - they are composed of have-nots simply too poor or without property - and in the fourth general quality - the duty to produce children.

Consensus prevailed in the fifth general quality - they had responsibility of maintaining duties to someone - plus the seventh general quality - the different standard of taxation upon the class - and in the tenth quality - that class members are morally competent - and lastly, in the eleventh general quality - its historical micro level continuity.

123. Five of the 12 general qualities were controversial.

User contests took place within the first general quality of proletariat - its size - which seemed its most contentious. As David Lovell (1988:85) bluntly put it, "most discussions of the proletariat during this period stressed its size". This issue of size pre-occupied French intelligentsia for the 100 years from Montesquieu in 1748 to Auguste Comte in 1848. The debate was broad in scope; participants argued for any size ranging from 'all of the people', to 'urban factory wage workers', to even a denial of the concept's existence.

User contests quietly took place in the sixth general quality - they are not the lowest of the classes - although this quality is a victim of neglect among 19th Century users.

Users contest the eighth quality - class conflict between proletariat and other classes. This post-1789 quality has its camps of supporters and of denialists.

User contests prevail in the ninth general quality - the concept is historically discontinuous at the macro level - over whether the proletariat has ended, begun or even exist.

Other contests were fought over the twelfth general quality - conscious empowerment of the proletariat. Some users deny that the proletariat has ever possessed this quality while others affirm its presence.

124. Here's an overview of the Engels and Marx adoption of the term 'class' into their writings.

In 1839, Engels was an 18 year old high-school dropout who had become a commercial apprentice and a parttime writer. Engels (1839:9-10) first used "class" when describing an industrializing German community: "The most degraded ... are those known as 'Karrenbinder', totally demoralized people, with no fixed abode or definite employment. ... Factory work is largely responsible. ... Terrible poverty prevails among the lower classes, particularly (among) the factory workers". Using 'class' instead of 'estate', Engels saw the 'Karrenbinder' as a 'social class'.

And in 1842, Marx was a 23 year old ambitious academic who finally gave up seeking a university position by November of 1841 and had now turned to working in journalism. Marx (1842a:121) felt sufficiently liberated to introduce "class" into his work as he wrote: "Thus the instruction forbids writers to cast suspicion on the frame of mind of individuals or whole classes".

But this first use of 'classes' was not self-motivated; the term was forced upon this cautious journalist. In quoting 'whole classes' from a censorship instruction drawn up by the Government of Prussia in December of 1841, by February of 1842, Karl Marx

(1842a:123) was literally forced to adopt the term 'class'.

Thus by 1842, both men had used the term 'class'. But Engels (1842a:303) had now moved ahead to use the term 'proletarian'. But the progress of Marx in adopting 'proletarian' was slower; but he retained the word 'class'. An appointment as the Editor of 'Rheinische Zeitung' in October of 1842, coerced the 24 year old Marx to retain the word 'class' as part of his daily job.

In his first article as editor, Marx (1842b:216) wrote '(t)hat the estate that today owns nothing 'demands' to share in the wealth of the middle classes".

Later that month, Marx (1842c:234) wrote: "In these customs of the poor class, ... there is an instinctive sense of right".

In effect, Marx was coerced by his job into using 'class'. When reflecting on this job as Editor, Marx (1842c:744) wrote: "In the year 1842-43, as editor of the 'Rheinische Zeitung', I first found myself in the embarrassing position of having to discuss what is known as material interests. ... (This) caused me in the first instance to turn my attention to economic questions". As an editor, Marx was forced to use concepts such as 'class' as part of his job at a politically progressive paper.

125. At this point in time, Frederick Engels was a 21 year old part-time writer in military service in the artillery of Berlin.

126. In a short article written on June 25, 1842, and published in 'Rheinische Zeitung', Engels (1842a:303) declared that "when for once a jury in France or England acquits a poor proletarian who, driven to desperation by hunger, has stolen a pennyworth of bread, although the case was proved by witnesses and confession".

127. Engels (1842b:368-369) wrote that "when (English) people here speak of Chart sts and radicals, they almost always have in mind the lower strata of society, the mass of proletarians".

128. Engels (1842c:373-374) said: "The English proletarian is ... becoming aware of his power. ... This revolution is inevitable for England, but ... revolution will be social, not political".

129. Thus Engels (1842d:375-376) wrote: "The (synchronic) working class is daily becoming more and more imbued with ... radical-democratic principles ... and is increasingly coming to recognize them as the expression of its collective consciousness".

130. These articles on England were published by someone whom Engels briefly met. This was the editor of the 'Rheinische Zeitung', Karl Marx, whom Engels had met only briefly for the first time only two weeks earlier, about November 16, 1842, when Marx labelled Engels an "extremist" (Himmelfarb, 1984:272).

131. Engels (1843a:390) writes: "That is ... the life of the Irish proletarians. ... He bears the burden of five centuries of oppression with all its consequences. Is it surprising that ...

he strikes out blindly and furiously on every opportunity, ... altogether a matter of indifference what it is directed against, so long as it can strike out and destroy?"

132. With the closing of the 'Rheinische Zeitung' in March of 1843 in Germany, Marx flees to Paris in October of 1843, to begin another journal 'Deutsch-Französische Jahrbucher' which began publication in February of 1844. As well as an Engels (1843b) article on economics, the first issue features a Marx (1844a) project which includes his first use of the word 'proletariat'.

133. So 6 of the 12 general qualities are addressed:

Affirmed is the eighth general quality of class conflict. Here Marx (1844a:185-187) wrote: "Hence the ... proletariat is already beginning to struggle against the bourgeoisie".

Affirmed is the fifth general quality of duty to someone. Here Karl Marx (1844a:185-187) gave to the proletariat the duty to take on the "role of 'emancipator' ... (which) finally comes to the class which implements social freedom (in France). ... In Germany, on the contrary, ... (it comes) in the formation of a class with 'radical chains', ... the 'proletariat'".

The sixth quality not of the lowest class was endorsed. Marx (1844a:185-187) wrote: "The proletariat is ... not the 'naturally arising' poor but the 'artificially impoverished', not the human masses mechanically oppressed by the gravity of society but the masses resulting from the 'drastic dissolution' of society, mainly of the middle estate, that form the proletariat".

Support of the sixth quality was also a rejection of the third general quality - they possessed few financial resources.

The tenth general quality of moral competence among the proletariat is also supported. Karl Marx (1844a:185-187) wrote that the proletariat demonstrated their moral competence: "By demanding the 'negation of private property', the proletariat merely raises to the rank of a 'principle of society' what society has made the principle of the 'proletariat'. ... As philosophy finds its 'material' weapons in the proletariat, so the proletariat finds its 'spiritual' weapons in philosophy".

The ninth general quality of historical macro level discontinuity is also supported. Karl Marx (1844a:185-187) wrote: "The proletariat is coming into being in Germany only as a result of the rising 'industrial' development".

134. Thus here we have an illustration of just how thorough a process of thought that Karl Marx had undertaken as he finally unveiled his extensive intervention into the concept proletariat.

135. On the creation of the proletariat, Engels (1844:487) wrote: "The most important effect of the eighteenth century for England was the creation of the proletariat by the industrial revolution. ... Up to 1780 England had few proletarians".

136. On these duties, Engels (1844:487) notes: "Industry concentrated work in factories and towns; it became impossible to combine manufacturing and agricultural activity, and the new working class was reduced to complete dependence on its labour". The effect was to view duty as forced upon the class.

137. In July, 1844, Marx (1844b:200) wrote: "When today workers' revolts break out throughout England, the bourgeoisie and government there know no better what to do. ... Their sole expedient is material force, and ... this ... diminishes in ... proportion as the ... understanding of the proletariat increase".

138. In July of 1844, Marx (1844b:201-202) wrote: "First of all, ... the proletariat at once ... proclaims its opposition to ... private property. The ... uprising 'begins' precisely with ... consciousness of the nature of the proletariat".

139. Marx (1844b:202) said: "(M)ore developed ... the 'political' understanding of a people, the more does the 'proletariat' - at any rate at the beginning of the movement - squander its forces in senseless, useless revolts ... (and it) sees the cause of all evils in the 'will', and all means of remedy in 'violence' and in the 'overthrow' of a 'particular' form of state".

140. In distinguishing correct-incorrect proletariat behaviour in July of 1844, Marx now joined the Engels of May of 1843 in trying to articulate a 'code of behaviour' for the 'good' proletariat. But Marx was not yet prepared to banish such violations of the code of behaviour from the proletariat - his class of preference.

141. Marx (1844c:241) slips in and thus links the diachronic to the synchronic person when "saying that the 'proletarian', ie, the man who, being without capital and rent, lives purely by labour, and ... is considered by political economy only as a 'worker'. ... It does not consider him ... as a human being".

142. In the Paris of August of 1844, Marx and Engels meet again and agree to form a working partnership. Marx quits writing his economic manuscript and then Marx and Engels (1844) jointly begin work on a first project entitled 'The Holy Family'. Early in this project - the first 20% of it - they merge their not very differing definitions of the concept proletariat; Marx and Engels (1844:35-37) would write that definition up in response to the work of the anarchist P.J. Proudhon (1806-1865).

143. Thus the newly acquainted Marx and Engels (1844:35-37) wrote: "Proletariat and wealth are opposites; ... they form a single whole. ... (I)n the antithesis (i)t is not sufficient to declare them two sides of a single whole".

By viewing proletariat with the undesirable antithesis, it saw necessary to distinguish a party of property from their hero. So Marx and Engels (1844:35-37) wrote of its position: "Private

property ..., as wealth, is compelled to maintain 'itself', and ... the proletariat, in 'existence'. That is the 'positive' side of the antithesis, self-satisfied private property".

Against the party of property, the proletariat 'mission' was outlined. Thus they (1844:35-37) wrote: "The proletariat ... is compelled ... to abolish itself and ... its opposite, private property, which ... makes it proletariat. It is the 'negative' side of the antithesis, its restlessness within its very self, dissolved and self-dissolving private property".

Two parties confronted each other since 'undesirables' among their 'proletariat' were not yet found. They (1844:35-37) wrote: "Within this antithesis the private property-owner is therefore the 'conservative' side, the proletarian the 'destructive' side. From the former arises the action of preserving the antithesis, from the latter the action of annihilating it".

What the proletariat is, motivates its future activities. Thus Marx and Engels (1844:35-37) wrote: "It is not a question of what this or that proletarian, or even the whole proletariat, at the moment 'regards' as its aim. It is a question of 'what the proletariat is', and what, in ... this 'being', it will historically be compelled to do. Its aim and historical action is visibly and irrevocably foreshadowed in its own life situation".

But some proletariat members were believed to actively exist across Europe. So Marx and Engels (1844:35-37) optimistically write: "There is no need to explain here that a large part of the English and French proletariat is already 'conscious' of its historic task and is constantly working to develop that consciousness into complete clarity".

Having yet to confront the similar but undesirable elements, Marx and Engels embrace an optimistic view of their proletariat. Again, they link the pre-Marx designed proletarian 12th with the 11th and the 1st general qualities; so conscious empowerment is linked with its historical discontinuity at the macro level as well as with its group size.

144. To this point, both Marx and Engels had finished 'The Holy Family' which contained a critique of Eugene Sue's (1804-1857) book (1842) entitled 'The Mysteries of Paris' which they had read. Then by December of 1844, both had read Max Stirner's (1806-1856) book (1844) entitled 'The Ego And His Own'. As to the importance of these two works, I will return below.

145. Although this clue may have been alluded to in their earlier work, its emergence - or perhaps its re-emergence - on this particular occasion is very timely indeed.

146. Metaphorical raincloud blocking sunshine of emancipation?

OUT OF PROLETARIAT EMERGES A LUMPENPROLETARIAT

147. The three major findings were:

First, the concept contested for 100 years among French intelligentsia to derive 12 general qualities of the proletariat.

Second, Marx and Engels intervened in the existing contest and, as all intelligentsia before them, articulated a definition of the proletariat; albeit one constrained by previous dialogue.

Third, the Marx and Engels interpretation of the concept left some theoretical space between their idea of a proletariat and the entity they tried to articulate; more crassly, their diachronic proletariat inadequately accounted for the space given by the synchronic working class - their proletariat did not embrace the full population of the working class.

148. After the 11th thesis project by Marx and the project on the working class of England by Engels, both finished in the spring of 1845, they began a second joint project called 'The German Ideology' (Marx and Engels, 1846) in November of 1845 which they quit writing in August of 1846 and never published.

149. Here Marx and Engels (1846) discussed: First, a micro level code of behaviour for their ideal proletariat. Second, both the contestants in, and the direction of, the macro level class struggle within their antithesis society.

Thus to date, they articulated a code of behaviour for their proletariat in order to come to intellectual terms with certain non-proletarian behaviour at the micro level and to articulate the directionality of macro level antithesis class struggle.

150. Marx and Engels (1846) created the concept lumpenproletariat within their second joint project 'The German Ideology' from 1845 to 1846 while they had both lived in Brussels, Belgium.

151. Marx and Engels (1846:84) noted that "in (Roman) Italy, ... the plebeians, midway between freemen and slaves, never succeeded in becoming more than a lumpen-proletariat".

152. Marx and Engels (1846:202) write - as they interwove their voice with that of their view of Stirner's voice - that "in order to make the transition to communism ... the lumpen-proletariat becomes transformed into 'workers', into ordinary proletarians".

153. Frederick Engels (1847a:83-84) wrote:

And the propertyless, in common parlance the (synchronic - ed) working classes? ... It is sufficient to point to the division among them. This division into farm labourers, day labourers, handicraft journeymen, factory workers and lumpen proletariat, together with their dispersal over a great, thinly populated expanse of country with few and weak central points, already renders it impossible for them to realize that their

interests are common, to reach understanding, to constitute themselves into 'one' class. This division and dispersal makes nothing else possible for them but restriction to their immediate, everyday interests, to the wish for a good wage for good work. That is, it restricts the (synchronic - ed) workers to seeing their interest in that of their employers, thus making every single section of the workers into an auxiliary army for the class employing them. The farm labourer and day labourer supports the interests of the noble or farmer on whose estate he works. The journeyman stands under the intellectual and political sway of his master. The factory worker lets himself be used by the factory owner. ... For a few talers the lumpen proletarian fights out with his fists the squabbles between bourgeoisie, nobility and police. And where two classes of employers have contradictory interests to assert, there exists the same struggle between the classes of workers they employ.

So little is the mass of the workers in Germany prepared to assume the leadership in public matters.

154. This position by Engels (1847a) runs counter to the duo's hoped for transformation of the old lumpenproletariat into a new proletariat as seen in 'The German Ideology' of 1846 in Brussels.

155. Frederick Engels (1847b:246-247) both comments upon and quotes the one German poet he found who had defined the meaning of their 'lumpenproletariat' rather well:

Beck develops ... occasional fine passages in this ... description of the lumpen proletariat:
 'Who day by day ... hunt garbage ...,
 mend pans and grind knives, starch linen ...,
 push ... the heavy cart, ... crying piteously:
 Who'll buy, who'll buy?
 Who fight over a copper ...; who ...
 sing praise to the God in whom they believe,
 ... who ... pluck the harp and blow upon
 the flute, ... the nursemaid ...,
 who shoulder burdens and split firewood,
 who have no master, and who have too many:
 Who dash to pray, procure and steal and
 drown with drink the vestige of a soul'
 ... Beck here rises for the first time above
 the usual morality of the German bourgeoisie.

156. This was 'The Manifesto of the Communist Party'.

157. Marx and Engels (1848a:494) wrote in 'The Manifesto of the Communist Party' publication that:

Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really

revolutionary class. The other classes ... finally disappear in the face of modern industry; the proletariat is its special and essential product. ...

The 'lumpen proletariat', the social scum, that passively rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of old society may, here and there, be swept into the movement by a proletarian revolution; its conditions of life, however, prepare it far more for the part of a bribed tool of reactionary intrigue.

On this work, Padover (1978:249) argues that "the 'Manifesto' introduced a new and baneful note into the revolutionary movement - the idea of conflict and hate. Up to that time, socialists had tended to be humanists and utopians, emphasizing the brotherhood of man, rather than the solidarity of class".

While Padover (1978) does overstate the issue, it should be noted that this fifth use of 'lumpenproletariat' also marks the first time that Marx and Engels (1848a) do indeed openly 'insult' the class by referring to them as the "social scum" and also as a "passively rotting mass". The members of this class concept will now be more frequently 'insulted' in their writings.

158. The French Revolutions of 1789 and 1830 were alongside the rise of the concept proletariat; this French Revolution of 1848 would be alongside the rise of the concept lumpenproletariat.

159. Since creation in 'The German Ideology', lumpenproletariat was used infrequently - only 6 uses during the 18 months up to January of 1848 - by them. Their faith in a proletariat reflects optimism in their negative antithesis. In 'The Communist Manifesto' of January of 1848, they considered the possibility that maybe the lumpenproletariat might be a 'bribed tool of reactionary intrigue' that might act against their proletariat. But the February-June, 1848 events - the Third French Revolution and other uprisings across Europe - had yet to take place!

160. Frederick Engels (1848a:25) wrote on Italy:

The national guard ... throws up barricades which are manned by 5,000 ... (proletarian) men. But they are opposed by 20,000 soldiers. ... Between them stand the 20,000 'lazzaroni' (lumpenproletariat) of Naples. ... The national guards ... would have won ... had the miserable conduct of the French ... not induced the 'lazzaroni' (lumpenproletariat) to join the royal side. ... (The) French ... thereby causing the 'lazzaroni' (lumpenproletariat), who were already leaning towards the people (proletariat), to join the troops. This action of the ... lumpenproletariat decided the defeat of the revolution, ... (the) soldiers and 'lazzaroni' (lumpenproletariat) combined pounced upon the defenders of the barricades. ... The 'lazzaroni' (lumpenproletariat) proved to be the greediest. ... The base acts ... of the ...

always 'sanfedistic lazzaroni' (lumpenproletariat) over the national guard ... are indescribable.

161. Engels (1848b:142-143) said of France's lumpenproletariat: The mobile guard, which was mostly recruited from the Paris lumpenproletariat, has already during its brief period of existence, thanks to good pay, transformed itself into the praetorian guard of whoever was in power. The organized lumpenproletariat has given battle to the unorganized working proletariat. It has, as was to be expected, placed itself at the disposal of the bourgeoisie, just as the 'lazzaroni' (lumpenproletariat) in Naples placed themselves at the disposal of Ferdinand. ... For three full days, 30,000 ... (proletarian) workers were able to hold their own against more than 80,000 soldiers and 100,000 men of the (lumpenproletarian) national guard. ... They have been ... massacred. Their dead will ... (be) the martyrs of the first decisive battle of the proletariat.

162. This placing itself at the disposal of the bourgeoisie again affirms that the lumpenproletariat could be an effective positive antithesis against the negative antithesis proletariat.

163. On political principles, Marx and Engels (1848b:259) wrote: "If because of their civil dependence, the poor are as little qualified to protect 'constitutional freedom' as the 'lazzaroni' (lumpenproletariat) in Naples".

164. Engels (1848c:406) quoted with comment: "And now listen to what the wretched Belgian press has to say: '... Only among the working classes' (read: the lumpenproletariat) 'can one find sentiments hostile to the paladins of the republic'".

165. Engels was in hiding from German authority in Switzerland.

166. Marx (1848a:505) said: "In Paris the mobile guard, in Vienna 'Croats' - in both cases 'lazzaroni', lumpenproletariat hired and armed - were used against the working and thinking proletarians".

167. So Marx (1848b:17) repeated: "In Naples the 'lazzaroni' (lumpenproletariat) are leagued with the monarchy against the bourgeoisie. In Paris ... the bourgeoisie is leagued with the 'lazzaroni' (lumpenproletariat) against the working class".

168. Marx (1848c:210,597) named a lumpenproletariat: "The literary lumpenproletariat of Herr Dumont (Joseph Dumont was a "moderate liberal German journalist" - ed), which accepts with the most touching passive resistance all the kicks bestowed on it ... is trying to revenge itself by denouncing the editors ... to the police on account of articles".

169. Not only could a lumpenproletarian inflict damage with the soldier's sword; a lumpenproletarian could also inflict damage upon an opponent with the literary pen!

170. Karl Marx (1849:267) was more specific on the occupations of the associates of Joseph Dumont: "These are ... 'Dumont' and his literary lumpenproletariat. These are ambitious professors, lawyers and similar persons, who can only hope to obtain respectable posts in a state where betrayal of the people's interests to the Government is a lucrative business".

171. This transformation was made difficult by the proletarian code of behaviour that Marx and Engels had imposed on the real world member of the synchronic working class.

Engels (1849:44) observed that the "Swiss proletariat is still largely what one describes as lumpenproletariat, prepared to sell themselves to anyone who will make extravagant promises".

172. From April of 1849, when Cologne police begin screening their letters, Marx and Engels stop using the concept in their work for nearly a year; this ends a second period of use of the term. In contrast to the first 18 months of the concept's existence - when it was used 6 times - in this second period of 10 months the concept was used on 18 occasions. While proletariat retained its popularity throughout the European revolutions of 1848-1849, as it had done in 1789 and 1830 within France, it was their lumpenproletariat that really came to the forefront within these revolutionary 10 months!

173. By this time both Marx and Engels had fled Europe to London.

174. In June of 1849, Engels fought in the conflict in Germany.

175. On the conflict in Germany, in which he fought in June, 1849, Frederick Engels (1850a:165-168) noted:

Finally the lumpenproletariat was here as elsewhere corruptible from the second day of the movement onwards, demanding weapons and pay ... in the morning and selling itself to the big bourgeois in the afternoon. ...

... The proletariat had ... only too recently freed itself from the slough of gin and pietism. ... Some eighty ... rifles, distributed with extreme carelessness, ended up for the most part in the hands of gin-happy lumpenproletarians, who sold them that very evening to the bourgeoisie ... (who) paid quite a high price for them. In this way the ... lumpenproletarians delivered up to the bourgeoisie several hundred rifles, which got into their hands.

176. On conspirators' lifestyle in Paris, Marx and Engels (1850a:317) said that "democratic bohemians of proletarian origin ... are therefore either workers who have given up their work and have ... become dissolute, or characters who have emerged from the lumpenproletariat and bring all the dissolute habits of that class with them into their new way of life".

177. Engels (1850b:407), said that the class of "'plebians' ... consisted of ruined burghers and the mass of townsmen without civic rights - journeymen, day labourers, and the numerous precursors of the lumpenproletariat, who existed even in the lowest stages of urban development".

178. So Engels (1850b:407) suggests: "The lumpenproletariat is, generally speaking, a phenomenon that occurs in a more or less developed form in all the so far known phases of society".

179. So Engels (1850b:408) suggests: "A great many, namely those living in the towns, still had a substantial share of sound peasant nature and had not as yet been possessed by the venality and depravity of the present 'civilized' lumpenproletariat".

180. Frederick Engels (1850b:450) wrote that "a vagabond mass of the lumpenproletariat had joined the troops and this undermined their discipline and demoralized ... (them), because the vagabonds came and went as they pleased".

181. Marx and Engels (1850b:512-513) wrote: "Catholicism's sole support in Britain is to be found at the two extremes of society, the aristocracy and the lumpenproletariat. The lumpenproletariat, the riff-raff of Irish origin or descended from Irishmen, is Catholic by descent".

182. Marx and Engels (1850b:523) wrote on the lumpenproletariat whose occupations were political activists:

... his party had sufficient insight to ascribe the growing importance of Bonaparte. ... The Bonapartists had so little faith in the magic effect of his personality that they sent with him everywhere as 'claqueurs' people from the Society of December 10, that organization of the Paris 'lumpenproletariat', packed 'en masse' into railway trains and post-chaises. They put speeches into the mouth of their marionette which, according to the reception in the different towns, proclaimed republican resignation or perennial tenacity as the keynote of the President's policy.

183. Thus Louis Bonaparte's central committee of organizers - the Society of December 10 - belong to the lumpenproletariat.

184. By November of 1850, Frederick Engels returns to work in the family firm in Manchester, England in order to financially support the work being undertaken by his partner, Karl Marx.

185. This became 'The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850'.

186. See in particular, the exceptionally thorough current user of 'lumpenproletariat', Kenneth Tunnell (1990:40) who notes 'The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850' - which featured five uses of the term 'lumpenproletariat'.

187. Karl Marx (1850:50-70) now turned loose his anger and rage at that positive antithesis, the fighting lumpenproletariat:

Since the finance aristocracy made the laws, was at the head of the administration of the state, had command of all the organized public authorities, dominated public opinion through ... the press, the sale of prostitution, the same shameless cheating, the same mania to get rich was repeated in every sphere, from the Court to the Cafes of dubious character, to get rich not by production, but by pocketing the ... wealth of others. ... The finance aristocracy, in its mode of acquisition as well as in its pleasures, is nothing but the 'rebirth of the lumpenproletariat on the heights of bourgeois society'. And the ... people cried: 'Down with the big thieves!' ... When in 1847 ... the same scenes were publicly enacted that regularly lead the lumpenproletariat to brothels, to workhouses and lunatic asylums, to the bar of justice, to the dungeon and to the scaffold. ... The February Revolution had ... the bourgeoisie ... (such that they) did not feel itself a match for the proletariat. ... There consequently remained but one way out: ... For this purpose the ... government formed ... 'mobile guards' ... composed of young men ... (who) belonged for the most part to the 'lumpenproletariat', which in all big towns forms a mass sharply differentiated from the industrial proletariat, a recruiting ground for thieves and criminals of all kinds, living on the crumbs of society, people without a definite trade, vagabonds, 'gens sans feu et sans aveu', varying according to the degree of civilization of the nation to which they belong, but never renouncing their 'lazzaroni' (armed lumpenproletariat - ed) character; at the youthful age at which the ... government recruited them, thoroughly malleable, as capable of the most heroic deeds and ... sacrifices as of the basest banditry and the foulest corruption. The ... government paid them ... that is, it bought them.

... (In) June ... the workers ... answered ... with the ... first great battle ... between the two classes that split modern society. It was a fight for the preservation or annihilation of the 'bourgeois' order. ... The workers,

with ... bravery and ingenuity, ... held in check for five days the army, the Mobile Guard ('lumpenproletariat' - ed), the Paris National Guard, and the National Guard that streamed in from the provinces.

... The 'June' revolution is the 'ugly' revolution, the nasty revolution, because the phrases have given place to the real thing. ... Order! ... Order! ... Order! ... The 'bourgeois' order.

188. The concept continued to be used unevenly. After 11 months of non-use, within these 10 months from February to November of 1850, the concept was used 16 times. After this 10 months of use, the concept again entered into 7 months of non-use from December of 1850 to July of 1851 during which they re-examined how they used the concept (more on this point below) immediately following Marx's public unleash of rage at the class by November of 1850. But then for 12 months from August of 1851 to August of 1852, the concept entered into a last period of high utilization.

189. Engels (1851a:421) wrote: "The fraud of 1825 and 1845 (was) reproduced at the level of the proletariat, lumpenproletariat and petty bourgeoisie".

190. Marx (1851a:446) wrote of the meeting: "Conspicuous by their absence, however, were the lumpenproletariat. ... You know that they are cowardly rascals, and that every one of the rascallions had too bad a conscience to appear before a gathering of any size. ... They ... are now compromised as being bourgeois scum".

191. Here the 'lumpenproletariat' were a diachronic class among the larger synchronic class of temporary refugees.

192. Engels (1851b:459) suggests: "It is fortunate that a country which, instead of proletarians, has virtually nothing but lazzaroni (lumpenproletariat - ed), should at least possess 'metayers' (agricultural labourers - ed)".

193. This particular document - 'The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte' - is among the most commonly acknowledged single sources for examining 'lumpenproletariat' - indeed, the term is used 11 times within the document.

194. Karl Marx (1852a:110-195) wrote in anger and rage against the lumpenproletariat:

The bourgeois republic triumphed. On its side stood the finance aristocracy, the industrial bourgeoisie, the middle class, the petty bourgeois, the army, the lumpenproletariat organized as the Mobile Guard, the intellectuals, the clergy and the rural population. On the side of the Paris proletariat stood none but itself. ... Donations and loans - the financial science of the lumpenproletariat, whether of high degree or low, is

restricted. ... Bonaparte ... was constantly accompanied by persons affiliated with the 'Society of December 10'. This society dates from the year 1849. On the pretext of founding a benevolent society, the lumpenproletariat of Paris had been organized. ... Alongside ruined and adventurous offshoots of the bourgeoisie, were vagabonds, discharged soldiers, discharged jailbirds, escaped galley slaves, rogues, mountebanks, 'lazzaroni' (or armed lumpenproletariat - ed), pickpockets, tricksters, gamblers, 'maquereaus' (or procurers - ed), brothel keepers, porters, 'literati', organ-grinders, rag-pickers, knife grinders, tinkers, beggars - in short, the whole indefinite, disintegrated mass. ... From this kindred element Bonaparte formed the core of the Society of December 10. ... Bonaparte ... constitutes himself 'chief of the lumpenproletariat'. ... The Society of December 10 belonged to him, it was 'his' work, his ... idea. ... Bonaparte, who precisely because he was ... a princely lumpenproletarian, had the advantage over a rascally bourgeois in that he could conduct a dirty struggle. ... The French bourgeoisie balked at the power of the working proletariat: it has brought the lumpenproletariat to power, with the chief of the Society of December 10 at the head. ... The army itself is no longer the flower of the peasant youth: it is the swamp-flower of the peasant lumpenproletariat. ... Bonaparte looks on himself as the ... (true) representative of the lumpenproletariat, to which he himself, his entourage, his government and his army belong, and whose prime consideration is to benefit itself. ... (Indeed) the (goal of the) Bonapartist lumpenproletariat is to enrich itself.

195. Engels (1852:88,694) said: "Mr (Eduard) Tellerling (a lawyer and journalist - ed) has apparently been chased out of France as being a homeless, vagrant member of the 'lumpenproletariat' and of no use even to the Society of December 10".

196. Marx and Engels (1852:313) wrote: "But all this does not suffice to hold together a volunteer corps, most of whose members either come from the lumpenproletariat or are rapidly assimilated into it. What is needed in addition is a lofty idea".

197. Karl Marx (1852b:155-156) noted and identified: "The tipsy Lumpenproletarian 'Herweg' from Nauss. ... The tipsy Herweg felt obliged ... to manifest approbation and ... he 'lorgnetted' the company with his pipe".

198. This was the last of the high use periods for the concept lumpenproletariat. Between August of 1851 and August of 1852, the term was used on 18 occasions in these 12 months, most frequently within personal letters. After August of 1852, its frequency of use declined. Nevertheless, lumpenproletariat continued to be used

occasionally. But the meaning of the concept would not really change despite this decreasing use by Marx and Engels.

199. Karl Marx (1853:388) said: "Hollowness of the entire credit system, turned into ... a colossal institutionalized racket under the direction of the Lumpenproletarian emperor".

200. Marx (1854a:448-449) said: "Miskowsky ... has come to a very bad end. The poor devil ... sunk to being a lumpenproletarian in Whitechapel to whom we in the West End from time to time sent some small aid. A few days ago the poor devil ... was 'burned alive' in the wooden sack he occupied. ... First you're reduced to beggary, then you starve, and finally you're burnt to death".

201. To be a proletarian, a person required a minimum of economic comfort to afford - without fear of severe physical discomfort, ie, hunger, etc. - to be able to think about their less than ideal condition. Without some minimum economic comfort, a proletariat may degenerate into unthinking lumpenproletariat, as someone inclined to irrational self-preservation, unable to see themselves as part of a collective with common difficulties.

Along a similar line of argument, Bussard (1987:677) points out that the lumpenproletariat had "acted only out of socially ignorant self-interest ... without a clear class-consciousness".

202. Marx (1854b:437) wrote of the "shameless demonstrations of the town mob, partly paid for their performances, and like the Lazzaroni (the armed lumpenproletariat - ed) of Naples, preferring the wanton rule of kings and monks to the sober regime of the middle classes".

203. Marx and Engels (1855:42) wrote: "According to General Sir William Napier ... it takes fully three years to drill the 'tag-rag' and 'bobtail' (the lumpenproletariat) of Old England into 'the best blood of England', 'the first soldiers of the world'".

204. Marx (1855a:325) said "there were prisoners with ... their clothes torn, guarded by ... characters recruited from among the Irish lumpenproletariat and pressed into the London police".

205. Marx (1855b:541) wrote that "the government of the Two Sicilies relies on Swiss and lazzaroni (lumpenproletariat - ed) at home and on the Austrian army abroad".

206. Karl Marx (1856:80) wrote:

... The fate of ... Poland is an inevitable one; the actual 'landed property' is usurped by the Crown, aristocracy, etc.; the patriarchal relations between 'landed property' and peasant communities lead to serfdom; optional land division creates a kind of 'peasant middle estate', the 'ordre equestre', to which the peasant can rise only so long as wars of conquest and colonization are still in

progress, though both these necessarily tend to accelerate his 'downfall'. As soon as the borderline (class - ed) is reached, this 'ordre equestre', incapable of sustaining the role of a true middle estate, turns into the lumpenproletariat of the aristocracy. ... This type of development is interesting in that it shows how serfdom comes into being as a result of purely economic factors, without the intermediate link of conquest or racial dualism.

207. This was the 'Economic Manuscripts of 1857-1858'.

208. Karl Marx (1858:203) now clearly saw the through time lumpenproletariat in a point in time synchronic economic context, as a member employed in the service sector:

... Such is the case with all services which workers exchange directly for the money of other people and which are consumed by these people. This is consumption of revenue, which as such is always part of simple circulation, not consumption of capital. Since one of the contracting parties does not confront the other as capitalist, this form of service cannot come into the category of productive labour. From the harlot to the Pope there is a mass of such rabble. But the honest and 'working' Lumpenproletariat, too, belongs to this category, eg the large mob of casual day-labourers, etc., in ports, etc. ... A(dam) Smith was 'essentially' right with his distinction between 'productive' and 'unproductive' labour. ...

As Marx's study of synchronic service workers increases, his anger directed at the lumpenproletariat decreases.

209. Although, not wishing to engage in the controversy of Marx's endorsement of the bourgeois Adam Smith's distinction between productive and unproductive labour, a point should be made.

210. The productive-unproductive divide impacts on job security aspects of both non-owner classes. The precarious daily existence of the unproductive labourer, the lumpenproletariat, in the service industry - where job security depends on the existence of a not highly probable 'by chance or by luck' purchase of a service for sale - stands in contrast with that of the productive labourer whose workplace conditions - the simple production of goods - gives psychological and economic assurance to a proletariat that they will obtain a future wage because future production, to meet future needs, is more probable. Such job security conditions encourage workers to develop a historical ideology conducive to becoming and remaining a proletariat.

211. The lumpenproletariat thus could be viewed as the social product of their not very 'real' work or unproductive labour.

212. The laws of supply-demand suggest the more the demand for a service, the more the supply of lumpenproletariat is required.

213. The three repeated uses were reprinted from a manuscript written in March of 1852 on France's Louis Bonaparte - see above.

214. Karl Marx (1860:155) would write: "Vogt remembers ... that alongside the class of the lumpenproletariat it is the class of peasant small holders that in France constitutes the sole social basis of the 'bas empire'".

215. The concept 'lumpenproletariat' now reappeared in the famous work by Karl Marx; 'Das Kapital' of 1867.

216. Marx (1867:518) wrote: "The lowest sediment of the relative surplus-population finally dwells in the sphere of pauperism. Exclusive of vagabonds, criminals, prostitutes, in a word, the lumpenproletariat, this layer ... consists of three categories".

217. Karl Marx (1868:27) wrote: "The said correspondent ... is none other than the notorious literary lumpenproletarian 'Elard Biscamp'. Long rejected by any decent society, this unfortunate seeks consolation in the bottle".

218. Engels (1870:98-99) twice uses the concept in an article: But even the proletariat ... is still far from being the majority of the German people. It is, therefore, also compelled to seek allies. These can be looked for only among the petty bourgeois, the lumpenproletariat of the cities, the small peasants and the agricultural labourers. ... The 'lumpenproletariat' this scum of depraved elements from all classes, with headquarters in the big cities, is the worst of all the possible allies. This rabble is absolutely venal and absolutely brazen. ... Every leader ... who uses these scoundrells as guards or relies on them for support proves himself by this action alone a traitor to the movement.

219. Marx (1871b:529-530) wrote: "The runaways of the 22nd March ... at last purged Paris from their presence by an unmolested Exodus, dragging along with them the cocottes, the lazzaroni (armed lumpenproletariat - ed) and the other dangerous class of the capital ... these 'men of order' from 18th March".

220. Marx and Engels (1873:454) said that "the proletariat ... has its 'declassé' elements; they make up the lumpenproletariat".

221. Karl Marx (1882:272) noted the service sector workers in the hotels of Cannes: "I have spent an entire month vegetating in this haunt of aristocratic idlers or adventurers. ... It is monumental because consisting solely of hotels; no plebian masses here, apart from the waiters in hotels and cafes etc., and servants, who belong

to the lumpenproletariat".

222. According to Engels (1886a:334), those assembled were "masses of the poor devils of the East End who vegetate in the borderland between working class and lumpenproletariat".

223. Those labelled as the lumpenproletariat were politically conscious against class consciousness, those labelled as working class lacked political consciousness - the label working class was used to describe political unconscious at a point-in-time.

224. Engels (1886b:447) wrote that "during the procession ... the masses of the Lumpenproletariat, whom Hyndman had taken for the unemployed, streamed through some fashionable streets near by, looted jewellers' and other shops, used the ... mutton which they had looted solely to break windows with, and dispersed without meeting with any resistance".

225. Engels (1886c:603) wrote on ancient Rome: "Then there were the free proletarians; not 'working' proletarians but the 'Lumpen'proletarians. ... The Roman Lumpenproletarians were parasites who were not merely useless but even harmful to society, and hence lacked any effective power".

226. Engels (1888:498) wrote: "On the lower fringes of all this bunch of nobles, there naturally emerges a numerically parasitic nobility, a noble Lumpenproletariat, which lives on debts, dubious gambling, pushiness, begging and political espionage".

227. This letter to Eduard Bernstein from Frederick Engels (1889a:261) could not be located in an English translation.

228. Engels (1889b:304) said of those in the dock labourers' strike in London: "They are, as you know, the most miserable of all the 'miserable' of the East End, the broken down ones of all trades, the lowest stratum above the Lumpenproletariat".

229. The December of 1890 letter from Frederick Engels (1890:509) to Holland's Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis could not be found in an English translation.

230. Lumpenproletariat shared some of the 12 general qualities associated with the concept proletariat. As noted in the sections on proletariat and lumpenproletariat above, both concepts shared the second general quality of hierarchical position; both were poor, thus sharing the third general quality; both could produce children as called for by the fourth general quality; in keeping with the fifth quality, both classes have political duties but these would often come into direct conflict; both were likely taxed differently than the remaining classes, as noted by the seventh quality, and, finally, conforming with the eleventh general quality, both concepts most frequently tended to be historically

continuous at the micro level of analysis.

231. Lumpenproletariat was also an opposite to proletariat on some of the twelve general qualities. Within the twelfth general quality, the possession of some form of conscious empowerment, the proletariat were assigned this characteristic while the lumpenproletariat were deficient of the property. As to the tenth general quality of moral competence, the proletariat possessed the property while lumpenproletariat were morally incompetent. Within the ninth quality, that of historical discontinuity at the macro level of analysis, the proletariat began alongside the factory system while the lumpenproletariat had existed earlier. For the eighth general quality of class conflict with the class above, that is, the bourgeoisie which had the property, the proletariat were in class conflict with the class above, while the lumpenproletariat were in class harmony with the class above. New to this eighth general quality is a Marx and Engels insight; the creation of lumpenproletariat meant that for the proletariat there clearly also was class conflict with the class among them or to their side as well as the traditional conflict with the class above. As to the sixth general quality of not being the lowest class, there remains some controversy. Although not stated as such, the argument seems to be that the proletariat is more likely to not be the lowest class than the lumpenproletariat. If we view class hierarchy solely as a measure of conscious empowerment, then the proletariat clearly ranks above the class of lumpenproletariat via their level of conscious empowerment. On the other hand, if class hierarchy were to be viewed only as a measure of its physical location then both classes are not of the lowest class - someone was always lower ie slaves or paupers.

This brings us to the first general quality, that of the size of the group. The Marx and Engels project resolves this old debate by making class size dependent upon the presence - or absence - of the other general qualities such as conscious empowerment. Despite this, the very strongest core of what constitutes the proletariat is most likely to be found in the goods producing sectors, in particular, within the factories where productive labour most often occurs, while the strongest core of the lumpenproletariat is most likely to be found within the service producing sectors, in particular, in the literary and law-enforcement (or the ideological) industries, where unproductive labour takes place.

232. Robert Bussard (1987:687) makes the same point: "After the early 1850s both Marx and Engels continued to use their notion occasionally. ... After this time, Marx and Engels increasingly turned to the study of economic questions. With this shift in emphasis from politics to economics, the notion of the 'lumpenproletariat' ceased to carry much importance ...".

233. The concept was another party included within the positive antithesis in struggle against their negative antithesis, the proletariat. While the concept unlocks the insight that the

proletariat was also faced by an enemy-among-them - that is, by another class located alongside them, rather than simply an oppositional class either above or below in the hierarchy - they were more concerned that its use might strike fear in their proletariat with the possibility of an enemy-among-them. From a public relations perspective, it was easier to sell the synchronic working class an idea of an enemy-above-them - the bourgeoisie - then it was to sell the idea that there was an enemy-among-them formed as the lumpenproletariat.

234. By August of 1851, both Marx and Engels had just fled from continental Europe to England.

235. The translations of 'lumpenproletariat' and 'proletariat' are evident from the German to the English excerpts from 'The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850' by Marx (1850).

While Marx completes the articles (begun in January of 1850) on events in 1848-1850 France for eventual publication in German; by April of 1850, Engels (1850c) was translating these articles into English for partial publication within 'The Democratic Review'. While Marx (1850:51) used the term "lumpenproletariat" in the German original, Engels (1850c:353-362) translated 'lumpenproletariat' into the term "mob" for the English version.

Elsewhere in the original document (here translated into English - ed), Marx (1850:62) wrote: "They belonged for the most part to the 'lumpenproletariat', which ... forms a mass sharply differentiated from the industrial proletariat". But by June of 1850, Engels (1850c:365) had translated to English: "They were recruits, almost exclusively from the mob, which ... forms a mass entirely distinct from the industrial working class".

236. During the mid-1850s, Marx wrote articles for several newspapers. Thus an article might appear in more than one paper. For articles on military affairs, Marx often persuaded Engels to write these on his behalf (Nikonenko, 1980). Thus, for an article placed in the 'New York Daily Tribune' - an "organ" of the Whig Party and Republican Party of the United States (Martynova, 1980:818) - Engels (1855:34) wrote: "We know from the best authority - Sir W. Napier - that it takes full three years to drill the tag-rag-and-bobtail of Old England into what John Bull calls 'the first soldiers of the world'". Marx translated this article from English to German and placed it within the 'Neue Oder Zeitung' - "the most radical German newspaper in the 1850s" (Martynova, 1980:818). Here Marx now adds a concept: "... it takes fully three years to drill the 'tag-rag' and 'bobtail' (the lumpenproletariat) of Old England into ... 'the first soldiers of the world'" (Marx and Engels, 1855:42).

237. On the unpopularity of the term 'proletariat' in England, Gertrude Himmelfarb (1984:283) wrote: "By the time Engels wrote the 'Condition (of the Working Class in England' in 1845), 'proletariat' was part of the vocabulary of French and German

Socialists - but not of English radicals".

238. In England, the term 'proletarian' or 'proletariat' was used since the 17th century to denote "rabble" (Himmelfarb, 1984:283). But in his 18th century dictionary, Samuel Johnson (1755) defined the "Proletarian. Adjective" as "mean; wretched; vile; vulgar".

239. The vision of a Karl Marx 'imposing' the term 'proletariat' upon a reluctant English radical does not seem 'too far fetched' if we accept Padover's (1978) tyrannical view of him. Certainly, Padover's (1978) Marx would not be above stating something like: 'So those English radicals don't like the word 'proletariat' eh! Well they can like it or lump it!'

240. Thus in the original German edition of 'The Condition of the Working Class in England' by Engels (1845) both synchronic and diachronic terminology was used contextually. Engels (1845:297) wrote: "I have continually used the expressions working men and proletarians, working class, propertyless class and proletariat as equivalents". Indeed, at one point, Engels (1845:310) wrote: "proletarians (working men)".

241. There was another major work by Marx suggesting that Marx and Engels were suppressing the use of 'lumpenproletariat' in their English language material. Events in 1848-1852 France were a minefield of opportunity to use the diachronic concept; indeed, in two German audience documents on these events, Karl Marx (1850; 1852a) used the term on 16 of all 88 of its occasions!

Given this history of use prior to 1852, the events in the France of 1870-1871 - the Paris Commune which constituted a 4th French Revolution - were also a minefield of opportunity for Marx to use 'lumpenproletariat'. But a major reappearance of the term just did not take place! Within a document which frequently drew parallels to the earlier events of 1848-1852, the concept was applied but once by Marx (1871b:529) in a related form as "the iazzaroni and the other dangerous class". While differentiating the armed from the unarmed 'lumpenproletariat', the concept's alternate term only appeared within the 2nd draft of his (1871b) 'The Civil War in France'. The concept 'lumpenproletariat' was absent from the 1st draft (Marx, 1871a) and the final draft (Marx, 1871c) of the English 'The Civil War in France'.

In the meantime, the more 'audience friendly' diachronic concept 'proletariat' appeared in all three drafts of Marx's (1871a:445; 1871b:521; 1871c:323) 'The Civil War in France' as the project outlined the 4th French Revolution; such was not the case with the absent 'lumpenproletariat'. Once journalists were referred to as the 'lumpenproletariat', now Marx (1871a:456) simply called them "vulgar professional journalists". What was known as the Bonapartist 'lumpenproletariat' in 1848-1852, were now seen by Marx (1871c:348) as "Bonapartist banditti". Earlier they were the state 'lumpenproletariat'; now, Marx (1871a:492) simply saw them as synchronic "state parasites".

242. I would refer the reader to the source referenced above. It is a translation of the original German document.

243. The official approval of Samuel Moore as the translator into the more synchronic English of the German 'Communist Manifesto' and of volume one of 'Capital' was a critical issue for those 'marketing strategists' known as Marx and Engels. The older but more diachronic 'Communist Manifesto' of 1848 was translated by Moore only after the more recent 'Capital' of 1867. Indeed, Engels found translating a diachronic 'Communist Manifesto' into something more 'user friendly' for a synchronic English audience particularly troubling (Guback and Bettig, 1987:3).

So perplexing was the Marx and Engels' marketing strategy of the 'Manifesto' for an English audience that, as Guback and Bettig (1987:8) have pointed out:

(T)he (unauthorized) Macfarlane version (of 1850) commanded the English language field until well after the death of Marx in 1883. It is again ironic that although the International Working Men's Association was headquartered in New York City (1872-1876), and drew its inspiration and objectives from Marx and Engels, it did not have at its disposal a sound and complete English language version of the 'Manifesto'. German editions and translations into other languages were numerous, though, and some of them were printed in New York.

244. Within England, these terms had a contextual history.

First, the term 'mob' is rooted in the differences between the two words 'people' and 'populace' as used by 'bourgeoisie'. In the 1830s, the term 'people' was used to refer to the respectable and more wealthy middle classes (ie a portion of the bourgeoisie), while the term 'populace' referred to the 'mob' or 'rabble' or - perhaps - the 'working class' or even the 'poor'. Thus 'mob' had the same context as 'working class' when used by individuals usually within the bourgeoisie. (see Himmelfarb, 1984:297-300). This made the rather awkward but all inclusive term 'mob' unfit to refer to but a portion of the lower social 'orders' for Marx and Engels; they did not wish their English alternate term for 'lumpenproletariat' to so inclusively embrace such a wide body of individuals - theoretically, they still had to account for the location of their 'proletariat'.

Second, the terms 'dangerous class' is rooted in the differences between 'working class' and 'ragged classes' as used by political or social reformers. In the 1830s, education reformers claimed expertise to make an administrative distinction between the term 'working classes' - who were the working poor able to 'afford' to keep their children within a school - and the term 'ragged classes' - who were the poor generally not working enough to 'afford' to keep their children within a school. At the same time, prison reformers claimed expertise to make an administrative distinction - generally within the boundaries of the 'ragged

classes' - between the 'perishing classes' - who were those who had not yet fallen into crime, but who were almost certain to do so if not given assistance - and the 'dangerous classes' - who were those who had already fallen into crime or who lived an 'everyone for themselves' day-to-day existence. (see Himmelfarb, 1984:377-380). This rather awkward 'dangerous class' terminology did not fit well as an English alternate term for 'lumpenproletariat' since it theoretically embraced a too small portion of the lower social 'order'.

Nevertheless, Marx and Engels were practical 'salespeople'. They wished to create a 'proletariat' in England. Perhaps in finding that their intended audience for new recruits into the 'proletariat' seemed more accustomed to the meaning of the reformer terminology of 'dangerous class' than they were for the bourgeois term 'mob', Marx and Engels then gradually adopted, the still inaccurate yet more popularly received, new terms 'dangerous class' to more accurately reflect (a bit more) - at a synchronic level - the 'enemy among us' model of class structure which German audiences had access to via the 'lumpenproletariat' versus 'proletariat' conflict terminology.

245. As was noted above, a similar 'suppressive fate' awaited an English readership for both editions of 'The Manifesto of the Communist Party' (Marx and Engels, 1850c:171; 1888:92) as well as for 'Le Capital' (Marx, 1875:566) and 'Capital' (Marx, 1887:557).

246. In general, Marx and Engels had a history of rejecting bourgeois ideas more frequently than they embraced them. Thus this adoption was more of an exception to general practice.

247. As noted above, the best discussion of this issue was in the 'Economic Manuscripts of 1857-1858' by Karl Marx (1858).

248. Via these personal judgments, they fought an enemy-among-them; they sorted out the 'worthy proletariat' from the 'unworthy lumpenproletariat'. This was Marx and Engels class struggle in the trenches; this was the war that they wished to very quietly explain, without having to popularize 'lumpenproletariat', to a wider audience. This form of correspondence was a major venue through which practical class struggle took place; a venue through which they were able to privately fight the class struggle without having to publicly adopt 'lumpenproletariat'. Rather than use a concept to articulate a personalized 'code of behaviour', Marx and Engels dropped the concept and just articulated that personalized 'code of behaviour'.

THE LUMPENPROLETARIAT GONE WRONG?

249. Draper on 'lumpenproletariat' was selected for two reasons:

FIRST, his look at Marx and Engels shows lumpenproletariat got much attention in Draper's (1972; 1978:453-478, 628-634) work. Whereas I found 88 uses of the concept within 50 documents, among the 83 footnotes in 'The Lumpen-class Versus the Proletariat', Draper (1978:453-478) had 41 footnotes that made reference to lumpenproletariat; these indicate awareness of 68 uses of the concept, within 36 separate documents. Draper (1978) also has awareness of another 7 uses of the concept in 4 other documents; this is a total of 75 uses in some 40 documents. This volume of research shows Draper as an authority on their lumpenproletariat.

SECOND, among the Sociofile database articles discussed, his name appeared as an authority on lumpenproletariat more often within footnotes, references or bibliographies than other writers. In the convenience of label school of users, the definitionally ambitious Kenneth Tunnell (1990); in the meaning of label school, Mark Traugott (1980), Frank Bovenkerk (1984) and Peter Hayes (1993) all noted Draper (1972; 1978) as an authority on 'lumpenproletariat'. Since they are among the most serious observers among the 25 English article authors on Sociofile, Hal Draper's (1972; 1977; 1978) work warrants our recognition.

250. The three contexts include: (1) in a "metaphorical" meaning; (2) in an "extended" meaning; and (3) in a "base" meaning.

251. In their first joint work - 'The Holy Family' - Marx and Engels (1844:35-36) define what they meant by the antithesis:

... Whereas the 'whole antithesis' is nothing but the 'movement of both its sides', and the precondition for the existence of the whole lies in the very nature of the two sides. ...

Proletariat and wealth are opposites; as such they form a single whole. They are both creations of the world of private property. The question is exactly what place each occupies in the antithesis. ...

Private property ... is the 'positive' side of the antithesis, self-satisfied private property.

The proletariat ... is the 'negative' side of the antithesis.

Thus the positive antithesis includes those who are 'satisfied' with the existence of private property, namely, the bourgeoisie and their allies, the lumpenproletariat.

252. See 'The Holy Family' by Marx and Engels (1844).

253. On Karl Marx's reading of various novels, such as 'The Mysteries of Paris', Saul Padover (1978:188-189) would write:

In Paris, Marx continued to pursue one of his unquenchable passions, a love of books, among them the novels of the extremely popular Eugene Sue, who

produced ... 'The Mysteries of Paris', ... whom he and Engels were to lampoon in 'The Holy Family'. (Arnold) Ruge said of Marx; "he reads much, works with uncommon intensity, does not go to bed for three, four nights in succession, and constantly plunges anew into an endless ocean of books".

Thus not only were non-fiction works an important aspect of Karl Marx's intellectual development, so also were works of fiction.

254. S. Praver (1976) makes this point within a 446 page overview of the fictional literature seen and read by Marx and Engels.

255. While 'The Holy Family' by Marx and Engels' (1844) never contained the term lumpenproletariat, Draper (1977) tries to link his view of the concept's origins with some implied origins within 'The Mysteries of Paris' by Sue (1842).

256. On the two major institutions, Eugene Sue (1842a:11) writes that in "October, 1838, ... a ... man ... crossed the Pont au Change, and darted ... into the Cite, that labyrinth of obscure, narrow, and winding streets which extends from the Palais de Justice (courthouse - ed) to Notre Dame (church - ed)".

The effect of this was to locate the district between two major social institutions which maintained morality designed to reassure and protect the bourgeois reader; the morality preaching church and the morality based (in)justice system of courthouses.

257. There were a number of service sector businesses existing between the large church and the courthouse in Paris.

(1) A major service sector business which was highly frequented was noted; Sue (1842a:11) says that "a vast number ... flock to the 'tapis-franc' ... a drinking-shop".

(2) Another area service sector player is, according to Sue (1842a:11), "the police" who "rarely fail to catch the criminals it seeks to take". (This successful police image showed the importance of property protection to the bourgeois reader and was also an endorsement of the positive antithesis working alongside or on behalf of the bourgeoisie).

(3) Another service sector industry identified by Eugene Sue (1842a:12) were those engaged in the business of retail and wholesale trade: "Stalls of charcoal-sellers, fruit-sellers, or venders of refuse meat occupied the ground floor of some of these ... abodes. ... The fronts of nearly all these shops were protected by strong bars of iron". (Again, the bourgeoisie were portrayed as having to take certain property protection measures to help remind those within the positive antithesis - sided with the bourgeoisie - that their property was sacred).

(4) There were other service sector players. The area featured service sector entertainers; wrote Sue (1842a:12), "women ... hummed popular airs in a low key". The quarter also possessed, according to Sue (1842a:15), a strong "Schoolmaster" who was of the service sector.

NOTE: Eugene Sue's people are not, as Draper (1977:228) implied, the "subterranean hordes of the people" or some urban dropouts from society; even the battling, villainous and 'knife-holding' Chourineur had a sense of social morality; according to Sue (1842a:17), for "he was never a thief," said the girl". So the bourgeois readers' private property was again portrayed as safe; even when placed before the fighting Chourineur - who was one of the most 'shady' characters portrayed in the novel.

SUMMARY: This area of Paris, as outlined by Sue, was inhabited by pre-welfare state, low income, service sector firms, wherein the strongest in-built morality of even the most 'shady' of people was built around the need to protect against theft of the property of the bourgeois reader. Without such safety assurance, bourgeois reader sympathy would never be gained.

258. Let us review the occupational and work history profile of some of the novel's major characters:

FIRST: The hero of the novel, Rodolph Durand, passes himself off as a "fan-painter" (Sue, 1842a:28) in the service sector.

SECOND: The young Fleur-de-Marie possessed a service sector work history. She had started as a child labourer who would "sell barley-sugar" (Sue, 1842a:31) while living with a woman who made a living by "selling fishing-lines" (Sue, 1842a:32). She was sent off to a morality-building service sector "house of correction" (Sue, 1842a:40) upon accusations of theft of property from a bourgeois "timber-merchant" (Sue, 1842a:40). (Again, we see the portrayal of an efficient police service protecting the bourgeois reader from theft). While in prison, she "learned to sew ... and ... began to sing" (Sue, 1842a:40); thus, she learnt occupational skills suitable for service sector work.

THIRD: The Fleur-de-Marie's prison friend Rigolette was rehabilitated while in prison; when she was released, she soon became a "famous needlewoman" (Sue, 1842a:42) within the service sector. (No doubt, an effective prison rehabilitation would reassure the bourgeois reader of the merits of prison life).

FOURTH: Even the fighting Chourineur was given a service sector work history profile. As a child labourer, Chourineur was first employed as a "horse" killer (Sue, 1842a:49). After being fired for too happily killing horses, the Chourineur was refused work by "butchers" who "despised" his previous job (Sue, 1842a:53). After two years work in a quarry in the goods producing sector, where he grew "tired of going always around like a squirrel in his cage" (Sue, 1842a:53), the Chourineur returns to the thrill and sensations of the service sector and "enlisted in a regiment" to "cut up English or Prussians" but "there was no war" only "a great deal of discipline" (Sue, 1842a:53). After doing time in a service sector prison, the Chourineur gained a job as a service sector street light "lighterman" (Sue, 1842a:57). Not only is a service sector work history endorsed in this last character, Sue even allows the goods producing sector to be degraded as 'cage-like' employment.

259. The claim by Draper (1977:228) that there were "no workers" in Eugene Sue's (1842) 'The Mysteries of Paris' has been further suggested of a larger French literature during the latter's era. In her review of the French 19th century novel, Vera Zolberg (1985:88) concludes that "workers and other non-bourgeois characters remained extremely rare in fiction". A major rationale for this rarity was, according to Zolberg (1985:87), that workers were "the social category least likely to be readers". Thus, the readers of French fiction came from the bourgeoisie; as Edward Tannenbaum (1981:493) put it, "what Sue's new novel did do, with its title and its opening description ..., was to appeal to the bourgeois tourist's taste for the exotic". For the bourgeois reader of Sue's (1842) novel then, the pre-welfare state service sector workers were, quite literally, 'The Mysteries of Paris'.

260. In the France of the 1840s, the goods-producing sector was largely a rural phenomenon at this time.

261. Since the lumpenproletarian core is found in the service sector, and given that Sue (1842) articulated service sector life in Paris, Draper (1977:228) was, ironically, accurate in labelling Sue's writings as a description of "the lumpen-world". Yet, Draper's view of what is lumpenproletariat, cannot be supported by looking at Sue's novel. Draper's (1977:228) first reference to a "lumpen-world", as an inspiring source for the concept in Marx and Engels, is thus unfortunate.

262. While their critique of Eugene Sue's (1842) 'The Mysteries of Paris' in 'The Holy Family' was completed in November of 1844, by the next month, December of 1844, Marx and Engels both managed to read a book which was titled in English as 'The Ego And His Own' by Max Stirner (1844).

263. As David Lovell (1988:131-132) put it: "Until 'The German Ideology', Marx disputed with his critics very much on their own ground. ... In 'The German Ideology', Marx attempted to 'step outside' the debate to see it in a broader context".

264. Saul Padover (1978:215-216) described 1846-1847 attempts by Marx and Engels to publish 'The German Ideology' in this manner: The book was never published ... during the authors' lifetime. Marx and Engels could not find a publisher in Germany. A communist polemic that derided other socialists was not a popular subject. In 1846, a ... socialist businessman ..., who had promised to finance ... 'The German Ideology', withdrew his offer after reading its ridicule of the 'true socialists'. ... In 1847, Marx and Engels again approached several German publishers in vain. ... (N)o one cared to risk censorship and the cost, especially for an inordinately bulky polemic.

265. According to Saul Padover (1978:215), both Marx and Engels had enjoyed writing 'The German Ideology' so much that:

They had a good time writing 'The German Ideology', often working until three or four o'clock in the morning and roaring with laughter at their own irreverence, oblivious to the fact that their hilarity kept Jenny (Marx's wife - ed) ... and the two babies awake. Years later, in the spring of 1883, Engels was sorting Marx's posthumous papers in London, and came across one particular piece (of 'The German Ideology' - ed) he thought so funny that ... he wrote to Laura Lafargue (Marx's daughter - ed) in Paris ... Engels added "We were bold devils then, Heine's poetry is childlike innocence compared with our prose". ... (Later) that year, ... he proudly referred to it as "a 'boundlessly' impudent work by Marx and me, ... the brashest ever written in the German language".

266. According to Robert Bussard (1987:680), "Marx and Engels went out of their way to parody Stirner's style".

267. The terms 'lump', 'lumper', 'lumpen' or other versions are a quite common occurrence in many of the Germanic group of languages which are dominant in Western and Northwestern Europe.

Some variation of the term 'lump' are found in the Germanic languages, such as Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Low German (Skeat, 1910:351; Onions, 1966:539), Middle High German (Barnhart, 1988:615) and Frisian (Skeat, 1910:351) - indeed Shipley (1970:219) claimed that the term "lump is common Teut(onic)". Thus it is not impossible that other Germanic languages may have intervened in their creation of the term 'lumpenproletariat'; in Danish, Norwegian and Swedish, the term "lump" is closer in meaning to the term "block" (Bradley, 1908b:498; Simpson and Weiner, 1989b:100) which is some form of physical mass or size.

268. Let's review in more detail Draper's (1978) evidence for his 'accidental slipping out' German origins argument.

Saying "there is no inquiry into the origin of the German term 'lumpenproletariat'" Draper (1978:628) says the prefix 'lump' or 'lumpen' was of German origin which first meant "'rag' (and) by extension it began to mean 'person in rags', ... (but) its meaning (later) darkened from 'ragamuffin' to 'bad person, riffraff, knave'. ... The ... conclusion that follows is that the ... meaning of the pejorative prefix to 'lumpenproletariat' is related not to rags but to 'bad people'". Thus 'lumpen' was believed to refer to the subjective, morally loaded 'bad people' rather than to the more objective 'person in rags'.

In using this German origins argument, Draper (1978:629) notes that "there can be little doubt that the Stirner material ... was already in Marx's mind when he began writing". So his (1978) view relies on the presence of the prefix "lump" or "lumpen" within Stirner's (1844) book which Marx and Engels (1846) had critiqued in 'The German Ideology'.

The reliability of this German position is not rock solid. As Draper (1978:630) notes, Stirner (1844) "does not happen to prefix 'lumpen' to the word 'proletariat', but his failure to do so is almost accidental, (for) so often do the two elements flirt with each other ... (in) Stirner's rhetoric". So his argument rests on the fact that Max Stirner (1844) had never used the term 'lumpenproletariat' in his book.

A lumpenproletariat German origin from Stirner (1844) has merit. The prefix 'lumpen' was commonly used prior to the Marx and Engels writings; according to Draper's (1978:629) research, "in the century before Marx, large numbers of 'lumpen' combinations were already in use for a variety of ... purposes ... and ... (such uses) make (it) clear that 'Lumpen' could be freely tacked on to almost any word ad hoc. ... The door was wide open to the ad hoc formation of 'lumpen' words. This is why Marx ... did not ... feel he was inventing a new technical term when he prefixed this (word) ... to ... 'proletariat'".

Stirner's (1844) writings show the lump-lumpen combinations that Draper (1978:629) suggests. In two small, consecutive, paragraphs, of 13 lines, in the section 'Social Liberalism' of subchapter 'The Free', Max Stirner (1844G:89) applies a sequence of nine lump prefix combinations among the concept proletarian as he writes: "'Lumpen' ... 'Lump' ... Lumpen ... 'Lumpengesindel' ... Proletarier ... Lump ... Lump ... 'Lump' ... Lump ... Lumpen". Later in the subchapter, in the concluding three paragraphs, of 14 lines, in a section 'Humane Liberalism', Stirner (1844G:104) follows with another sequence of ten lump prefix combinations when he writes: "Lumperei ... Lumpigste ... Lumpiger ... Lumperei ... Lumperei ... Lumpen ... Lump ... Lumperei ... Lump ... Lump".

Max Stirner did not shy away from using 'lump' and with intermingling it with proletarian in his writing. Thus in their reading of a moralizing Stirner (1844), the possibility of a Marx and Engels inspiration for an original use of the prefix lumpen is made possible by circumstantial evidence in a book they read.

Another consideration supports a conceptual inspiration from Stirner; this relates to Draper's (1978:628) noting "of the pejorative prefix ... to 'bad people'". This moral slant to the prefix is supported or reproduced by the large 20 volume second edition 'The Oxford English Dictionary' where Simpson and Weiner (1989b:102) defined "lumpen" as "boorish, stupid, unenlightened, used derisively to describe persons, attitudes, etc." From this moralistic German origin, the prefix 'put down' certain people.

SUMMARY: This is the German origins argument. Since Modern German took root by the year 1650, Hal Draper (1978:629) articulates a Modern German origins position as he notes that the term 'lumpen' was used only "in the century before Marx".

269. In referring to the moral judgment of 'bad people' being cast by Max Stirner (1844) upon the terms 'lump' or 'lumpen', Hal Draper (1978:631) thus argues that when 'lumpenproletariat' was first created:

... the formation 'Lumpenproletariat' slips out ... as simply another one of the several combinations with 'Lumpen' that are before Marx's eyes at the moment; ... Marx simply spelled out Stirner's thought, which makes this connection time and again. ... When Marx writes 'lumpenproletariat' at this point, he is still referring to Stirner's line of thought, not his own.

Thus Draper's (1978) position is that of an 'accidental slipping out' of the term; this interpretation should also be labelled as 'unscientifically inspired'.

270. For the purposes here, I will overlook another possible German origins source offered in 'The German Ideology'. Within this first work which offered the new term 'lumpenproletariat', Marx and Engels (1846:225) wrote: "Here Saint Max (Stirner) again ascribes to himself the wisdom of seizing and striking, as though his whole harangue about the rebellious proletariat were not an unsuccessful travesty of (Wilhelm) Weitling (1808-1871) and his thieving proletariat".

Based on this, Gertrude Himmelfarb (1984:389) suggests that "the introduction of Wilhelm Weitling suggests another source of their lumpenproletariat. It also points to ... Weitling, like Stirner, assigned a progressive role to the 'thieving proletariat', in fact a more active role than Stirner gave it. Where Stirner simply had the 'Lumpen' emerge as the dominant class under communism, Weitling gave to it the task of bringing about the communist revolution".

271. Thus if a German named concept 'lumpenproletariat' were to refer to Draper's (1978) 'bad people', then Marx and Engels were alternatively given the further linguistic 'tools' to also be able to name this concept with a further nine names such as.

(1) the 'Bosewichterproletariat'; the noun 'bosewichter' referred to the "rascal" and the "villain" (Scholze-Studenrecht and Sykes (1990c:169);

(2) the 'Gaunersproletariat'; the noun 'gauners' referred to the "rogue" (Scholze-Studenrecht and Sykes (1990e:309);

(3) the 'Halunkenproletariat'; the noun 'halunken' referred to the "rascal", the "scoundrel", and the "villain" (Scholze-Studenrecht and Sykes (1990f:358);

(4) the 'Schlingelproletariat'; the noun 'schlingel' referred to the "rascal" and the "rogue" (Scholze-Studenrecht and Sykes (1990k:634);

(5) the 'Schufteproletariat'; the noun 'schufte' referred to the "scoundrel" (Scholze-Studenrecht and Sykes (1990m:645);

(6) the 'Schurkenproletariat'; the noun 'schurken' referred to the "rogue" and the "villain" (Scholze-Studenrecht and Sykes (1990n:646);

(7) the 'Spitzbubeproletariat'; the noun 'spitzbube' referred to the "rascal", the "rogue" and the "scoundrel" (Scholze-Studenrecht and Sykes (1990o:674);

(8) the 'Schlawinerproletariat'; the noun 'schlawiner'

referred to the "trickster", the "rascal" and the "rogue" (Scholze-Studenrecht and Sykes (1990j:632); or

(9) the 'Lausbubproletariat'; the noun 'lausbube' referred to the "little rascal" (Scholze-Studenrecht and Sykes (1990h:473)).

In summary, a German concept meaning 'bad people' could have been alternatively labelled with yet another nine names.

272. Thus if a German named concept 'lumpenproletariat' were to refer to 'drop outs', then Marx and Engels were alternatively also able to name this concept as the 'Aussteigernenproletariat'; the noun 'aussteigernen' referred to the "drop-out" (Scholze-Studenrecht and Sykes (1990b:115)).

273. Thus if a German named concept 'lumpenproletariat' were to refer more objectively to the 'poor in rags', then Marx and Engels were alternatively able to name this concept as:

(1) the 'Armutproletariat'; the noun 'armut' referred to "poverty" (Scholze-Studenrecht and Sykes (1990a:86);

(2) the 'Fetzenderproletariat'; the noun 'fetzender' referred to "cheap rags" (Scholze-Studenrecht and Sykes (1990d:281);

(3) the 'Kaseblattproletariat'; the noun 'kaseblatt' referred to "rag" (Scholze-Studenrecht and Sykes (1990g:425); and

(4) the 'Schluckersproletariat'; the noun 'schluckers' referred sympathetically to "poor devil" (Scholze-Studenrecht and Sykes (1990l:634)).

In summary, a German concept meaning 'the poor in rags' could have been alternatively labelled with a further four names.

274. The 'deliberate construction' hypothesis advanced here gets support from two other events.

FIRST, it is rather unlikely that Marx and Engels would take the creation of any major new theoretical insight very lightly. Rather than letting a new concept "slip out" as Draper (1978:631) suggests, like their other major insights Marx and Engels thought out their new concepts (please see above material for their reasoned out position taken on their vision of the concept 'proletariat'). Their experiences were of help in formulating the concept lumpenproletariat. Engels' experience in Manchester were part of the concept's creation.

SECOND, their overall position in the ongoing debate over the concept of 'proletariat' made it necessary that they create of a new diachronic concept to act as 'theoretical in-fill' to help cover the remaining space of their synchronic working class. Prior to 1845, Engels declared that 'proletariat' had originated with the factory system; the flow of history forced them to create a new diachronic concept by which to label people existing in non-factory system conditions that were similar to, but were not exactly those of the proletariat. The chance to critique Stirner (1844) in 'The German Ideology' prompted them to unveil publicly their new diachronic concept which 'in-filled' their

position taken on the theoretically limited concept proletariat.

SUMMARY: These two rationales appear in their work. As noted earlier, lumpenproletariat was used twice when unveiled within 'The German Ideology'. Here both rationales are satisfied:

First, it was the non-factory system conditions which encouraged Marx and Engels (1846:84) to use the new concept to label a similar class during the ancient Roman Empire. This usage satisfied the second rationale.

Second, the first rationale would be satisfied by Marx and Engels (1846:202) on the other use in 'The German Ideology'. Upon reading the non-historical thought of Stirner (1844) they rebelled against his slipping out of a variety of terms to label what Marx and Engels saw as a historical class deserving its very own descriptive. Imagine their frustration as they read within a confused Max Stirner (1844:112-115) the following sequence of descriptives used to label as a class those "immoral" people who "lack settlement ... a solid, seemly life, a fixed income, etc." in his thought: "... the sharper, ... the thief, robber, ... the gamester, the penniless man without a situation, the frivolous man ... the dangerous proletariat ... vagabonds ... proletariat ... paupers ... (the) honest and serviceable fellow ... those poor ... the breeder of unrest ... good citizens ... labouring class ... destitute labourer ... state servants ... him who has nothing to lose ... the non-possessor ... (and, finally) the labourers".

Circumstantially, it was against this 'slipping out' of any number of labels within the work of Max Stirner (1844) that they have rebelled. Out of frustration, Marx and Engels sought to bring intellectual order out of the anarchical disorder of the author Stirner. To counter the impulsive 'slipping out' of a Max Stirner (1844), Marx and Engels (1846:202) systematically described this disorder when summing up the confused thought of Max Stirner; "the lumpen-proletariat becomes transformed into 'workers', into ordinary proletarians". Marx and Engels (1846) didn't just let slip out a morally loaded term; they clearly thought out the creation of this concept in an intellectual spirit of wit and joy.

Stirner's intellectual disorder has been noted elsewhere. Paterson (1971:111) notes that Marx and Engels complained that "he (Stirner - ed) retains ... (an) abstract, a priori method ... which is completely unhistorical and ... ignores the actual empirical patterns ... in social affairs".

275. There are other plausible origins for the term which Marx and Engels created; Hal Draper (1978) assumed too much from the circumstantial evidence given for a German origin.

The term 'lumpen' has a variety of uses in other Germanic languages - other than German - that Draper's (1978) modern German origins for lumpen must be viewed with skepticism. Given my reluctance to accept the circumstantial evidence supporting an inspiration for lumpenproletariat from Stirner (1844), I offer circumstantial evidence supporting origins from two other

languages: the first, from the Dutch language, the second, from the English language.

FIRST, the Marx and Engels 'lumpen' may have originated from the DUTCH language. Marx was 'reluctantly' fluent in Dutch; 'reluctantly' since his mother, Henriette Presburg, grew up in Nijmegen in a family which immigrated to Holland from Slovenia about 200 years earlier. While Marx's mother tried to learn German upon marriage, she communicated with her young son through Dutch. However, Marx and his mother had a 'falling out' in their later years which effectively ended most communication between mother and son. Indeed, Marx's financially secure mother refused to assist him when he and his family were in economic ruin. This relationship with his mother, along with the influence of his friend, the German poet Heinrich Heine, who once told Karl Marx that Dutch was not a language but a throat affliction, combined to influence Marx to 'downplay' and even 'deny' his skills with the Dutch language (Padover, 1978:8-13).

Thus, circumstantially, if Marx allowed his passion to rule his reason, that is, had he wished to label a concept which he did not particularly admire with an insulting label, then the possibility that he might borrow the name of that label for any 'unliked' concept from the Dutch language exists. As the above discussion notes, Marx was not an admirer of those people that he had labelled as the 'lumpenproletariat'. Circumstantially, then, this new class concept may have Dutch inspiration, if we accept the premise that Marx's passion ruled over his reason.

SECOND, the Marx and Engels 'lumpen' may have originated from the ENGLISH language. This inspiration for lumpenproletariat is based on the assumption that Engels found an English use of 'lumpen' while living and working in Manchester, England, or perhaps also like Marx, may have uncovered lumpen while reading English works.

There are three plausible sources for an English origins which call into question the claims of Draper (1978).

(1) THE MODERN ENGLISH 'LUMPER' ALTERNATIVE. Here the Modern English 'lumpen' is believed to have originated from the early Modern Dutch word "lomp" which meant "rag" (Bradley, 1908b:498; Skeat, 1910:351; Onions, 1966:539; Barnhart, 1988:615; Simpson and Weiner, 1989b:100).

Like the Dutch words such as 'yacht', and 'deck', the term 'lomp' - become lump - became associated with commercial activity in England after import from Holland. In a plausible situation, a well dressed English merchant might greet a well dressed Dutch merchant next to a ship with cargo ready for unloading:

Says the English merchant: 'I will get my hired people to help unload your cargo - please excuse their rather poor dress, they only wear rags'.

Responds the Dutch merchant: 'I would welcome the assistance with the cargo of your lomp'.

Just such a Dutch and English occasion during international commerce may have created the meaning of a lumpen-related term 'lumper'. A privileged literary class member, Samuel Johnson

(1709-1784) in his 'Dictionary of the English Language' of 1755, just "could not visit caverns ... the warehouses ... and shops" (Johnson, 1755) to discover the term *lumper*. Yet Samuel Johnson (1755) had "found in books" the similar word "lumping" for his dictionary which he subjectively would define as "a low word". Thus the term 'lumping' had a class-based connotation.

Yet *lumper* got noticed by the literary class of England. After serving in a General James Wolfe regiment in 1758, George Parker (1732-1800) finished 'A View of Society and Manners in High and Low Life' in 1781 wherein a *lumper* was subjectively someone "hanging about quays, wharfs, etc. stealing ... whatever comes to hand" (Farmer and Henley, 1896:249). Fifteen years later the term *lumper* was judged by Patrick Colquhoun (1745-1820) in 'Police of the Metropolis' of 1796 more objectively as those who practiced the "discharging and delivering the cargos of ships" (Farmer and Henley, 1896:249). Thus during the last half of the 18th century, England's literary class uncovered *lumper* and associated it with international seaport activities.

But "the meaning of words change" (Freeborn, 1992:ix); by the mid 19th century, the term 'lumper' moved beyond England's seaports and embraced additional meaning. By 1850, an observer and interviewer of street life, Henry Mayhew (1812-1887) in 'London Labour and the London Poor' used 'lumper' as if it were a word that was quite common among lower class street life. In distinguishing "two ... classes" of "street-seller", Mayhew (1861a:373) wrote that "a 'Duffer' (is) a man who sold goods under false pretences ...; whereas a 'Lumper' would sell ... (goods) which might be really the commodities represented; but which by some management or other, were made (to) appear ... (different than they appeared after the sale of that good)". In short, over a rather short 50 years a 'lumper' became a small scale retailer in a pre-welfare state economy.

This view of *lumper* as a small scale retailer was supported by a definition of a companion term, the wholesaler. According to Mayhew (1861a:373-374), the "'swag' ... supplied ... a street-seller. ... (Thus) the swag or wholesale(rs) ... are ... traders. ... The 'duffers' and 'lumpers' are supplied ... (by the) swag-shop keepers ... (who are from the sector called) wholesale".

But the interviewer expanded upon the definition of *lumper* as a small scale retailer. Later, Henry Mayhew (1861b:256) saw a *lumper* as a "middleman; whether 'sweater', 'piece-master', 'lumper', or what not, coming between the employer and employed". Thus the *lumper* was more than a small retailer; the *lumper* was an agent of service between employer and the other employed. Yet later, Henry Mayhew (1861b:329) clarified the meaning of "'middlemen' (as those) living by the labour of others". And finally, Mayhew (1861b:330) concludes that "the 'lumper', or first contractor, agrees for both labour and materials ... (who) then, in his turn, finds out a sub-contractor. ... The first contractor (the *lumper*) has scarcely any trouble whatsoever. ... The sub-contractor has a little more trouble". Thus a 'lumper' was also a first contractor.

So what happened in the 50 years that changed the meaning of 'lumper' in England by the middle of the 19th century? Until the end of the 18th century, the English meaning of 'lumper' suggests that Hal Draper's (1978) "lumpen" as "rag" was possibly correct. But a shift in the interests of or composition of the literary class from the age of Samuel Johnson and George Parker to the literary class in the age of Henry Mayhew uncovered a new meaning in the term 'lumper'. It is plausible that the legitimate Dutch 'rag' association is more complex in England than the root from the early Modern Dutch as linked to the international commerce activities of that nation with England.

What might make more complex the straight Dutch to English link just suggested? At least two plausible influences might serve to complicate the Dutch to English linkage.

The first relates to the presence of yet other European languages which might use the term. Some variation of the term 'lump' can be found among the other Germanic languages, such as Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Low German (Skeat, 1910:351; Onions, 1966:539), Middle High German (Barnhart, 1988:615) and Frisian (Skeat, 1910:351) - indeed Shipley (1970:219) claimed that the term "lump is common Teut(onic)". Thus other Germanic origins may have intervened along with the early Modern Dutch origins association; indeed, in Danish, Norwegian and Swedish, the term "lump" seems closer to meaning the word "block" (Bradley, 1908b:498; Simpson and Weiner, 1989b:100) which approximates some form of physical mass or size.

A second influence relates to the presence of social class in the use of the term. To be active in international commerce, one must necessarily be from a certain social class or status; thus, one probably has ownership of a yacht to be able to apply a name to that yacht as in this not implausible situation:

An English Questioner: 'What kind of ship is that?'

The Dutch Response: 'A yacht'.

Thus the Dutch term 'lomp' as meaning 'rag' may be class based; a term used to differentiate one social class from another by the objective criteria of one's clothing fashion.

There were antagonistic language differences between the social classes in England during the 18th century. According to Freeborn (1992:190), "the language of the common people was regarded as inferior by the educated upper classes in the eighteenth century, ... (indeed) language was regarded as 'the dress of thought'". But following the first French Revolution of 1789 and England's reforms during the first half of the 19th century, the literary class of England may have been induced to inform itself of the lowest of the classes in England through more sympathetic perspectives than solely through the manner in which a person had fashionably dressed themselves.

As a product of this more sympathetic approach in England, it is plausible that before Henry Mayhew did his interviews, the lowest class of England may have held on to a different meaning for the term 'lumper'. While the merchant and other upper classes of England appreciated 'lumper' for its meaning of class

difference based on one's dress, the lowest class of England may have appreciated the term for meaning another quality such as some form of physical size derived from the root meaning of 'block' as in the Scandinavian Germanic languages. Thus in making reference to a group of people of certain occupation as being 'lumpers', the lowest class might have appreciated the term for its reference to some form of human collectivity with a common purpose manifested through the tasks they accomplished.

Thus a Dutch alternative took root in commercial activity of England with the approval of the upper classes; it may also have had alternative lower class roots which complemented the Dutch source. It is not implausible that Frederick Engels may have been inspired to construct the meaning of his 'lumpen' prefix on the basis of his exposure to the use of 'lumper' as middlemen while in Manchester. Supporting this plausible circumstance, Henry Mayhew (1861b:377) also informs us that a certain type of lumper middleman "are sometimes called Manchestermen" partially because a census of Great Britain from 1841 showed that "the counties in which the hawkers, hucksters, and pedlars most abound appear to be - 1st Lancaster (near Manchester - ed)".

(2) THE MODERN ENGLISH 'LUMP-WORK' ALTERNATIVE. This position suggests that the plural prefix 'lumpen' was derived from a manner of subdividing work. This alternative may be linked to the Dutch origins alternative (just above); it may not have been possible in England until the term 'lumper' was firmly established to define either a middleman or first contractor. In his writings, Mayhew (1861a, 1861b) establishes chronologically the meaning of "lumper" for the reader - Mayhew had many of these writings published in the 'Morning Chronicle' newspaper from 1849 to 1850 - before publicly unveiling "lump work" to his readers.

Not only are 'lumper' and 'lump-work' linked, but since Mayhew's (1861b:330) 'lumper' was a first contractor, 'lump work' and 'piece work' were joined. According to Mayhew (1861b:330), "the main distinction between it (lump work - ed) and piece-work being that the work is given out in large quantities (by the former). ... The first man who agrees to the job takes it in the lump, and he again lets it to others in the piece. ... 'Lump' work, 'piece' work ... are all portions of the contract system".

As a proportioning of the hierarchical contract system, 'lump-work' exists at the front end while piece work takes place at the back end of the contract in its subdivided form. "The 'contract system' or 'lump work', as it is called, is ..." writes Henry Mayhew (1861b:329), "that the work should be obtained by the trading operative (lumper - ed) in large quantities, so that those upon whose labour he lives should be kept continually occupied, and ... the greater his (lumper) profit".

This view of 'lump-work' as the first hierarchical division of work from the employer is elsewhere confirmed. In 'The Oxford English Dictionary', Simpson and Weiner (1989b:100) reference "lump work" to be defined as the work "of persons ... who contract to do work 'in the lump', i.e. for a lump sum".

The use of the concept 'lump-work' within the English

language has declined. The tension in Henry Mayhew's (1861b) writing - the necessity to use the term 'contract work' to help define the term 'lump work' - may reflect a class struggle in England over just how to give a 'name' to this specific concept of how to do work. It appears that the literary-skilled upper and merchant classes of England are imposing a legalistic and state supported label of 'contract work' to the task in opposition to the lower classes who seem to prefer using the label 'lump-work'. In using both terms, Mayhew asserts the linguistic dissent of the lower classes in using 'lump-work' but seemingly makes apology to his upper class readers by also inserting 'contract work' to help his upper class readers to bridge a seeming class struggle understanding over just which word label would triumph linguistically in England - 'lump-work' or 'contract work'.

So we are offered another Marx and Engels source for the prefix to the concept lumpenproletariat. If the alternative has any credibility as an inspiration for Marx and Engels, I would suggest that the two creators were deliberately taking sides in this linguistic class struggle. In choosing 'lumpen' as their prefix, Marx and Engels dared to attempt to preserve a continuing existence for the lower class preferred, but now defunct English term 'lump-work' which is today - late in the 20th century - now triumphantly replaced by the more legalistic and authoritative term 'contract work' readily preferred by lawyers.

(3) THE OLD ENGLISH 'LUMPEN' ALTERNATIVE. This Old English origins hypothesis argues a longer history exists for the verb 'lumpen' that helped inspire Marx and Engels in 1845-1846. This 'pre-modern' hypothesis notes that the verb 'lumpen' is a "past participle" of the Old English verb "gelimpan" which meant "to happen" (Bradley, 1908a:303; Wright and Wright, 1925:267; Ogura, 1986:62; Simpson and Weiner, 1989a:969-970).

The origins of our Modern English term "lump" may have been associated with this Old English origins. Bradley (1908b:498), who is redone by Simpson and Weiner (1989b:100), writes that "the ulterior etymology (of lump) is quite uncertain. ... It might perhaps be connected with Old English (ge)limpan, past participle (ge)lumpen, to happen, the original notion being that of such a quantity as chance determines - such a portion as may offer itself, and not any measured or intentionally shaped piece".

The Old English origins hypothesis views the verb 'lumpen' as having a long history. The past participle verb 'gelumpen' or 'lumpen' is found in a translation by Alfred (970?:155) which is believed to be written about 970 in the Midlands of England; the verb 'lumpen' was still found written some 400 years later about 1380 in two West-Midland (near present day Manchester - ed) poems written by Anonymous (1380?a:49,74; 1380?b:104).

Given its use as an Old English strong verb, why did 'gelimpan' and its past participle 'lumpen' supposedly disappear from everyday usage? Of about 13 Old English verbs which had meant "to happen" (Ogura, 1986:51-75), the verb "'gelimpan' is the commonest verb denoting 'to happen' (Ogura, 1986:75).

Such usage should ensure its success against its 12

competitors; yet it didn't. Why? According to Ogura (1986:68) the wide use of the verb "'gelimpan' ... came to belong to three different semantic fields - 'to happen', 'to belong to' and 'to become'. It seems that 'gelimpan' was driven out by a new loan word 'happen' because of (1) the confusion of the three meanings, and (2) the petrification in its use to a mere introductory formula 'hit gelamp' and the consequent loss of its force".

The credibility of this third Old English origins camp, which finds that the past participle strong verb 'lumpen' meant 'to happen', rests on a theoretical 'leap-of-faith'. Could the Old English meaning of 'lumpen' survive for another 450 years from about 1380 to about 1840 in the West Midlands area of England near the City of Manchester? If Frederick Engels had uncovered this particular meaning of 'lumpen' from the lower class natives of Manchester, this third alternative is another worthy opponent to the essentially circumstantial Modern German origins position that is advanced by Hal Draper (1978).

SUMMARY: Thus I have offered here some other sources of origin to form the research base for a 'deliberately thought out' alternative hypothesis to the circumstantial 'accidental slipping out' Modern German origins position offered by Hal Draper (1978).

276. The objective reason. In his project, Draper (1978) underestimates the contribution of Engels. This applies to 'The German Ideology' wherein lumpenproletariat is created. Of some importance was when 'The German Ideology' was written, "the bulk of the manuscript ... is in Engels' hand" (Marx and Engels, 1846:19,587). While this may be a mute point, Hal Draper (1978) implicitly suggests the concept be associated with Marx; it is more likely that lumpenproletariat was created by Engels who had a stronger connection with England than his partner. Why?

By the writing of 'The German Ideology' from November of 1845, Marx spent but two months in England - mostly in its libraries reading economic works - while Engels, having worked a number of years in the family's goods producing firm in England, and having already researched a book on conditions in England, was more likely to be familiar with English concepts as lumpen, the relationship between piece work and lump work, and whether or not a 1380 Old English meaning of lumpen had survived into the Manchester of the 1840s (see above). More support for an Engels' created lumpenproletariat can be uncovered. Two are noted.

FIRST, the concept's history shows that Marx and Engels suppressed the use of the concept in the later years of Marx's life. Some three years after Marx's death, however, Engels would resurrect the concept from near death.

SECOND, the English alternative confronts the research of Draper (1978). Upon completing research of German dictionaries and encyclopedias, Hal Draper (1978:629) admits weakness in the German origins argument; "to this day 'Lumpenproletariat' does not usually appear even in large German dictionaries. When listed in German encyclopedias, it is treated as a term peculiar to Marx, not as a German word. Indeed (one) modern dictionary ...

lists it as a foreign loan word!" Even the German word experts, according to Hal Draper (1978:629), deny any German origin.

277. The subjective reason. Max Stirner (1844) was so despised that it induced Marx and Engels - despite the fun they had while doing their writing - to work so mightily that they altered their radical liberal perspective to intellectually defeat Stirner.

Thus it is plausible that they came to subjectively despise Max Stirner (1844). It is also plausible that Marx and Engels would have found great intellectual joy in playing what is but a 'linguistic game' in defeating Stirner (1844). The temptation to use 'lumpen' from an English context, which Stirner (1844) had used in a German context, may have been too strong a temptation to pass by. Being human, with all the emotions which such beings were possessed, Marx and Engels probably laughed with great glee as they may have made this linguistic discovery and uncovered its delicious irony in this multilingual usage of the term lumpen.

It would be Marx and Engels who literally gained the 'last laugh' at the expense of Stirner (1844). This was the Max Stirner who had driven them to such intellectual turmoil that they had to basically alter their own intellectual beliefs to defeat him.

278. According to Draper (1978:453), "Marx did not work this (lumpenproletariat - ed) out until 1852". This meant the concept was worked out about six years after its creation in 1846; they had, in those six years, used the concept on 58 of their total of 88 lifetime occasions! If Draper was correct, then a long-term learning curve was undertaken by Marx and Engels!

279. In 'The German Ideology', the 'deliberate construction' hypothesis is supported by Marx and Engels (1846:202) who said the lumpenproletariat "have existed in every epoch ... (and then) 'on a mass scale' after the decline of the Middle Ages preceded the mass formation of the ordinary proletariat".

280. At the time, Hal Draper (1978:456) said that the "four groups making up the 'proletariat', ... (were) the 'workers' ... the beggars, the thieves, and the prostitutes".

281. The problem with the 'proletariat', as Draper (1978:456) saw it, was that in "the 1840s, the packaging of these four groups under the single label 'proletariat' ... was intolerable for anyone trying to make sense of the new developments".

In France, according to Draper (1978:456) "the modern meaning of 'proletariat' arose ... as a special designation for the new ... class of wage-workers". As Draper (1978:456) saw the debate, "some other term would have to be found for the other (remaining) three groups in ... (the old) 'proletariat', and this was the function assumed - for Marx - by 'lumpenproletariat'".

For the synchronic inclined Draper (1978:457), "the word 'lumpenproletariat' came in to designate a part of the old proletariat but not of the modern proletariat".

282. There are two of importance:

FIRST: The proletariat and the lumpenproletariat in conflict relationship. In 'The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850', Marx (1850:62-63) said the French "government formed ... 'mobile guards' ... belonged ... to the 'lumpenproletariat', which in all big towns forms a mass sharply differentiated from the industrial proletariat. ... And so the Paris proletariat was confronted with an army, drawn from its own midst, of ... young, strong, foolhardy men ... the Mobile Guard".

Draper's (1978) view of the diachronic concepts relationship differs; he focused on the structural or objective separation of the two classes. As Draper (1978:462) wrote on the classes:

... On the one hand, the lumpen-elements are drawn 'from its own midst', that is, generated out of the ranks of the proletariat, and on the other hand 'sharply differentiated from the industrial proletariat'. ... The solution of the terminological confusion was also plain. For historically the lumpenproletariat 'was' drawn from the midst of the working masses in the sense of being 'precipitated out of them' by the processes of developing bourgeois society.

Since Draper (1978) saw 'lumpenproletariat' and 'proletariat' as synchronic concepts, he confronted contradictory evidence - such as the objective boundaries between concepts that embrace the same person - in the confines of its objective properties. Thus Draper dealt objectively with evidence implying the same person might be in two classes by arguing that the 'lumpenproletariat' had objectively fallen out of the 'proletariat' - as if a person was 'transported down' to a new class, thus effectively obeying some law of gravity.

Had Draper viewed the concepts as diachronic, interpretation of the seemingly contradictory became manageable. If the 'proletariat' and the 'lumpenproletariat' were both viewed as the diachronic expression of the synchronic 'working class', then the seemingly contradictory may be explained. In one case, the diachronically formed 'Paris proletariat was confronted with an army, drawn from its own midst' within the synchronic 'working class' to which it belonged as did the 'lumpenproletariat'. In the other, one diachronic class 'forms a mass sharply differentiated from the industrial proletariat', yet another diachronic class.

SECOND: The composition of the 'lumpenproletariat'. In 'The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte', a still angry Karl Marx (1852a:149) said that the 'lumpenproletariat' "were vagabonds, discharged soldiers, discharged jailbirds, escaped galley slaves, rogues, mountebanks, 'lazzaroni', pickpockets, tricksters, gamblers, 'procurers', brothel keepers, porters, 'literati', organ-grinders, rag-pickers, knife grinders, tinkers, beggars - in short, the whole indefinite, disintegrated mass, thrown hither and thither".

This Marx (1852a) outburst sparked controversy as to its accurate portrayal of the concept. An opposing position by Draper was that this read was the best lumpenproletariat definition

available from Marx and Engels. Having declared that Marx and Engels took six years to find their meaning of lumpenproletariat from 1846 to 1852, Draper (1978:463) now held that "the basic breakthrough on the meaning of the lumpenproletariat was made ... in 'The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte'". Then Draper (1978:465) concludes that "the view that is now made clear, and will be consistently repeated, is that this class, formed out of social detritus and offscourings, is generated as the waste-product 'of all classes' ... the general sewer of society".

My position on 'lumpenproletariat' differs; they are not 'the general sewer of society'. Given that Draper (1972) suggests there were three meanings - a base meaning, an extended meaning, and a metaphorical meaning - to be found in the concept, he would argue that the 'sewer of society' description is a 'base meaning' of 'lumpenproletariat'.

Rather than a 'base meaning' - if I read the three vague Draper meanings correctly - of the concept, it is more likely that this is an 'extended meaning' of 'lumpenproletariat'. The prolonged use of adjectives reflects an extreme use of negative labels by an angry Karl Marx upset with the lumpenproletariat, who had killed-off many a good proletarian in the Paris of 1848. Marx's literary outburst against the Paris lumpenproletariat produced an extreme use of adjectives to define the concept. This emotional run-on of subjective descriptives was but an 'extended meaning' of 'lumpenproletariat'.

283. While Hal Draper (1977; 1978) acknowledged some 75 uses of the concept lumpenproletariat within 40 documents, this project found 88 uses within 50 documents.

284. These three uses include:

FIRST, Marx and Engels (1848b:259) wrote of the "civil dependence ... (of the 'armed lumpenproletarian') 'lazzaroni'" as their literary anger at a murderous Paris lumpenproletariat was beginning to show itself in their work.

SECOND, Marx and Engels (1855:42) calls England's future soldiers "the 'tag-rag' and 'bobtail' (the lumpenproletariat)".

THIRD, Karl Marx (1855b:541) notes that "the government of the Two Sicilies relies on ... lazzaroni at home".

285. Karl Marx (1860:34,155) recycled three uses from 'The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte' of 1852 and, when commenting on the effective political power of the class, he notes that it is "the class of the lumpenproletariat ... that in France constitutes the sole social basis of the 'bas empire'".

286. There were five overlooked uses of lumpenproletariat that belonged in this group:

FIRST, the fragile nature of class consciousness was noted. Here is the fragile nature of class consciousness within a growing proletariat whose class conscious behaviour barely moves beyond that of the lumpenproletariat. Engels (1849:44) wrote that

the "Swiss proletariat is still largely what one describes as lumpenproletariat, prepared to sell themselves to anyone who will make extravagant promises". Had Draper noted this use in context, some discussion of consciousness difference between the two diachronic classes was required. A synchronic lumpenproletariat stopped him from engaging in an analysis of class consciousness.

SECOND, a person was named a lumpenproletariat. Here is a person named as a member of the lumpenproletariat. As a measure of the class consciousness and reliability of a supporter, Marx (1852b:155) refers to a "tipsy lumpenproletarian 'Herweg'" who 'tips' between being the two diachronic classes. Had Draper seen this, he would have had to account for the easy movement of a person 'tipsy' between the two classes.

THIRD, the proletariat and lumpenproletariat consciousness are compared. Here lumpenproletariat is compared to proletariat through the presence of class consciousness. On consciousness, Marx and Engels (1873:454) write that "the proletariat, too, has its 'declassé' elements; they make up the lumpenproletariat". Here the term 'declassé' is metaphorically used to reference the declassified lacking class consciousness; they are declassified of, or without class consciousness.

FOURTH, there is a position on the objective class location of the lumpenproletariat. The physical class position of the lumpenproletariat is below workers with a trade. Engels (1889b:304) says those "of all trades, (are) the lowest stratum above the lumpenproletariat". With lumpenproletariat below those with a trade, Engels declared that service workers were below workers whose trade was producing goods. This is a preference for productive labour over the unproductive labourer.

FIFTH, an overlooked use has not been translated. Here Engels (1890:509) used "lumpenproletariat" in a non-translated letter; this project suffers researcher incompetence in the German language only once among the 13 overlooked uses.

287. On three occasions the street-fighting of June, 1848, in Paris, was addressed by Traugott (1980a; 1980b; 1985).

First, Traugott (1980a:36) concludes that "all empirical evidence underscores the similarity in class origins between (proletarian) insurgents and (lumpenproletarian) Mobile Guardsmen".

Second, similarly and separately, Traugott (1980b:710) writes: "I am forced to conclude that the Mobile Guard ... in fact constituted a reasonable cross-section of the Parisian population of the times and, in its class composition, differed little from the insurgents themselves".

Third, and later, Mark Traugott (1985:124) clarified what he meant by class as well as the similarity between the fighting parties and the general population of Paris when he concluded that "a remarkable similarity exists in the occupational distribution of insurgents, Mobile Guardsmen, and the general Parisian population".

The similarity between a lumpenproletariat Mobile Guard and

the proletariat National Workshops in the Paris of June, 1848 was attributed to their creation five short months earlier. Traugott (1985:178) claims to "have shown that members of the Mobile Guard and National Workshops alike were recruited from the February barricades, at which point they constituted an undifferentiated mass ... (and) that through late May both groups were effectively coopted and ... were quite similar in political orientation".

288. Another debate is related to the productive labour versus unproductive labour controversy distinguished by Karl Marx's intellectual behaviour which differed from his usual behaviour; rather than attack the credibility of bourgeois thought - as he often did - he borrowed and even defended the thinking of the bourgeois economist Adam Smith! Indeed David Lovell (1988:201) says "the distinction between productive and unproductive labourers does not correspond to Marx's earlier distinctions between ... proletarians and lumpenproletarians (which was chiefly political)". I happen to disagree!

Their reluctance to popularize lumpenproletariat led them to examine synchronic issues to resolve diachronic problems: 'How are the diachronic classes maintained in a synchronic moment?'

Their answer: 'The diachronic proletariat is maintained by synchronic activity in productive labour, while lumpenproletariat does the same through unproductive labour'. In denying linkage between them, Lovell (1988) overlooks the link between historical or diachronic class development and how momentary or synchronic activities influence that process. The move to examine synchronic economics was undertaken with the belief they might be able to explain the historical and political diachronic developments; in particular, the productive versus unproductive idea was borrowed from Adam Smith to help historically explain these classes.

289. The diachronic-synchronic divide was problematic for some trying to examine the proletariat. This intellectual struggle can be found in an observation made nearly 60 years ago within a 297 page expose of the concept proletariat by Goetz Briefs (1937).

More specifically, Goetz Briefs (1937:76-77) stated on the appearance of the proletariat:

It is a significant fact that in 'Capital', his masterwork, the concepts 'proletariat' and 'proletarian' almost never appear. In ... Volume I the omission is a striking one. ... Except for ... few references, 'Capital' has almost nothing to say about proletarians or the proletariat, the terms regularly used being 'workers', 'wage-labourers', 'factory hands', 'the mass of workers', 'the working-class'. But ... he has purposely detached an economic concept, wage-labourer, from the sociological concept, proletariat.

Here he has problems noticing the distinction between synchronic concepts and diachronic ones - although Briefs struggled to make a similar comparison when referring to the "wage-labourer" as a point-in-time economic concept and then viewing "proletariat" as

a point-through-time sociological concept - we see the start of an answer to the diachronic versus synchronic point of view.

290. On the 'two conditions' model, Frederick Engels (1845:507) wrote: "If the competition of the (synchronic - ed) workers among themselves is destroyed, if all determine not to be further exploited by the (diachronic - ed) bourgeoisie, the rule of property is at an end".

To recapitulate, the 'two conditions' model accounted for what prevented the 'proletariat' from victory. The two conditions model expressed two viewpoints of class struggle which were:

FIRST, the model set a traditional second general quality of hierarchy as a site of above versus below class struggle between 'bourgeoisie' and 'proletariat' in the eighth general quality.

SECOND, the model saw 'anti-hierarchy' as a potential site for a different kind of class struggle; a struggle that was not vertical but horizontal in its nature. Indeed, the synchronic concept 'workers' was used instead of a diachronic concept to suggest that more than one diachronic class was present; that these diachronic classes openly 'competed' with each other.

The articulation of this second horizontal class struggle is a point at which Marx and Engels become mature Marxists.

291. In a book for Toronto Studies in Philosophy on Marx and Engels, Keith Graham (1992:5) makes "a distinction between his 'synchronic materialism', concerning the shape and interrelations of a given society at a moment in time; and his 'diachronic materialism', concerning the dynamics of social change". To show the linkage of class to these two materialisms, two subchapters entitled "Class in Synchronic Materialism" (Graham, 1992:55-64) and "Class in Diachronic Materialism" (Graham, 1992:75-79) enforce these two modes of thought in Marx and Engels.

292. Any 'lumpenproletariat' versus 'proletariat' contrast should also include:

(1) The major property of a lumpenproletariat versus proletariat contrast was whether class consciousness in either diachronic class was present. A condition to be a proletariat was having class consciousness, while a requirement for being lumpenproletariat was a lack of class consciousness. Rather than class consciousness, lumpenproletariat possessed some form of 'obedience consciousness' to the bourgeoisie which was sufficiently ingrained to enable them to even take up arms against their proletarian countrymen.

(2) The proletariat versus lumpenproletariat contrast has other features. The strongest original core of the proletariat is found in the goods producing sectors, that is, within the factories where productive labour often occurs, while the strongest original core of the lumpenproletariat is found in the service producing sectors, that is, in the literary and law-enforcement industries, where unproductive labour exists.

(3) The proletariat versus lumpenproletariat contrast

extends to other properties. Given a Marx and Engels thesis-antithesis tension, the lumpenproletariat were a reactionary old society class while proletariat would replace lumpenproletariat to become a new society class. Thus, in present old society, the lumpenproletariat are a larger class than proletariat.

(4) The micro 'codes of behaviour' of both classes differ. While lumpenproletariat behave in a vicious and opportunistic manner; were corruptible and void of principle, the proletariat behave according to fairness and to principle. Similarly, while the lumpenproletariat liked to be bought by the highest bidder with extravagant promises and preferred to serve those with the most power, the proletariat act against oppressive power and were unimpressed by promises. While lumpenproletariat were politically little qualified and thus incompetent, the proletariat were politically competent. In addition, while the proletariat had done some thinking, the lumpenproletariat spend no time in thought. As a final code of behaviour characteristic, while lumpenproletariat were controlled by their alcohol consumption habits, the proletariat controlled their alcohol consumption habits. Thus specific individual behaviour - no matter how trivial - was judged in a collective manner in order to identify, and separate, one diachronic class from the other.

(5) Some characteristics of the lumpenproletariat do not require a direct contrast with the proletariat. There was a rationale as to why lumpenproletariat might never become the proletariat; geographical dispersal restricted this class to their immediate, everyday interests. to the wish for a good wage for good work instead of assisting to bring them together as a proletariat.

(5) Another characteristic noted that lumpenproletariat existed in some specific occupations. Those whose occupations included journalists, lawyers, certain ambitious professors, police, army reserve, the Pope, waiters and servants, political activists, public relations experts, speech writers, and those who do business with the Government were particularly filled by those who belonged to the lumpenproletariat.

(6) The lumpenproletariat was also composed of people with other characteristics. They were identified as being made up of those people who had a specific ethnicity or a certain religion, and were suggested to also be composed of younger men who were more malleable than were those who were members of the proletariat.

(7) The lumpenproletariat also made use of certain services more frequently than the proletariat. The former were quite likely to visit the brothels, the lunatic asylums, the courthouse, and the dungeon more often than the latter. The former were also more likely to take out loans of money than the latter.

(8) There are common characteristics between the proletariat and the lumpenproletariat. Both were composed of urban workers.

SUMMARY: While both classes featured common characteristics, they were more commonly marked by their differences. Thus the

mirror image metaphor for these two classes has merit.

293. Creating 'lumpenproletariat' was an insight by Marx and Engels which moved their work beyond the existing radical-liberal debate on class. They had discovered a 13th general quality of 'proletariat'; an ever present 'lumpenproletariat' meant struggle with a class 'among you'.

294. FIRST, is lumpenproletariat a status? The concept status is any position held by a person within some form of social system. Since a person may hold a number of statuses - that is, a status set - which help build that person's status hierarchy at any point-in-time, the concept is more synchronic in character than diachronic. While lumpenproletariat is diachronic and is also more abstract in its meaning than is the concept status, its concept form is not a good match with that of a status.

SECOND, is lumpenproletariat an identity? The concept identity might be a person's making or self-assertion of themselves into a someone quite different than others. Since self-assertion is a process, this concept seems more diachronic in character than synchronic. This seems compatible with the meaning of lumpenproletariat. While a common identity is possible at the macro level of activity, self-assertion is generally an individual micro process. When we think of lumpenproletariat, we here will associate the concept with some macro level activities. This is not a perfect match with the concept form of identity.

THIRD, is lumpenproletariat a class? The concept class could be a set of individuals which share similar economic status sets or marketplace positions. Since the characteristic of economic status sets is mostly of point-in-time qualities, the concept class tends to be more synchronic in character than diachronic. In effect, the concept form of the diachronic lumpenproletariat, is not a good match with that of a class.

FOURTH, is lumpenproletariat a social class? The concept social class is a set of individuals which share similar economic status sets or marketplace position as well as other social status sets such as group consciousness, common identity, or the common will to behave as a social unit. Since economic status sets is mostly of point-in-time qualities, while the other social status sets tend to possess point-through-time qualities, the concept social class can take on a diachronic character. Thus the concept of a diachronic lumpenproletariat, is a plausible match with that of a social class since the qualities of the lumpenproletariat combine the economic with the social.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE OLD CONCEPT LUMPENPROLETARIAT

295. An example of how a science tries to standardize its basic concepts is found in chemistry; any Chemist, knows to which substance the letter 'K' refers.

296. Here I refer to the vaguely defined three meanings which Draper (1972) attributes - that is, a base meaning, an extended meaning, and a metaphorical meaning - to the manner in which Marx and Engels used 'lumpenproletariat' in their writing.

297. From a public relations perspective, it is easier to sell to a future proletariat the idea of 'an enemy above' in the form of the bourgeoisie, than it was to sell them the idea that there was 'an enemy among them' in the form of a lumpenproletariat.

298. Of Eduard Bernstein, Manfred Steger (1992:657-658) has said that "Bernstein was the first post-Marxist".

299. On February 7, 1898, Eduard Bernstein (1898c:192) found himself having to defend an earlier writing which read: "I frankly admit that I have extraordinarily little feeling for, or interest in, what is usually termed 'the final goal of socialism'. This goal, whatever it may be, is nothing to me, the movement is everything".

Thus Eduard Bernstein (1898c) took a keen interest in the nature of social movements; on this occasion, he had to defend himself against claims that he had put the condition of a (any?) social movement ahead even of its specific goals as a movement. Bernstein's (1898c:193) response was to argue that the purpose of a social movement's "goal is not the realization of a social plan but the implementation of a social 'principle'". And further, Bernstein (1898c:193) noted, that: "There is value only in being clear about the general course of the movement, and in examining closely the factors which influence it".

Then eight months later, in an October 10, 1898 letter to Karl Kautsky, Bernstein had "suggested formulating socialist theory within a 'language of rights', thus rejecting the ... Marxist perspective that rights are nothing but the egotistic manifestations of the self-interested individual 'withdrawn into himself and separated from the community'" (Steger, 1992:648).

300. Here is a 'language game' on class structure, with the 'modernity' versus 'postmodernity' debate in mind, which I would like to put forward for new debate.

Recently, Barry Smart (1993:13-14) wrote:

... a concept of postmodernity has been invoked to describe developments in a number of areas, including ... (then a list of over 20 areas is then given - ed) ... have all been described as postmodern.

My 'language game' adds to that postmodernity list by further playing with the concept of industry sectors defined as

the primary, secondary, and tertiary industry sectors. More specifically, my 'language game' is based on the assumptions that the primary industries dominated the economies of the age of premodernity, the secondary industries dominated the economies of the age of modernity, while tertiary industry dominates the economies of the age of postmodernity.

In my 'language game' I add a further debate as noted by Barry Smart (1993:19-20) which is:

... that we find disagreement developing around the idea of postmodernism, notably between analysts and critics who conceive of postmodernism as a culture of eclecticism which celebrates the status quo, and those who argue that there is an alternative postmodernism which ... resist(s) the status quo. In short a contrast between an affirmative (postmodernism) and a critical postmodernism, or a postmodernism of reaction and a postmodernism of resistance.

Thus, in my 'language game', I play with the notion of two visions of postmodernity as being an affirmative postmodernity as well as a critical postmodernity.

With the Marx and Engels concepts of diachronic classes in mind, I would like to propose a scheme of industry-class relations for discourse. Within this proposed scheme, designed to associate class relations through a variety of industrial ages, it is hoped that debate recaptures the place of class. Being that class is quite possibly the oldest sociological concept going, I remain convinced that class analysis should remain with us.

XXXXX

XXXXX

HISTORICAL MODEL OF CLASS RELATIONS DURING INDUSTRIAL AGES

XXX

Premodernity

- small synchronic working class (small urban)
 - the moral class does not exist
 - the immoral class does not exist
 - the unjudged class lumpenproletariat
- physically present class bourgeoisie
- dominant consciousness obedience consciousness
- opposition consciousness does not exist

Modernity

- larger synchronic working class (more urban)
 - the moral class proletariat
 - the immoral class lumpenproletariat
 - the unjudged class does not exist
- physically present class bourgeoisie
- dominant consciousness obedience consciousness
- opposition consciousness class consciousness

Affirmative Postmodernity

- large synchronic working class (very urban)
 - the moral class does not exist
 - the immoral class does not exist
 - the unjudged class lumpenproletariat

- physically present class	bourgeoisie
- dominant consciousness	obedience consciousness
- opposition consciousness	does not exist
Critical Postmodernity	
- large synchronic working class (very urban)	
- the small moral class	proletariat
- the moral class	rightsproletariat
- the moral class	religiousproletariat
- the immoral class	lumpenproletariat
- the unjudged class	does not exist
- physically present class	bourgeoisie
- dominant consciousness	obedience consciousness
- small minority consciousness	class consciousness
- opposition consciousness	rights consciousness
- opposition consciousness	religious consciousness

XXXXX

XXXXX

There are a number of features of this model that require comment on assumptions made.

First: In all ages the bourgeoisie exists as an oppressor.

Second: In all ages there is a synchronic urban working class which avoids any notion human consciousness. What varies among the ages is the consciousness of that synchronic working class when it is expressed in diachronic class terms.

(1) During those ages where the synchronic class is the unjudged class, little - if any - moral judgment is cast upon that class because it is not engaged in some form of class struggle with a class to its side.

(2) During those ages where the synchronic class includes a moral class and an immoral class, moral judgments are cast upon the neighbouring classes to its side because they are both engaged in class struggle with that class to its side. In addition, if present, the moral class would be the negative antithesis against the other classes present, while the immoral class are the positive antithesis loyal to the bourgeoisie.

Third: The dominant consciousness of each age reflect the consciousness of the synchronic working class becoming either an uncontested diachronic class or several diachronic classes in contest with each other and, perhaps, with the bourgeoisie. The lumpenproletariat is the class of dominant consciousness in each age and its consciousness focuses on obedience to the social order as articulated by the bourgeoisie. But during certain eras - modernity and critical postmodernity - oppositional diachronic classes arise in opposition to the lumpenproletariat:

(1) If that oppositional class is the proletariat, then the consciousness is directed towards class struggle; this occurs because the new proletariat believes that the dominant lumpenproletariat has lost its sense of class consciousness which it had somewhat maintained during the previous era. Further, if an oppositional moral class had oppositional consciousness in an earlier age, its influence wanes as a new age begins; that is, class conscious becomes a lower priority in those ages following

modernity as it becomes replaced by other forms of oppositional consciousness.

(2) If that oppositional class is the rightsproletariat, then its consciousness is more focused on citizenry civil and minority rights; this occurs because the rightsproletariat believes that the dominant lumpenproletariat has lost its sense of citizenry rights consciousness which the lumpenproletariat had somewhat maintained during the previous era.

(3) If that oppositional class is the religiousproletariat, then its consciousness is focused on promoting a more religious lifestyle; this occurs because the religiousproletariat believes that the dominant lumpenproletariat has lost its religious consciousness and lifestyle which the lumpenproletariat had somewhat maintained during the previous era.

ADDED NOTE: The postmodern phenomena of a rightsproletariat and of a religiousproletariat have roots in western civilization. The rightsproletariat is most evident in struggles for citizens' rights. The religiousproletariat is evident within the 'activist' and the 'born again' Christian communities, but its strength is most evident worldwide in many of the anti-western fundamentalist nations of Islam. Both of these classes, however, may confront each other; issues where such conflict may occur is over abortion, daycare, or the place of women in relation to the household and the workplace, wherein the lumpenproletariat would simply wish that this conflict would go away since it interferes with their simple desire for happy self-gratification.

SUMMARY: Given that 'class' will always be among us, the rehabilitation of the lumpenproletariat should aide in our appreciation of class relations through any age or era. Class struggle is more than 'hierarchical', it also exists 'non-hierarchically' with the other diachronic class(es) among them.

APPENDIX NUMBER 1.1

Sociofile Data Base on the Lumpenproletariat:
From January, 1974 to December, 1995.

Berrocal, Luciano.

1981 "In Search of the Nation State: Genesis of the State in Puerto Rico". *Revue de l'Institut de Sociologie*. Volume 1-2:377-396.

Bovenkerk, Frank.

1980 "Rehabilitation of the Rabble: How and Why Marx and Engels Have Pictured the Lumpenproletariat Unjustly as a Force of Political Reaction". *Sociologische-Gids*. Volume 27(3):191-224.

1984 "The Rehabilitation of the Rabble: How and Why Marx and Engels Wrongly Depicted the 'Lumpenproletariat' as a Reactionary Force". *Netherlands Journal of Sociology*. Volume 20(1):13-41.

Burnham, Walter Dean.

1984*** "A Commentary on Harry Eckstein". *Daedalus*. Volume 113(4):147-160.

Cleaver, Eldridge.

1972*** "On Lumpen Ideology". *Black Scholar*. Volume 4(3):2-10.

Eckstein, Harry.

1984 "Civic Inclusion and Its Discontents". *Daedalus*. Volume 113(4):107-145.

Efirov, Svetoazar Aleksandrovich.

1979 "'Leftist' Extremism: Social Reality and Ideology". *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya*. Volume 6(2):154-166.

Florea, Aurelia.

1974 "Research Into Poverty, Social Information, and Popular Participation in Iran". *International Review of Sociology*. Volume 10(2-3):156-184.

Form, William; and Claudine Hanson.

1985 "The Consistency of Stratal Ideologies of Economic Justice". *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*. Volume 4:239-270.

French, Laurence A.

1978 "Watergate: An Assessment of Bourgeois Justice". *Quarterly Journal of Ideology*. Volume 2(1):33-38.

- Gouldner, Alvin W.
1974 "The Metaphoricality of Marxism and the Context Freeing Grammar of Socialism". Theory and Society. Volume 1(4):387-414.
- Hayes, Peter.
1993 "Marx's Analysis of the French Class Structure". Theory and Society. Volume 22(1):99-123.
- Kane, Francine.
1977 "Female Proletariat in Senegal, Town and Country". Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines. Volume 17(1):77-94.
- Kenworthy, Eldon.
1975 "Orthodox and Revisionist Interpretations of the Initial Support For Peronism". Desarrollo Economico. Volume 14(56):749-763.
- Knauder, Stefanie.
1984 "Aspects of Social Change in Zambia". Osterreichische Zeitschrift fur Soziologie. Volume 9(4):97-106.
- Kowalewski, David.
1991 "Counterinsurgent Vigilantism and Public Response: A Philippine Case Study". Sociological Perspectives. Volume 34(2):127-144.
- Kozlova, Natal'ya Nikitichna.
1993 "'The Weak Point' of Social Reality". Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya. Volume 20(2):79-87.
- Leontidou, Lila.
1985 "Urban Land Rights and Working Class Consciousness in Peripheral Societies". International Journal of Urban and Regional Research. Volume 9(4):533-556.
- Lelli, Marcello.
1977 "The Words Don't Change". Critica Sociologica. Volume 41:37-47.
- Mahabir, Cynthia.
1988 "Crime in the Caribbean: Robbers, Hustlers and Warriors". International Journal of the Sociology of Law. Volume 16(3):315-338.
- Mason, Tim.
1977 "National Socialism and the Working Class, 1925 - May, 1933". New German Critique. Volume 11:49-93.

- McDonogh, Gary W.
1991 "Culture and Categorization in a Turn-of-the-Century Barcelona Elite". *Cultural Anthropology*. Volume 6(3): 323-345.
- Miller, Wilbut R.
1975 "Police Authority in London and New York City, 1830-1870". *Journal of Social History*. Volume 8(2): 81-101.
- Munford, C.J.
1972 "Social Structure and Black Revolution". *Black Scholar*. Volume 4(3):11-23.
1973 "The Fallacy of Lumpen Ideology". *Black Scholar*. Volume 4(10):47-51.
- Naison, Mark.
1976*** "Charles Valentine on 'Voluntary Ethnicity': A Fraternal Critique". *Journal of Ethnic Studies*. Volume 4(1):11.-116.
- Nowakowski, Stefan.
1975 "Changes in the Social Macrostructure and Their Influence on Local Urban and Rural Communities". *Kultura i Społeczeństwo*. Volume 19(1):89-104.
- Pandey, P.S.
1978 "India's Population Problem - Myth and Reality". *Eastern Anthropologist*. Volume 31(3):313-318.
- Saffioti, Heleieth; and Vera Lucia Silveira Botta Ferrante.
1983 "Women and the Contradictions of Agrarian Capitalism". *Perspectivas*. Volume 6:67-75.
- Sarcinelli, Franco.
1994 "Pasolini and the Italian Case". *Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia*. Volume 35(2):205-230.
- Srinivasan, Shaila.
1992 "The Class Position of the Asian Bourgeoisie". *New Community*. Volume 19(1):61-74.
- Traugott, Mark.
1980 "The Mobile Guard in the French Revolution of 1848". *Theory and Society*. Volume 9(5):683-720.
- Tunnell, Kenneth D.
1990 "Property Criminals as the Lumpenproletariat: A Serendipitous Finding". *Nature, Society and Thought*. Volume 3(1):39-55.

Valentine, Charles A.

1975*** "Voluntary Ethnicity and Social Change: Classism, Racism, Marginality, Mobility, and Revolution With Special Reference to Afro-Americans and Other Third World Peoples". *Journal of Ethnic Studies*. Volume 3(1):1-27.

1976 "Class and Ethnicity, Marxism and Lumpenism: Notes in Response to a Critique of 'Voluntary Ethnicity'". *Journal of Ethnic Studies*. Volume 4(3):53-67.

Wallerstein, Immanuel.

1973 "Imperialism and Capitalism: Are the Workers the Most Oppressed Class?". *Insurgent Sociologist*. Volume 3(2): 25-28.

Woodward, Peter.

1978 "Ambiguous Amin". *African Affairs*. Volume 77(307): 153-164.

Wright, Richard A.

1980 "The Technocratic Estate in Postindustrial Society: Marxian Political Economics Toward The Year 2000". *International Review of Modern Sociology*. Volume 10(1):125-139.

*** Not directly listed on 'Sociofile' but the article is referred to within another abstract of an article listed.

APPENDIX NUMBER 1.2

**Frequency Distribution of Use of Lumpenproletariat in Sociofile
Data Base Year of Use of Word in Article Publication
By Language in Which Article is Written.**

Number of Uses by Language of Article

Year of Use	Total	English	Others
1972#	2	2	0
1973#	2	2	0
1974	2	1	1
1975	4	2	2
1976	2	2	0
1977	3	1	2
1978	3	3	0
1979	1	0	1
1980	3	2	1
1981	1	0	1
1982	0	0	0
1983	1	0	1
1984	4	3	1
1985	2	2	0
1986	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0
1988	1	1	0
1989	0	0	0
1990	1	1	0
1991	2	2	0
1992	1	1	0
1993	2	1	1
1994	1	0	1
1995##	0	0	0
Article Totals	38	26	12
Median Year	1980	1979	1980

Notes: # Underrepresented since Sociofile listed articles from 1974 to 1995 but also included some articles from 1972 and 1973.
 ## Underrepresented since Sociofile does not yet list all articles for 1995.

APPENDIX NUMBER 1.3

**Frequency Distribution of Use of Lumpenproletariat in Sociofile
Established Sociology Subfield Abstracts By Language
in Which Article is Written.**

Number of Uses by Language of Article			
Sociology Subfield	Total	English	Others
Political Systems	7	2	5
Stratification-Mobility	6	6	0
Marxist-Radical Sociology	4	4	0
Crime	2	2	0
Analysis of Societies	2	1	1
Feminist Studies	2	0	2
Terrorism	1	1	0
Culture	1	1	0
Social Indicators	1	1	0
Demography	1	1	0
Sociology of Law	1	1	0
Urban Sociology	1	1	0
Teaching Sociology	1	1	0
Sociology of Literature	1	0	1
Social Change	1	0	1
Poverty	1	0	1
History and Theory	1	0	1
Abstract Totals	34	22	12

Note: The Sociology Subfields used here are those created by the creators of Sociofile and Sociofile alone assigned each abstract within these subfields. These subfields are used here for illustrative purposes only since the methodology by which each abstract is assigned to each subfield is not found in published work by Abstracts.

APPENDIX NUMBER 2.1

**The Marx and Engels Lumpenproletariat Appears in Documents:
From August of 1846 to December of 1890.**

Engels, Frederick.

- 1847a "The Constitutional Question in Germany". Pp. 75-91. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 6. New York: International Publishers, 1976.
- 1847b "German Socialism in Verse and Prose". Pp. 235-273. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 6. New York: International Publishers, 1976.
- 1848a "The Latest Heroic Deed of the House of Bourbon". Pp. 24-26. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 7. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1848b "The 25th of June". Pp. 139-143. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 7. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1848c "The Antwerp Death Sentences". Pp. 404-406. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 7. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1849 "The Model Republic". Pp. 42-46. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 9. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1850a "The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution". Pp. 147-239. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 10. New York: International Publishers, 1978.
- 1850b "The Peasant War in Germany". Pp. 397-482. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 10. New York: International Publishers, 1978.
- 1851a "Engels to Marx (Manchester to London) August 11". Pp. 419-422. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 38. New York: International Publishers, 1982.
- 1851b "Engels to Marx (Manchester to London) September 23". Pp. 458-462. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 38. New York: International Publishers, 1982.
- 1852 "Engels to Marx (Manchester to London) April 25". Pp. 87-89, 694. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 39. New York: International Publishers, 1983.
- 1870 "Prefare to the Second Edition of 'The Peasant War in Germany'". Pp. 93-100. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 21. New York: International Publishers, 1985.
- 1886a "Engels to Laura Lafarge (London to Paris) February 9". Pp. 333-337. Correspondence: Frederick Engels with Paul and Laura Lafargue. Volume 1. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959.

3 of/de 3

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

- 1886b "Engels to August Bebel (London to Berlin) February 15". Pp. 445-448. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Correspondence. London: Martin Lawrence Ltd., 1934.
- 1886c "Lawyers' Socialism". Pp. 597-616. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 26. New York: International Publishers, 1990.
- 1888 "The Role of Force in History". Pp. 453-510. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 26. New York: International Publishers, 1990.
- 1889a "Engels to Eduard Bernstein (Eastbourne to London) August 22". Pp. 260-261. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Werke. Band 37. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1967.
- 1889b "Engels to Laura Lafarge (Eastbourne to Le Perreux) August 27". Pp. 301-305. Correspondence: Frederick Engels with Paul and Laura Lafargue. Volume 2. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960.
- 1890 "Engels to Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis (London to The Hague) December 3". Pp. 509-510. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Werke. Band 37. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1967.

Marx, Karl.

- 1848a "The Victory of the Counter Revolution in Vienna". Pp. 503-506. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 7. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1848b "Counter-Revolution in Berlin". Pp. 14-19. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 8. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1848c "Refutation". Pp. 210, 597. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 8. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1849 "Montesquieu LVI". Pp. 254-267. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 8. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1850 "The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850". Pp. 43-145. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 10. New York: International Publishers, 1978.
- 1851a "Marx to Engels (London to Manchester) August 31". Pp. 445-449. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 38. New York: International Publishers, 1982.
- 1851b "Marx to Engels (London to Manchester) September 13". Pp. 455-457. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 38. New York: International Publishers, 1982.
- 1852a "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte". Pp. 99-197. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 11. New York: International Publishers, 1979.
- 1852b "Marx to Engels (London to Manchester) August 10". Pp. 153-157. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 39. New York: International Publishers, 1983.
- 1853 "Marx to Engels (London to Manchester) October 12". Pp. 387-388. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 39. New York: International Publishers, 1983.

- 1854a "Marx to Engels (London to Manchester) May 5". Pp. 448-450. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 39. New York: International Publishers, 1983.
- 1854b "Revolutionary Spain". Pp. 389-446. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 13. New York: International Publishers, 1980.
- 1855a "Agitation Over The Tightening-Up of Sunday Observance". Pp. 323-327. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 14. New York: International Publishers, 1980.
- 1855b "Marx to Engels (London to Manchester) July 3". Pp. 540-541. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 39. New York: International Publishers, 1983.
- 1856 "Marx to Engels (London to Manchester) October 30". Pp. 80-82. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 40. New York: International Publishers, 1983.
- 1858 "Economic Manuscripts of 1857-1858". Pp. 5-537. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 28. New York: International Publishers, 1986.
- 1859a "Marx to Ferdinand Lassalle (London to Berlin) November 22". Pp. 536-539. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 40. New York: International Publishers, 1983.
- 1859b "Marx to Engels (London to Manchester) December 10". Pp. 547-550. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 40. New York: International Publishers, 1983.
- 1860 "Herr Vogt". Pp. 21-329. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 17. New York: International Publishers, 1981.
- 1867 "Das Kapital. Volume 1". Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Gesamtausgabe. Band 5. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1983.
- 1868 "Connections Between The International Working Men's Association and English Working Men's Organizations". Pp. 25-27. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 21. New York: International Publishers, 1985.
- 1871b "Second Draft of 'The Civil War in France'". Pp. 515-551. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 22. New York: International Publishers, 1986.
- 1882 "Marx to Engels (Cannes to London) June 5". Pp. 272-274. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 46. New York: International Publishers, 1992.
- Marx, Karl; and Frederick Engels.
- 1846 "The German Ideology". Pp. 19-539. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 5. New York: International Publishers, 1976.
- 1848a "The Manifesto of the Communist Party". Pp. 477-519. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 6. New York: International Publishers, 1976.

- 1848b "The Civic Militia Bill". Pp. 256-265. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 7. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1850a "'Les Conspirateurs', Par A. Chenu, ...". Pp. 311-325. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 10. New York: International Publishers, 1978.
- 1850b "Review: May to October". Pp. 490-532. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 10. New York: International Publishers, 1978.
- 1852 "The Great Men of the Exile". Pp. 227-326. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 11. New York: International Publishers, 1979.
- 1855 "Parliamentary and Military Affairs". Pp. 40-42. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 14. New York: International Publishers, 1980.
- 1873 "The Alliance of Socialist Democracy and the International Working Men's Association". Pp. 454-580. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 23. New York: International Publishers, 1988.

APPENDIX NUMBER 2.2

The Number of Documents and Number of Uses Wherein the Concept
Lumpenproletariat Appears By Six Year Interval Since
Creation of the Concept.

Interval	Total Document-Use		Public Document-Use		Private Document-Use	
08/46-08/52	26	58	20	52	6	6
08/46-01/48	4	6	4	6	0	0
02/48-04/48						
05/48-03/49	9	18	9	18	0	0
04/49-01/50						
02/50-11/50	5	16	5	16	0	0
12/50-07/51						
08/51-08/52	8	18	2	12	6	6
09/52-09/58	8	9	4	5	4	4
10/58-10/64	3	6	1	4	2	2
11/64-11/70	3	4	3	4	0	0
12/70-12/76	2	2	2	2	0	0
01/77-01/83	1	1	0	0	1	1
02/83-02/89	4	5	2	3	2	2
03/89-03/95	3	3	0	0	3	3
Totals	50	88	32	70	18	18

APPENDIX NUMBER 2.3

**Number of Documents Wherein Each Writer Used The Concept
Lumpenproletariat.**

Author	Number of Documents		
	Total	Public	Private
Frederick Engels	19	11	8
Karl Marx	23	13	10
Marx and Engels	8	8	0
Total Documents	50	32	18

Author	Total	Number of Documents			
		First 5 Years		Final 39 Years	
		Public	Private	Public	Private
Frederick Engels	19	8	0	3	8
Karl Marx	23	5	0	8	10
Marx and Engels	8	5	0	3	0
Total Documents	50	18	0	14	18

APPENDIX NUMBER 3

The Definition of the Concept Lumpenproletariat Within Some Dictionaries of Concepts.

(A) Dictionaries of Concepts Classified by the Library of Congress Under the Subject Area of 'HM'.

(1) Dictionaries of Concepts Which Do Not Contain the Concept of Lumpenproletariat.

Abercrombie, Nicholas; Stephen Hill, and Bryan S. Turner. (eds)
1988 The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology (2nd ed). London:
Penguin Books Ltd.

Fairchild, Henry Pratt. (ed)
1944 Dictionary of Sociology. New York: Philosophic Library.

Hoult, Thomas Ford. (ed)
1969 Dictionary of Modern Sociology. Totowa, NJ:
Littlefield, Adams and Co.

Mitchell, G. Duncan. (ed)
1968 A Dictionary of Sociology. London: Routledge and Kegan
Paul.
1979 A New Dictionary of the Social Sciences. New York:
Aldine Publishing Company.

Theodorson, George A.; and Achilles G. Theodorson.
1969 A Modern Dictionary of Sociology. New York: Thomas Y.
Crowell Company.

(2) Dictionaries of Concepts Which Contain the Concept of Lumpenproletariat.

Anonymous.
1986 The Encyclopedic Dictionary of Sociology (3rd ed). Gullford, CN: The Dushkin Publishing Group Inc.

Mann, Michael. (ed)
1984 The International Encyclopedia of Sociology. New York:
The Continuum Publishing Company.

Marshall, Gordon. (ed)
1994 The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Sociology. Oxford:
Oxford University Press.

(B) Dictionaries of Concepts Classified by the Library of Congress Under the Subject Area of 'HX'.

Bekerman, Gerard.

**1983 Marx and Engels: A Conceptual Concordance. Totowa, NJ:
 Barnes and Noble Books.**

Bottomore, Tom. (ed)

**1983 A Dictionary of Marxist Thought. Cambridge, MA:
 Harvard University Press.**

Carver, Terrell.

1987 A Marx Dictionary. Totowa, NJ: Barnes and Noble Books.

Russell, James.

1980 Marx-Engels Dictionary. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

Wilczynski, J.

**1981 An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Marxism, Socialism and
 Communism. London: The MacMillan Press Ltd.**

APPENDIX NUMBER 4.1

The Discourse on the Proletarian-Proletariat Among French Language Writers from 1748 to 1848.**Beranger, Charles.**

- 1831 "Petition d'un Proletaire a la Chambre des Deputes"
Pp. 72-73. Partially translated by 1988 by David
Lovell. Marx's Proletariat: The Making of a Myth.
London: Routledge.

Blanc, Louis.

- 1848 "Introduction, (to) Organization of Labour".
Pp. 231-237. Translated by 1964 by Ronald Sanders and
Albert Fried (eds). Socialist Thought: A Documentary
History. (Rev Ed). New York: Columbia University Press.

Blanqui, Auguste.

- 1832 "Defence Before the Court of Assizes". Pp. 36-47.
Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). Before
Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848.
New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.
- 1834 "The Man Who Makes the Soup Should Get to Eat It".
Pp. 193-199. Translated by 1964 by Ronald Sanders and
Albert Fried. Socialist Thought: A Documentary History.
(Revised Edition). New York: Columbia University Press.
- 1835 "Propagande Democratique". Pp. 313-315. Reprinted by
1993 in: Louis Auguste Blanqui: Oeuvres I. Nancy:
Presses Universitaires de Nancy.

Buchez, Philippe.

- 1833 "Introduction a la Science de l'Histoire". (1st ed)
Partially translated by 1958 by Barbara Petri. The
Historical Thought of P.J.B. Buchez. Washington: The
Catholic University of America Press.
- 1842 "Introduction a la Science de l'Histoire". (2nd ed)
Partially translated by 1958 by Barbara Petri. The
Historical Thought of P.J.B. Buchez. Washington: The
Catholic University of America Press.

Cabet, Etienne.

- 1842 "Communist Propaganda: Debating Points to Support or
Avoid". Pp. 81-90. Translated by 1983 by Paul E.
Corcoran (ed). Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in
France, 1830-1848. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

Comte, Auguste.

- 1820 "A Brief Appraisal of Modern History". Pp. 79-110.
Translated by 1877 by Henry Dix Hutton. Ronald Fletcher
(ed). The Crisis of Industrial Civilization: The Early
Essays of Auguste Comte. Reprinted by 1974 by: London:
Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.

- 1848 "A General View of Positivism". Pp. 1-444. Translated by 1975 by J.H. Bridges. A General View of Positivism. New York: Robert Speller and Sons, Publishers, Inc.

Considerant, Victor.

- 1834a "Destinee Sociale". Volume 1. Partially translated by 1988 by Rondel Van Davidson. Did We Think Victory Great?: The Life and Ideas of Victor Considerant. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- 1834b "Destinee Sociale". Volume 1. P. 77. Partially translated by 1988 by David Lovell. Marx's Proletariat: The Making of a Myth. London: Routledge.
- 1836 "Pre-requisite for the Legitimacy of a Social Doctrine". Pp. 181-187. Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.
- 1839 "Theorie du droit de propriete et du droit au travail". Partially translated by 1988 by Rondel Van Davidson. Did We Think Victory Great?: The Life and Ideas of Victor Considerant. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- 1843 "The New Feudalism". Pp. 153-158. Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

Enfantin, Barthelemy Prosper.

- 1829 "The Successive Transformation of Man's Exploitation by Man and of the Rights of Property". Pp. 80-89. Translated by 1958 by Georg G. Iggers. The Doctrine of Saint-Simon: An Exposition. Boston: Beacon Press.
- 1830 "'L'organisateur' (Issue:) August 15, 1830" P. 88. Partially translated by 1978 by Timothy McCarthy. Marx and the Proletariat: A Study in Social Theory. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, Inc.

Granier de Cassagnac, Adolphe.

- 1838 "Histoire de la classe Bourgeoise et de la classe Ouvriere". Pp. 71-72. Partially translated by 1978 by Timothy McCarthy. Marx and the Proletariat: A Study in Social Theory. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, Inc.

Lahautiere, Richard.

- 1839 "A Brief Catechism of Social Reform". Pp. 48-60. Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

Lamennais, Hugues Felicite Robert de.

- 1839 "De l'esclavage moderne". P. 76. Partially translated by 1988 by David Lovell. Marx's Proletariat: The Making of a Myth. London: Routledge.

Laponneraye, Albert.

- 1832 "Declaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen". P. 76. Partially translated by 1988 by David Lovell. Marx's Proletariat: The Making of a Myth. London: Routledge.

Leroux, Jules.

- 1833 "Political Economy Considered as a Science". Pp. 129-136. Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.
- 1840 "Le Proletaire et Le Bourgeois: Dialogue sur la question des salaires". P. 78. Partially translated by 1988 by David Lovell. Marx's Proletariat: The Making of a Myth. London: Routledge.

Leroux, Pierre.

- 1833 "Cours d'economie politique fait a l'Athenee de Marseille par M. Jules Leroux". P. 73. Partially translated by 1988 by David Lovell. Marx's Proletariat: The Making of a Myth. London: Routledge.

Montesquieu, Charles de Secondat, Baron de.

- 1748 "De L'esprit des Lois". Pp. 1-722. Translated by 1989 by Anne M. Cohler, Basia Carolyn Miller, and Harold Samuel Stone. The Spirit of the Laws. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pecqueur, Constantin.

- 1839 "Economie Sociale". Pp. 76-77. Partially translated by 1978 by Timothy McCarthy. Marx and the Proletariat: A Study in Social Theory. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, Inc.
- 1842 "Theorie Nouvelle d'Economie Sociale et Politique ou Etudes sur l'organisation des Societes". Reprinted by 1971 by: New York: Burt Franklin.
- 1846 "Free Trade". Pp. 160-171. Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

Proudhon, Pierre Joseph.

- 1840 "What Is Property". Pp. 201-229. Partially translated by 1964 by Benjamin Tucker. Albert Fried and Ronald Sanders (ed). Socialist Thought: A Documentary History. (Revised Edition). New York: Columbia University Press.

Reynaud, Jean.

- 1832 "The Necessity of Special Representation For The Proletarians". Pp. 69-70. Partially translated by 1988 by David Lovell. Marx's Proletariat: The Making of a Myth. London: Routledge.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques.

- 1762 "The Social Contract". Pp. 1-116. Translated by 1968 by G.D.H. Cole. The Social Contract and Discourses. London: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd.

Saint-Simon, Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de.

- 1824a "The Class of the Proletarians". Pp. 239-240. Translated by 1976 by Ghita Ionescu. The Political Thought of Saint-Simon. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1824b "On the Social Organization". Pp. 219-238. Translated by 1976 by Ghita Ionescu. The Political Thought of Saint-Simon. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sismondi, Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de.

- 1819 "New Principles of Political Economy. 1st ed.". Translated by 1991 by Richard Hyse. New Principles of Political Economy. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- 1827 "Forward to the Second Edition". Pp. 7-15. Translated by 1991 by Richard Hyse. New Principles of Political Economy. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- 1834 "Of Landed Wealth". Pp. 137-152. Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.
- 1837 "Etudes sur L'Economie Politique: Tome Premier". Pp. 1-327. Reprinted by 1980 as: Etudes sur L'Economie Politique: I-II. Geneve: Slatkine Reprints.
- 1838 "Etudes sur L'Economie Politique: Tome Deuxieme". Pp. 1-344. Reprinted by 1980 as: Etudes sur L'Economie Politique: I-II. Geneve: Slatkine Reprints.

Tristan, Flora.

- 1843 "To Working Men and Working Women". Pp. 113-125. Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

Varin, Emile.

- 1839 "To All". Pp. 93-97. Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

APPENDIX NUMBER 4.2

Marx and Engels Join the Discourse on Proletarian-Proletariat:
From 1839 to 1845.

Engels, Frederick.

- 1839 "Letters From Wuppertal". Pp. 7-25. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 2. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1842a "The End of the 'Criminalistische Zeitung'". Pp. 302-303. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 2. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1842b "The English View of the Internal Crises". Pp. 368-369. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 2. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1842c "The Internal Crises". Pp. 370-374. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 2. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1842d "The Position of the Political Parties". Pp. 375-377. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 2. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1842e "The Condition of the Working Class in England". Pp. 378-379. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 2. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1843a "Letters From London". Pp. 379-391. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 3. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1843b "Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy". Pp. 418-443. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 3. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1844 "The Condition of England: The Eighteenth Century". Pp. 469-488. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 3. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1845 "The Condition of the Working-Class in England". Pp. 295-583. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 4. New York: International Publishers, 1975.

Marx, Karl.

- 1842a "Comments on the Latest Prussian Censorship Instruction". Pp. 109-131. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 1. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1842b "Communism and the Augsburg 'Allgemeine Zeitung'". Pp. 215-221. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 1. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1842c "Debates on the Law on Thefts of Wood". Pp. 224-263; 744. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 1. New York: International Publishers, 1975.

- 1844a "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law: Introduction". Pp. 175-187. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 3. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1844b "Critical Marginal Notes on the Article 'The King of Prussia and Social Reform' by a Prussian". Pp. 189-206. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 3. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1844c "The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844". Pp. 229-346. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 3. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1845 "Theses on Feuerbach". Pp. 3-5. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 5. New York: International Publishers, 1976.
- Marx, Karl; and Frederick Engels.
- 1844 "The Holy Family". Pp. 5-211. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 4. New York: International Publishers, 1975.

APPENDIX NUMBER 5.1

**French Language Writers Who Used Proletarian or Proletariat:
From 1748 to 1848.**

Year	Name of Writer Using 'Proletarian-Proletariat'
1748	Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu (1689-1755)
1762	Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778)
1778	Denis Diderot (1713-1784) and Jean D'Alembert (1717-1783) ¹
1788	Single Writer ²
1789	Four Writers ³
1794	Gracchus Babeuf (1760-1797) ⁴
1819	Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi (1773-1842)
1820	Auguste Comte (1798-1857)
1824	Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon (1760-1825) ⁵
1827	Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi (1773-1842)
1829	Barthelemy Prosper Enfantin (1796-1864)
1830	Barthelemy Prosper Enfantin (1796-1864) ⁶
1831	Charles Beranger (?) ⁷
1832	Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881)
1832	Jean Reynaud (1806-1863) ⁸
1832	Albert Laponneraye (1808-1849) ⁹
1833	Philippe Buchez (1796-1865) ¹⁰
1833	Pierre Leroux (1797-1871) ¹¹
1833	Jules Leroux (1805-1883)
1833	Achille Roche (?) ¹²
1834	Victor-Prosper Considerant (1808-1893) ¹³

- 1834 Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881) (Uses 'proletariat')
- 1834 Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi (1773-1842)
- 1835 French Academy¹⁴
- 1835 Single Writer (Uses 'proletariat')¹⁵
- 1835 Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881)
- 1836 Victor-Prosper Considerant (1808-1893)
- 1837 Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi
(1773-1842)¹⁶
- 1838 Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi
(1773-1842)¹⁷
- 1838 Adolphe Granier de Cassagnac (1806-1880)¹⁸
- 1839 Hugues Felicite Robert de Lamennais (1782-1854)¹⁹
- 1839 Constantin Pecqueur (1801-1887)²⁰
- 1839 Victor-Prosper Considerant (1808-1893)
(Uses 'proletariat')²¹
- 1839 Richard Lahautiere (1813-1882) (Uses 'proletariat')
- 1839 Emile Varin (1814-n.d.)
- 1840 Jules Leroux (1805-1883)²²
- 1840 Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865)²³
- 1842 Etienne Cabet (1788-1856)
- 1842 Philippe Buchez (1796-1865)²⁴
- 1842 Constantin Pecqueur (1801-1887)²⁵
- 1843 Flora Tristan (1803-1844)
- 1843 Victor-Prosper Considerant (1808-1893)
- 1846 Constantin Pecqueur (1801-1887)²⁶
- 1848 Auguste Comte (1798-1857) (Uses 'proletariat')²⁷
- 1848 Louis Blanc (1811-1882)

APPENDIX NUMBER 5.2

French Language Writers Debate the General Qualities of the
Proletarian-Proletariat: From 1748 to 1848.

General Quality of Proletarian-Proletariat

Year	Writer
01. <u>Size of Class</u>	
	Created By: Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43) ³¹
1748	Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu (1689-1755) ³²
1762	Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) ³³
1794	Gracchus Babeuf (1760-1797) ³⁴
1819	Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi (1773-1842) ³⁵
1820	Auguste Comte (1798-1857) (argues that the proletarian class has not existed since slavery ended) ³⁶
1824	Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon (1760-1825) ³⁷
1827	Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi (1773-1842) ³⁸
1830	Barthelemy Prosper Enfantin (1796-1864) ³⁹
1831	Charles Beranger (?) ⁴⁰
1832	Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881) ⁴¹
1832	Jean Reynaud (1806-1863) ⁴²
1832	Albert Laponneraye (1808-1849) ⁴³
1833	Pierre Leroux (1797-1871) ⁴⁴
1833	Jules Leroux (1805-1883) ⁴⁵
1834	Victor-Prosper Considerant (1808-1893) ⁴⁶
1836	Victor-Prosper Considerant (1808-1893) ⁴⁷

01. Size of ClassCreated By: Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43)³¹1748 Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu
(1689-1755)³²1762 Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778)³³1794 Gracchus Babeuf (1760-1797)³⁴1819 Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi
(1773-1842)³⁵1820 Auguste Comte (1798-1857) (argues that the proletarian
class has not existed since slavery ended)³⁶1824 Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon
(1760-1825)³⁷1827 Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi
(1773-1842)³⁸1830 Barthelemy Prosper Enfantin (1796-1864)³⁹1831 Charles Beranger (?)⁴⁰1832 Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881)⁴¹1832 Jean Reynaud (1806-1863)⁴²1832 Albert Laponneraye (1808-1849)⁴³1833 Pierre Leroux (1797-1871)⁴⁴1833 Jules Leroux (1805-1883)⁴⁵1834 Victor-Prosper Considerant (1808-1893)⁴⁶1836 Victor-Prosper Considerant (1808-1893)⁴⁷

- 1838 Adolphe Granier de Cassagnac (1806-1880)⁴⁸
- 1839 Hugues Felicite Robert de Lamennais (1782-1854)⁴⁹
- 1839 Constantin Pecqueur (1801-1887)⁵⁰
- 1839 Emile Varin (1814-n.d.)⁵¹
- 1840 Jules Leroux (1805-1883)⁵²
- 1840 Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865)⁵³
- 1842 Etienne Cabet (1788-1856)⁵⁴
- 1843 Flora Tristan (1803-1844)⁵⁵
- 1843 Victor-Prosper Considerant (1808-1893)⁵⁶
- 1846 Constantin Pecqueur (1801-1887)⁵⁷
- 1848 Auguste Comte (1798-1856)⁵⁸
- 1848 Louis Blanc (1811-1882)⁵⁹

02. The Class as Part of a Class Hierarchy

Created By: Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43)⁶⁰

- 1748 Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu (1689-1755)⁶¹
- 1762 Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778)⁶²
- 1794 Gracchus Babeuf (1760-1797)⁶³
- 1819 Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi (1773-1842)⁶⁴
- 1820 Auguste Comte (1798-1857) (argues that the proletarian class has not existed since slavery ended)⁶⁵
- 1824 Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon (1760-1825)⁶⁶
- 1827 Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi (1773-1842)⁶⁷
- 1831 Charles Beranger (?)⁶⁸
- 1832 Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881)⁶⁹

- 1832 Jean Reynaud (1806-1863)⁷⁰
- 1832 Albert Laponneraye (1808-1849)⁷¹
- 1833 Philippe Buchez (1796-1865)⁷²
- 1833 Pierre Leroux (1797-1871)⁷³
- 1833 Jules Leroux (1805-1883)⁷⁴
- 1834 Victor-Prosper Considerant (1808-1893)⁷⁵
- 1836 Victor-Prosper Considerant (1808-1893)⁷⁶
- 1838 Adolphe Granier de Cassagnac (1806-1880)⁷⁷
- 1839 Hugues Felicite Robert de Lamennais (1782-1854)⁷⁸
- 1839 Victor-Prosper Considerant (1808-1893)⁷⁹
- 1840 Jules Leroux (1805-1883)⁸⁰
- 1840 Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865)⁸¹
- 1842 Etienne Cabet (1788-1856)⁸²
- 1842 Philippe Buchez (1796-1865)⁸³
- 1843 Flora Tristan (1803-1844)⁸⁴
- 1843 Victor-Prosper Considerant (1808-1893)⁸⁵
- 1848 Louis Blanc (1811-1882)⁸⁶

03. The Class as Too Poor or Propertyless

Created By: Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43)⁸⁷

- 1794 Gracchus Babeuf (1760-1797)⁸⁸
- 1819 Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi
(1773-1842)⁸⁹
- 1820 Auguste Comte (1798-1857) (argues that the proletarian
class has not existed since slavery ended)⁹⁰
- 1827 Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi
(1773-1842)⁹¹
- 1831 Charles Beranger (?)⁹²

- 1832 Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881)⁹³
- 1832 Jean Reynaud (1806-1863)⁹⁴
- 1833 Pierre Leroux (1797-1871)⁹⁵
- 1833 Jules Leroux (1805-1883)⁹⁶
- 1834 Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi
(1773-1842)⁹⁷
- 1838 Adolphe Granier de Cassagnac (1806-1880)⁹⁸
- 1839 Victor-Prosper Considerant (1808-1893)⁹⁹
- 1840 Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865)¹⁰⁰
- 1848 Louis Blanc (1811-1882)¹⁰¹

04. The Class as Child Producers

Created By: Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43)¹⁰²

- 1762 Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778)¹⁰³
- 1819 Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi
(1773-1842)¹⁰⁴
- 1820 Auguste Comte (1798-1857) (argues that the proletarian
class has not existed since slavery ended)¹⁰⁵
- 1827 Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi
(1773-1842)¹⁰⁶
- 1833 Jules Leroux (1805-1883)¹⁰⁷
- 1843 Flora Tristan (1803-1844) (argues since women are not
proletarians, class does not produce children)¹⁰⁸

05. The Class as Duty Bound

Created By: Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43)¹⁰⁹

- 1819 Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi
(1773-1842)¹¹⁰
- 1824 Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon
(1760-1825)¹¹¹
- 1831 Charles Beranger (?)¹¹²

- 1832 Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881)¹¹³
- 1832 Jean Reynaud (1806-1863)¹¹⁴
- 1839 Hugues Felicite Robert de Lamennais (1782-1854)¹¹⁵

06. The Class as Not the Lowest Class

- 1748 Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu
(1689-1755)¹¹⁶
- 1762 Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778)¹¹⁷
- 1820 Auguste Comte (1798-1857) (argues that the proletarian
class has not existed since slavery ended)¹¹⁸
- 1824 Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Jaint-Simon
(1760-1825) (argues that the proletarian is the lowest
of the classes)¹¹⁹
- 1838 Adolphe Granier de Cassagnac (1806-1880) (argues that
the proletarian is the lowest of the classes)¹²⁰
- 1843 Flora Tristan (1803-1844) (argues since women are not
of the proletarians, the proletariat is not the lowest
of the classes)¹²¹
- 1843 Victor-Prosper Considerant (1808-1893)¹²²

07. The Class as Taxed Differently

- 1748 Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu
(1689-1755)¹²³
- 1820 Auguste Comte (1798-1857) (argues that the proletarian
class has not existed since slavery ended)¹²⁴
- 1832 Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881)¹²⁵

08. The Class in Conflict With A Class Above

- 1794 Gracchus Babeuf (1760-1797)¹²⁶
- 1820 Auguste Comte (1798-1857) (argues that the proletarian
class has not existed since slavery ended)¹²⁷
- 1824 Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon
(1760-1825)¹²⁸

- 1827 Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de Sismondi
(1773-1842)¹²⁹
- 1831 Charles Beranger (?)¹³⁰
- 1832 Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881)¹³¹
- 1832 Jean Reynaud (1806-1863) (argues that there is no
class conflict)¹³²
- 1832 Albert Laponneraye (1808-1849)¹³³
- 1833 Philippe Buchez (1796-1865) (argues that there is no
class conflict)¹³⁴
- 1833 Pierre Leroux (1797-1871)¹³⁵
- 1834 Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881)¹³⁶
- 1839 Hugues Felicite Robert de Lamennais (1782-1854)¹³⁷
- 1839 Richard Lahautiere (1813-1882)¹³⁸
- 1840 Jules Leroux (1805-1883)¹³⁹
- 1842 Philippe Buchez (1796-1865) (argues that there is no
class conflict)¹⁴⁰
- 1843 Flora Tristan (1803-1844) (argues since women are not
proletarians, the proletarians may be in conflict with
the group of women below the proletarian class)¹⁴¹
- 1848 Auguste Comte (1798-1857) (argues that there is no
class conflict)¹⁴²

09. The Class as Macro-Level Historically Discontinuous

- 1820 Auguste Comte (1798-1857) (argues that the proletarian
class has not existed since slavery ended)¹⁴³
- 1833 Jules Leroux (1805-1883) (argues that the proletarian
class could end)¹⁴⁴
- 1839 Richard Lahautiere (1813-1882) (argues that the
proletariat class can begin)¹⁴⁵
- 1848 Auguste Comte (1798-1857) (argues that the proletariat
class began in the Middle Ages)¹⁴⁶

10. The Class as Morally Competent

- 1824 Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon
(1760-1825)¹⁴⁷
- 1831 Charles Beranger (?)¹⁴⁸
- 1832 Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881)¹⁴⁹
- 1832 Jean Reynaud (1806-1863)¹⁵⁰
- 1832 Albert Laponneraye (1808-1849)¹⁵¹
- 1839 Victor-Prosper Considerant (1808-1893)¹⁵²

11. The Class as Micro-Level Historically Continuous

- 1829 Barthelemy Prosper Enfantin (1796-1864)¹⁵³
- 1832 Jean Reynaud (1806-1863)¹⁵⁴
- 1832 Albert Laponneraye (1808-1849)¹⁵⁵
- 1834 Victor-Prosper Considerant (1808-1893)¹⁵⁶
- 1838 Adolphe Granier de Cassagnac (1806-1880)¹⁵⁷
- 1843 Flora Tristan (1803-1844)¹⁵⁸

12. The Class as Consciously Empowered

- 1831 Charles Beranger (?)¹⁵⁹
- 1832 Albert Laponneraye (1808-1849)¹⁶⁰
- 1834 Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881)¹⁶¹
- 1842 Etienne Cabet (1788-1856) (argues that conscious
empowerment is not possible)¹⁶²
- 1846 Constantin Pecqueur (1801-1887) (argues that conscious
empowerment is not possible)¹⁶³

ENDNOTES (From Appendix 5.1 and Appendix 5.2)

1. 1778 'Encyclopedia' Volume 27. Page 549. by Denis Diderot and Jean D'Alembert is cited in G. Briefs (1937:55).
2. 1788 'Single Writer' is cited in R.B. Rose (1981:285-286).
3. 1789 'Four Writers' are cited in R.B. Rose (1981:285-286).
4. 1794 'Pamphlet' is cited in R.B. Rose (1978:174; 1981:288).
5. 1824 See both Saint-Simon (1824a:240; 1824b:222-237)
6. Enfantin (1830) cited in McCarthy (1978:88).6.
7. 'Petition of a Proletarian to the Chamber of Deputies' published in a February of 1831 edition of 'The Globe' and authored by Charles Beranger (1831) cited in David Lovell (1988:72-73)
8. 'The Necessity of Special Representation for the Proletarians' by Jean Reynaud (1832) cited in David Lovell (1988:69-70)
9. Laponneraye (1832) cited in Lovell (1988:76)
10. Buchez (1833) cited in Petri (1958)
11. Pierre Leroux (1833) cited in Lovell (1988:73)
12. 'Manual for the Proletarian' by Achille Roche in 1833 cited in Corcoran (1983:229)
13. Considerant (1834) cited in Davidson (1988) and cited in Lovell (1988:77)
14. The French Academy accepts the word 'proletarian' in 1835 cited in G. Briefs (1937:55)
15. 'Pamphlet' published at Lyons in 1835 by Unknown Writer cited by R.B. Rose (1981:297)
16. Sismondi (1837:24-31)
17. Sismondi (1838:75)
18. Granier de Cassagnac (1838) cited in McCarthy (1978:71-72)
19. Lamennais (1839) cited in Lovell (1988:76)
20. Pecqueur (1839) cited in McCarthy (1978:76-77)

21. Considerant (1839) cited in Davidson (1988)
22. Jules Leroux (1840) cited in Lovell (1988:78)
23. Proudhon (1840:208)
24. Buchez (1842) cited in Petri (1958)
25. Pecqueur (1842:409)
26. Pecqueur (1846:169-170)
27. Comte (1848:140-226)
31. Cicero (60:149-151)
32. Montesquieu (1748:527)
33. Rousseau (1762:95)
34. Babeuf, 1794, is cited in R.B. Rose (1981:288)
35. Sismondi (1819:520)
36. Comte (1820:102)
37. Saint-Simon (1824b:222-223)
38. Sismondi (1827:10)
39. Infantin (1830) cited in McCarthy (1978:88)
40. 'Petition of a Proletarian to the Chamber of Deputies'
published in a February of 1831 edition of 'The Globe' and
authored by C. Beranger (1831) cited in Lovell (1988:72-73)
41. Blanqui (1832:37-42)
42. 'The Necessity of Special Representation for the
Proletarians' by Jean Reynaud (1832) cited in Lovell
(1988:69-70)
43. Laponneraye (1832) cited in Lovell (1988:76)
44. Pierre Leroux (1833) cited in Lovell (1988:73)
45. Jules Leroux (1833:133-135)
46. Considerant (1834) cited in Lovell (1988:77)
47. Considerant (1836:184)

48. Granier de Cassagnac (1838) cited in McCarthy (1978:71-72)
49. Lamennais (1839) cited in Lovell (1988:76)
50. Pecqueur (1839) cited in McCarthy (1978:76-77)
51. Varin (1839:94)
52. Jules Leroux (1840) cited in Lovell (1988:78)
53. Proudhon (1840:208)
54. Cabet (1842:82)
55. Tristan (1843:113,119,124)
56. Considerant (1843:156-158)
57. Pecqueur (1846:169-170)
58. Comte (1848:222)
59. Blanc (1848:232)
60. Cicero (60:149-151)
61. Montesquieu (1748:527)
62. Rousseau (1762:95)
63. Babeuf, 1794 is cited in R.B. Rose (1981:288)
64. Sismondi (1819:520)
65. Comte (1820:102)
66. Saint-Simon (1824b:222)
67. Sismondi (1827:10)
68. 'Petition of a Proletarian to the Chamber of Deputies'
published in a February of 1831 edition of 'The Globe' and
authored by C. Beranger (1831) cited in Lovell (1988:72-73)
69. Blanqui (1832:37-42)
70. 'The Necessity of Special Representation for the
Proletarians' by Jean Reynaud (1832) cited in Lovell
(1988:69-70)
71. Laponneraye (1832) cited in Lovell (1988:76)

72. Buchez (1833) cited in Petri (1958:24)
73. Pierre Leroux (1833) cited in Lovell (1988:73)
74. Jules Leroux (1833:133-135)
75. Considerant (1834) cited in Davidson (1988)
76. Considerant (1836:184)
77. Granier de Cassagnac (1838) cited in McCarthy (1978:71-72)
78. Lamennais (1839) cited in Lovell (1988:76)
79. Considerant (1839) cited in Davidson (1988)
80. Jules Leroux (1840) cited in Lovell (1988:78)
81. Proudhon (1840:208)
82. Cabet (1842:82)
83. Buchez (1842) cited in Petri (1958:24)
84. Tristan (1843:113,119,124)
85. Considerant (1843:157-158)
86. Blanc (1848:232)
87. Cicero (60:149-151)
88. Babeuf, 1794 is cited in R.B. Rose (1981:288)
89. Sismondi (1819:520)
90. Comte (1820:102)
91. Sismondi (1827:10)
92. 'Petition of a Proletarian to the Chamber of Deputies'
published in a February of 1831 edition of 'The Globe' and
authored by C. Beranger (1831) cited in Lovell (1988:72-73)
93. Blanqui (1832:37-42)
94. 'The Necessity of Special Representation for the
Proletarians' by Jean Reynaud (1832) cited in Lovell
(1988:69-70)
95. Pierre Leroux (1833) cited in Lovell (1988:73)

96. Jules Leroux (1833:133-135)
97. Sismondi (1834:150)
98. Granier de Cassagnac (1838) cited in McCarthy (1978:71-72)
99. Considerant (1839) cited in Davidson (1988)
100. Proudhon (1840:208)
101. Blanc (1848:232)
102. Cicero (60:149-151)
103. Rousseau (1762:95)
104. Sismondi (1819:520)
105. Comte (1820:102)
106. Sismondi (1827:10)
107. Jules Leroux (1833:133-135)
108. Tristan (1843:113,119,124)
109. Cicero (60:149-151)
110. Sismondi (1819:520)
111. Saint-Simon (1824b:222)
112. 'Petition of a Proletarian to the Chamber of Deputies'
published in a February of 1831 edition of 'The Globe' and
authored by C. Beranger (1831) cited in Lovell (1988:72-73)
113. Blanqui (1832:37-42)
114. 'The Necessity of Special Representation for the
Proletarians' by Jean Reynaud (1832) cited in Lovell
(1988:69-70)
115. Lamennais (1839) cited in Lovell (1988:76)
116. Montesquieu (1748:527)
117. Rousseau (1762:95)
118. Comte (1820:102)
119. Saint-Simon (1824b:222)

120. Granier de Cassagnac (1838) cited in McCarthy (1978:71-72)
121. Tristan (1843:113,119,124)
122. Considerant (1843:157-158)
123. Montesquieu (1748:527)
124. Comte (1820:102)
125. Blanqui (1832:37-42)
126. Babeuf, 1794 is cited in R.B. Rose (1981:288)
127. Comte (1820:102)
128. Saint-Simon (1824a:240)
129. Sismondi (1827:10)
130. 'Petition of a Proletarian to the Chamber of Deputies'
published in a February of 1831 edition of 'The Globe' and
authored by Charles Beranger (1831) cited in David Lovell
(1988:72-73)
131. Blanqui (1832:37-42)
132. 'The Necessity of Special Representation for the
Proletarians' by Jean Reynaud (1832) cited in David Lovell
(1988:69-70)
133. Laponneraye (1832) cited in Lovell (1988:76)
134. Buchez (1833) cited in Petri (1958:24)
135. Pierre Leroux (1833) cited in Lovell (1988:73)
136. Blanqui (1834:195,197)
137. Lamennais (1839) cited in Lovell (1988:76)
138. Lahautiere (1839:49)
139. Jules Leroux (1840) cited in Lovell (1988:78)
140. Buchez (1842) cited in Petri (1958:24)
141. Tristan (1843:113,119,124)
142. Comte (1848:140-226)
143. Comte (1820:102)

144. Jules Leroux (1833:133-135)
145. Lahautiere (1839:49)
146. Comte (1848:166)
147. Saint-Simon (1824b:222)
148. 'Petition of a Proletarian to the Chamber of Deputies'
published in a February of 1831 edition of 'The Globe' and
authored by Charles Beranger (1831) cited in David Lovell
(1988:72-73)
149. Blanqui (1832:37-42)
150. 'The Necessity of Special Representation for the
Proletarians' by Jean Reynaud (1832) cited in Lovell
(1988:69-70)
151. Laponneraye (1832) cited in Lovell (1988:76)
152. Considerant (1839) cited in Davidson (1988)
153. Enfantin (1829:82-83)
154. 'The Necessity of Special Representation for the
Proletarians' by Jean Reynaud (1832) cited in Lovell
(1988:69-70)
155. Laponneraye (1832) cited in Lovell (1988:76)
156. Considerant (1834) cited in Davidson (1988) and cited in
Lovell (1988:77)
157. Granier de Cassagnac (1838) cited in McCarthy (1978:71-72)
158. Tristan (1843:113,119,124)
159. 'Petition of a Proletarian to the Chamber of Deputies'
published in a February of 1831 edition of 'The Globe' and
authored by Charles Beranger (1831) cited in David Lovell
(1988:72-73)
160. Laponneraye (1832) cited in Lovell (1988:76)
161. Blanqui (1834:195,197)
162. Cabet (1842:82)
163. Pecqueur (1846:169-170)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abercrombie, Nicholas; Stephen Hill, and Bryan S. Turner. (eds)
1988 The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology (2nd ed). London:
Penguin Books Ltd.

Alfred.
970? "The Old English Version of 'The Lays of Boethius'".
pp. 151-204. Walter John Sedgefield (ed). King
Alfred's Old English Version of Boethius. Oxford:
The Clarendon Press, 1899. Reprinted in 1968 by:
Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt.

Anonymous.
1380?a "Cleanness". pp. 37-88. Early English Alliterative
Poems in the West-Midland Dialect of the Fourteenth
Century. Reprinted in 1869 by: London: Trubner and Co.
for the Early English Text Society. Richard Morris (ed)
1380?b "Patience". pp. 89-104. Early English Alliterative
Poems in the West-Midland Dialect of the Fourteenth
Century. Reprinted in 1869 by: London: Trubner and Co.
for the Early English Text Society. Richard Morris (ed)
1986 The Encyclopedic Dictionary of Sociology (3rd ed).
Gullford, CN: The Dushkin Publishing Group Inc.

Anonymous, Library of Congress.
1989 Subject Headings. 12th Edition. Washington, DC: U.S.
Government Printing Office.

Avineri, Shlomo.
1969 The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Balibar, Etienne.
1994 Masses, Classes, Ideas: Studies on Politics and
Philosophy Before and After Marx. Translated by James
Swenson. New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, Inc.

Barnhart, Robert K.
1988 "Lump". p. 615. The Barnhart Dictionary of Etymology.
New York: The H.W. Wilson Company.

Bash, Harry H.
1995 Social Problems and Social Movements: An Exploration
into the Sociological Construction of Alternative
Realities. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.

Bekerman, Gerard.
1983 Marx and Engels: A Conceptual Concordance. Totowa, NJ:
Barnes and Noble Books.

Beranger, Charles.

- 1831 "Petition d'un Proletaire a la Chambre des Deputes"
Pp. 72-73. Partially translated by 1988 by David
Lovell. Marx's Proletariat: The Making of a Myth.
London: Routledge.

Bernstein, Eduard.

- 1898a "The Realistic and the Ideological Moments in
Socialism". Pp. 229-243. Edited and translated by 1988
by H. Tudor and J.M. Tudor. Marxism and Social
Democracy: The Revisionist Debate, 1896-1898.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1898b "(Eduard) Bernstein to (August) Bebel (October 20,
1898)". Pp. 323-328. Edited and translated by 1988
by H. Tudor and J.M. Tudor. Marxism and Social
Democracy: The Revisionist Debate, 1896-1898.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1898c "A Statement. (February 7, 1898)". Pp. 191-194. Edited
and translated by 1988 by H. Tudor and J.M. Tudor.
Marxism and Social Democracy: The Revisionist Debate,
1896-1898. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1899 The Preconditions of Socialism. Edited and translated
by 1993 by Henry Tudor. Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press.

Berrocal, Luciano.

- 1981 "In Search of the Nation State: Genesis of the State in
Puerto Rico". Revue de l'Institut de Sociologie.
Volume 1-2:377-396.

Blanc, Louis.

- 1848 "Introduction, (to) Organization of Labour".
Pp. 231-237. Translated by 1964 by Ronald Sanders and
Albert Fried (eds). Socialist Thought: A Documentary
History. (Revised Edition). New York: Columbia
University Press.

Blanqui, Auguste.

- 1832 "Defence Before the Court of Assizes". Pp. 36-47.
Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). Before
Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848.
New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.
- 1834 "The Man Who Makes the Soup Should Get to Eat It".
Pp. 193-199. Translated by 1964 by Ronald Sanders and
Albert Fried. Socialist Thought: A Documentary History.
(Revised Edition). New York: Columbia University Press.
- 1835 "Propagande Democratique". Pp. 313-315. Reprinted by
1993 in: Louis Auguste Blanqui: Oeuvres I. Nancy:
Presses Universitaires de Nancy.

- Blumer, Herbert.**
 1969 **Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method.**
 Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Bottomore, Tom. (ed)**
 1983 **A Dictionary of Marxist Thought.** Cambridge, MA:
 Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre.**
 1987 "What Makes a Social Class?: On The Theoretical and
 Practical Existence Of Groups". Berkeley Journal of
 Sociology. Volume 32:1-17.
 1992 "The Purpose of Reflexive Sociology (The Chicago
 Workshop)". Pp. 61-215. Pierre Bourdieu and Loic J.D.
 Wacquant. An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology.
 Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bovenkerk, Frank.**
 1980 "Rehabilitation of the Rabble: How and Why Marx and
 Engels Have Pictured the Lumpenproletariat Unjustly
 as a Force of Political Reaction". Sociologische-Gids.
 Volume 27(3):191-224.
 1984 "The Rehabilitation of the Rabble: How and Why Marx and
 Engels Wrongly Depicted the 'Lumpenproletariat' as a
 Reactionary Force". Netherlands Journal of Sociology.
 Volume 20(1):13-41.
- Bradley, Henry. (ed)**
 1908a "Limp". p. 303. A New English Dictionary on Historical
 Principles. Volume VI. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
 1908b "Lump". pp. 498-499. A New English Dictionary on
 Historical Principles. Volume VI. Oxford: The Clarendon
 Press.
- Briefs, Goetz A.**
 1937 **The Proletariat: A Challenge to Western Civilization.**
 New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Brown, Doug.**
 1991 "Thorstein Veblen Meets Eduard Bernstein: Toward an
 Institutional Theory of Mobilization Politics".
 Journal of Economic Issues. Volume 25(3):689-708.
- Buchez, Philippe.**
 1833 "Introduction a la Science de l'Histoire". (1st ed)
 Partially translated by 1958 by Barbara Petri. The
 Historical Thought of P.J.B. Buchez. Washington: The
 Catholic University of America Press.
 1842 "Introduction a la Science de l'Histoire". (2nd ed)
 Partially translated by 1958 by Barbara Petri. The
 Historical Thought of P.J.B. Buchez. Washington: The
 Catholic University of America Press.

Burnham, Walter Dean.

1984 "A Commentary on Harry Eckstein". *Daedalus*. Volume 113(4):147-160.

Bussard, Robert L.

1987 "The 'Dangerous Class' of Marx and Engels: The Rise of the Idea of the 'Lumpenproletariat'". *History of European Ideas*. Volume 8(6):675-692.

Cabet, Etienne.

1842 "Communist Propaganda: Debating Points to Support or Avoid". Pp. 81-90. Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). *Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848*. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

Carver, Terrell.

1987 *A Marx Dictionary*. Totowa, NJ: Barnes and Noble Books.

Chevalier, Louis.

1958 *Labouring Classes and Dangerous Classes*. Translated by 1973 by Frank Jellinek. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius.

60BC "The Republic". Pp. 11-285. Translated by 1928 by Clinton Walker Keyes. *De Re Publica, De Legibus*. London: William Heinemann Ltd.

Cleaver, Eldridge.

1972 "On Lumpen Ideology". *Black Scholar*. Volume 4(3):2-10.

Cohen, Bernard P.

1989 *Developing Sociological Knowledge: Theory and Method*. (2nd ed). Chicago: Nelson-Hall Inc.

Cohen, Jean L.

1982 *Class and Civil Society: The Limits of Marxian Critical Theory*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Comte, Auguste.

1820 "A Brief Appraisal of Modern History". Pp. 79-110. Translated by 1877 by Henry Dix Hutton. Ronald Fletcher (ed). *The Crisis of Industrial Civilization: The Early Essays of Auguste Comte*. Reprinted by 1974 by: London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.

1830a "Lecture 1: Aim of the Course. General Considerations on the Nature and Importance of Positive Philosophy". Pp. 19-41. Translated from 'Course in Positive Philosophy' by 1974 by Margaret Clarke. Stanislaw Andreski (ed). *The Essential Comte*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc.

- 1830b "Lecture 2: Plan of this Course, or General Considerations on the Hierarchy of the Positive Sciences". Pp. 19-41. Translated from 'Course in Positive Philosophy' by 1974 by Margaret Clarke. Stanislaw Andreski (ed). The Essential Comte. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc.
- 1848 "A General View of Positivism". Pp. 1-444. Translated by 1975 by J.H. Bridges. A General View of Positivism. New York: Robert Speller and Sons, Publishers, Inc.
- 1851 "Introductory Principles". Pp. 325-594. Translated by 1875 by Anonymous. System of Positive Polity or Treatise on Sociology: First Volume. Reprinted by 1968 by: New York: Burt Franklin.

Considerant, Victor.

- 1834a "Destinee Sociale". Volume 1. Partially translated by 1988 by Rondel Van Davidson. Did We Think Victory Great?: The Life and Ideas of Victor Considerant. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- 1834b "Destinee Sociale". Volume 1. P. 77. Partially translated by 1988 by David Lovell. Marx's Proletariat: The Making of a Myth. London: Routledge.
- 1836 "Pre-requisite for the Legitimacy of a Social Doctrine". Pp. 181-187. Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.
- 1839 "Theorie du droit de propriete et du droit au travail". Partially translated by 1988 by Rondel Van Davidson. Did We Think Victory Great?: The Life and Ideas of Victor Considerant. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- 1843 "The New Feudalism". Pp. 153-158. Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

Corcoran, Paul E.

- 1983 "Bibliography". Pp. 224-231. Paul E. Corcoran (ed). Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

Cuneo, Carl J.

- 1993 "Class Structure and Process". Pp. 104-138. Peter S. Li and B. Singh Bolaria (eds). Contemporary Sociology: Critical Perspectives. Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman Ltd.

Davidson, Rondel Van.

- 1988 Did We Think Victory Great?: The Life and Ideas of Victor Considerant. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc.

Debord, Guy.

- 1977 Society of the Spectacle. Translated by 1983 by Anon.
Detroit, MI: Black and Red.

Draper, Hal.

- 1972 "The Concept of the 'Lumpenproletariat' in Marx and Engels". *Economies et Societes*. Volume 6(12):2285-2312.
1977 Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution. Volume 1: State and Bureaucracy. New York: Monthly Review Press.
1978 Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution. Volume 2: Politics of Social Classes. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Eckstein, Harry.

- 1984 "Civic Inclusion and Its Discontents". *Daedalus*.
Volume 113(4):107-145.

Efirov, Svetozar Aleksandrovich.

- 1979 "'Leftist' Extremism: Social Reality and Ideology".
Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya. Volume 6(2):154-166.

Enfantin, Barthelemy Prosper.

- 1829 "The Successive Transformation of Man's Exploitation by Man and of the Rights of Property". Pp. 80-89.
Translated by 1958 by Georg G. Iggers. *The Doctrine of Saint-Simon: An Exposition*. Boston: Beacon Press.
1830 "'L'organisateur' (Issue:) August 15, 1830" P. 88.
Partially translated by 1978 by Timothy McCarthy.
Marx and the Proletariat: A Study in Social Theory.
Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, Inc.

Engels, Frederick.

- 1839 "Letters From Wuppertal". Pp. 7-25. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: *Collected Works*. Volume 2. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
1842a "The End of the 'Criminalistische Zeitung'". Pp. 302-303. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: *Collected Works*. Volume 2. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
1842b "The English View of the Internal Crises". Pp. 368-369. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: *Collected Works*. Volume 2. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
1842c "The Internal Crises". Pp. 370-374. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: *Collected Works*. Volume 2. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
1842d "The Position of the Political Parties". Pp. 375-377. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: *Collected Works*. Volume 2. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
1842e "The Condition of the Working Class in England". Pp. 378-379. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: *Collected Works*. Volume 2. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
1843a "Letters From London". Pp. 379-391. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: *Collected Works*. Volume 3. New York: International Publishers, 1975.

- 1843b "Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy". Pp. 418-443. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 3. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1844 "The Condition of England: The Eighteenth Century". Pp. 469-488. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 3. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1845 "The Condition of the Working-Class in England". Pp. 295-583. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 4. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1845G "Die Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England". Pp. 225-506. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Werke. Band 2. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1969.
- 1847a "The Constitutional Question in Germany". Pp. 75-91. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 6. New York: International Publishers, 1976.
- 1847b "German Socialism in Verse and Prose". Pp. 235-273. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 6. New York: International Publishers, 1976.
- 1848a "The Latest Heroic Deed of the House of Bourbon". Pp. 24-26. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 7. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1848b "The 25th of June". Pp. 139-143. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 7. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1848c "The Antwerp Death Sentences". Pp. 404-406. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 7. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1849 "The Model Republic". Pp. 42-46. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 9. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1850a "The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution". Pp. 147-239. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 10. New York: International Publishers, 1978.
- 1850b "The Peasant War in Germany". Pp. 397-482. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 10. New York: International Publishers, 1978.
- 1850c "Two Years of a Revolution: 1848 and 1849". Pp. 353-369. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 10. New York: International Publishers, 1978.
- 1851a "Engels to Marx (Manchester to London) August 11". Pp. 419-422. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 38. New York: International Publishers, 1982.
- 1851b "Engels to Marx (Manchester to London) September 23". Pp. 458-462. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 38. New York: International Publishers, 1982.
- 1852 "Engels to Marx (Manchester to London) April 25". Pp. 87-89, 694. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 39. New York: International Publishers, 1983.

- 1855 "The War That Looms on Europe". Pp. 32-39. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 14. New York: International Publishers, 1980.
- 1870 "Prefare to the Second Edition of 'The Peasant War in Germany'". Pp. 93-100. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 21. New York: International Publishers, 1985.
- 1872 "Engels to Wilhelm Liebknecht (London to Leipzig) January 18". Pp. 296-299. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 44. New York: International Publishers, 1989.
- 1886a "Engels to Laura Lafarge (London to Paris) February 9". Pp. 333-337. Correspondence: Frederick Engels with Paul and Laura Lafargue. Volume 1. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959.
- 1886b "Engels to August Bebel (London to Berlin) February 15". Pp. 445-448. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Correspondence. London: Martin Lawrence Ltd., 1934.
- 1886c "Lawyers' Socialism". Pp. 597-616. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 26. New York: International Publishers, 1990.
- 1888 "The Role of Force in History". Pp. 453-510. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 26. New York: International Publishers, 1990.
- 1889a "Engels to Eduard Bernstein (Eastbourne to London) August 22". Pp. 260-261. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Werke. Band 37. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1967.
- 1889b "Engels to Laura Lafarge (Eastbourne to Le Perreux) August 27". Pp. 301-305. Correspondence: Frederick Engels with Paul and Laura Lafargue. Volume 2. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960.
- 1890 "Engels to Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis (London to The Hague) December 3". Pp. 509-510. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Werke. Band 37. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1967.
- 1895a "Engels to Karl Kautsky (London to Stuttgart) May 21". Pp. 481-484. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Werke. Band 39. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1968.
- 1895b "Engels to Karl Kautsky (London to Stuttgart) May 21". Pp. 533-534. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Correspondence. London: Martin Lawrence Ltd., 1934.

Fairchild, Henry Pratt. (ed)

1944 Dictionary of Sociology. New York: Philosophic Library.

Farmer, John S.; and W.E. Henley (eds).

1896 "Lumper". pp. 249-250. Slang and its Analogues: Past and Present. Volume III. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd. Reprinted by: New York: Kraus Reprint Corporation (1965).

Florea, Aurelia.

- 1974 "Research Into Poverty, Social Information, and Popular Participation in Iran". *International Review of Sociology*. Volume 10(2-3):156-184.

Form, William; and Claudine Hanson.

- 1985 "The Consistency of Stratal Ideologies of Economic Justice". *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*. Volume 4:239-270.

Freeborn, Dennis.

- 1992 *From Old English to Standard English*. Ottawa: The University of Ottawa Press.

French, Laurence A.

- 1978 "Watergate: An Assessment of Bourgeois Justice". *Quarterly Journal of Ideology*. Volume 2(1):33-38.

Fried, Albert; and Ronald Sanders (eds.)

- 1992 *Socialist Thought: A Documentary History*. (Revised Edition). New York: Columbia University Press.

Gorz, Andre.

- 1964 *Strategy For Labour: A Radical Proposal*. Translated by 1967 by Martin A. Nicolaus and Victoria Ortiz. Boston: Beacon Press.
- 1980 *Farewell to the Working Class: An Essay on Post-Industrial Socialism*. Translated by 1982 by Michael Sonenscher. London: Pluto Press Limited.

Gouldner, Alvin W.

- 1970 *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- 1974 "The Metaphoricality of Marxism and the Context Freeing Grammar of Socialism". *Theory and Society*. Volume 1(4):387-414.
- 1979 *The Future of Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class*. New York: The Seabury Press.
- 1985 *Against Fragmentation: The Origins of Marxism and the Sociology of Intellectuals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Grabb, Edward G.

- 1992 "Social Stratification". Pp. 195-235. James Teevan (ed) *Introduction to Sociology: A Canadian Focus*. (4th Ed). Scarborough: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc.

Graham, Keith.

- 1992 *Karl Marx, Our Contemporary: Social Theory for a Post-Leninist World*. Toronto: The University of Toronto Press.

Granier de Cassagnac, Adolphe.

- 1838 "Histoire de la classe Bourgeoise et de la classe Ouvriere". Pp. 71-72. Partially translated by 1978 by Timothy McCarthy. *Marx and the Proletariat: A Study in Social Theory*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, Inc.

Guback, Thomas; and Ronald Bettig.

- 1987 "Translating the 'Manifesto' Into English; Nineteenth Century Communication, Twentieth Century Confusion". *Journal of Communication Inquiry*. Volume 11(2):3-16.

Hayes, Peter.

- 1993 "Marx's Analysis of the French Class Structure". *Theory and Society*. Volume 22(1):99-123.

Himmelfarb, Gertrude.

- 1984 *The Idea of Poverty: England in the Early Industrial Age*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Hoult, Thomas Ford. (ed)

- 1969 *Dictionary of Modern Sociology*. Totowa, NJ: Littlefield, Adams and Co.

Ionescu, Ghita.

- 1976 "Introduction". Pp. 1-57. Ghita Ionescu (ed.). *The Political Thought of Saint-Simon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, Samuel.

- 1755 *Dictionary of the English Language*. London: W. Strahan.

Kane, Francine.

- 1977 "Female Proletariat in Senegal, Town and Country". *Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines*. Volume 17(1):77-94.

Kenworthy, Eldon.

- 1975 "Orthodox and Revisionist Interpretations of the Initial Support For Peronism". *Desarrollo Economico*. Volume 14(56):749-763.

Knauder, Stefanie.

- 1984 "Aspects of Social Change in Zambia". *Osterreichische Zeitschrift fur Soziologie*. Volume 9(4):97-106.

Knuttila, Murray.

- 1993 *Sociology Revisited: Basic Concepts and Perspectives*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Inc.

Kowalewski, David.

1991 "Counterinsurgent Vigilantism and Public Response: A Philippine Case Study". *Sociological Perspectives*. Volume 34(2):127-144.

Kozlova, Natal'ya Nikitichna.

1993 "'The Weak Point' of Social Reality". *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya*. Volume 20(2):79-87.

Lahautiere, Richard.

1839 "A Brief Catechism of Social Reform". Pp. 48-60. Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). *Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848*. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

Lamennais, Hugues Felicite Robert de.

1839 "De l'esclavage moderne". P. 76. Partially translated by 1988 by David Lovell. *Marx's Proletariat: The Making of a Myth*. London: Routledge.

Laponneraye, Albert.

1832 "Declaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen". P. 76. Partially translated by 1988 by David Lovell. *Marx's Proletariat: The Making of a Myth*. London: Routledge.

Lelli, Marcello.

1977 "The Words Don't Change". *Critica Sociologica*. Volume 41:37-47.

Lemert, Charles.

1993 "Modernity's Classical Age: 1848-1919". Pp. 25-33. Charles Lemert (ed). *Social Theory: The Multicultural and Classic Readings*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Leontidou, Lila.

1985 "Urban Land Rights and Working Class Consciousness in Peripheral Societies". *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. Volume 9(4):533-556.

Leroux, Jules.

1833 "Political Economy Considered as a Science". Pp. 129-136. Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). *Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848*. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

1840 "Le Proletaire et Le Bourgeois: Dialogue sur la question des salaires". P. 78. Partially translated by 1988 by David Lovell. *Marx's Proletariat: The Making of a Myth*. London: Routledge.

- Leroux, Pierre.
1833 "Cours d'economie politique fait a l'Athenee de Marseille par M. Jules Leroux". P. 73. Partially translated by 1988 by David Lovell. *Marx's Proletariat: The Making of a Myth*. London: Routledge.
- Lovell, David W.
1988 *Marx's Proletariat: The Making of A Myth*. London: Routledge.
- Low, Konrad.
1985 *Marxismus-Quellenlexikon*. Cologne: Kolner Universitatsverlag.
- Lucal, Betsy.
1994 "Class Stratification in Introductory Textbooks: Relational or Distributional Models?". *Teaching Sociology*. Volume 22(2):139-150.
- Lyotard, Jean-Francois.
1984 *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mahabir, Cynthia.
1988 "Crime in the Caribbean: Robbers, Hustlers and Warriors". *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*. Volume 16(3):315-338.
- Mann, Michael. (ed)
1984 *The International Encyclopedia of Sociology*. New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.
- Marcuse, Herbert.
1964 *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Marshall, Gordon. (ed)
1994 *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martynova, Natalia.
1980 "Index of Periodicals". Pp. 816-819. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: *Collected Works*. Volume 14. New York: International Publishers.
- Marx, Karl.
1842a "Comments on the Latest Prussian Censorship Instruction". Pp. 109-131. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: *Collected Works*. Volume 1. New York: International Publishers, 1975.

- 1842b "Communism and the Augsburg 'Allgemeine Zeitung'". Pp. 215-221. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 1. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1842c "Debates on the Law on Thefts of Wood". Pp. 224-263; 744. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 1. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1844a "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law: Introduction". Pp. 175-187. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 3. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1844b "Critical Marginal Notes on the Article 'The King of Prussia and Social Reform' by a Prussian". Pp. 189-206. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 3. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1844c "The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844". Pp. 229-346. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 3. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1845 "Theses on Feuerbach". Pp. 3-5. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 5. New York: International Publishers, 1976.
- 1847 "Wage Labour and Capital". Pp. 197-228. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 9. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1848a "The Victory of the Counter Revolution in Vienna". Pp. 503-506. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 7. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1848b "Counter-Revolution in Berlin". Pp. 14-19. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 8. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1848c "Refutation". Pp. 210, 597. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 8. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1849 "Montesquieu LVI". Pp. 254-267. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 8. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1850 "The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850". Pp. 43-145. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 10. New York: International Publishers, 1978.
- 1851a "Marx to Engels (London to Manchester) August 31". Pp. 445-449. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 38. New York: International Publishers, 1982.
- 1851b "Marx to Engels (London to Manchester) September 13". Pp. 455-457. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 38. New York: International Publishers, 1982.
- 1852a "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte". Pp. 99-197. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 11. New York: International Publishers, 1979.
- 1852b "Marx to Engels (London to Manchester) August 10". Pp. 153-157. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 39. New York: International Publishers, 1983.

- 1853 "Marx to Engels (London to Manchester) October 12". Pp. 387-388. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 39. New York: International Publishers, 1983.
- 1854a "Marx to Engels (London to Manchester) May 6". Pp. 448-450. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 39. New York: International Publishers, 1983.
- 1854b "Revolutionary Spain". Pp. 389-446. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 13. New York: International Publishers, 1980.
- 1855a "Agitation Over The Tightening-Up of Sunday Observance". Pp. 323-327. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 14. New York: International Publishers, 1980.
- 1855b "Marx to Engels (London to Manchester) July 3". Pp. 540-541. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 39. New York: International Publishers, 1983.
- 1856 "Marx to Engels (London to Manchester) October 30". Pp. 80-82. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 40. New York: International Publishers, 1983.
- 1858 "Economic Manuscripts of 1857-1858". Pp. 5-537. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 28. New York: International Publishers, 1986.
- 1859a "Marx to Ferdinand Lassalle (London to Berlin) November 22". Pp. 536-539. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 40. New York: International Publishers, 1983.
- 1859b "Marx to Engels (London to Manchester) December 10". Pp. 547-550. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 40. New York: International Publishers, 1983.
- 1860 "Herr Vogt". Pp. 21-329. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 17. New York: International Publishers, 1981.
- 1861 "Marx to Engels (London to Manchester, July 5". Pp. 305-309. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 41. New York: International Publishers, 1985.
- 1867 "Das Kapital. Volume 1". Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Gesamtausgabe. Band 5. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1983.
- 1868 "Connections Between The International Working Men's Association and English Working Men's Organizations". Pp. 25-27. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 21. New York: International Publishers, 1985.
- 1871a "First Draft of 'The Civil War in France'". Pp. 437-514. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 22. New York: International Publishers, 1986.
- 1871b "Second Draft of 'The Civil War in France'". Pp. 515-551. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 22. New York: International Publishers, 1986.
- 1871c "The Civil War in France". Pp. 307-359. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 22. New York: International Publishers, 1986.

- 1872 "Das Kapital. Volume 1". Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Gesamtausgabe. Band 6. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1987.
- 1875 "Le Capital. Volume 1". Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Gesamtausgabe. Band 7. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1989.
- 1882 "Marx to Engels (Cannes to London) June 5". Pp. 272-274. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 46. New York: International Publishers, 1992.
- 1883 "Das Kapital. Volume 1". Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Gesamtausgabe. Band 8. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1989.
- 1887 "Capital. Volume 1". Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Gesamtausgabe. Band 9. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1990.
- 1890 "Das Kapital. Volume 1". Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Gesamtausgabe. Band 10. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1991.
- Marx, Karl; and Frederick Engels.
- 1844 "The Holy Family". Pp. 5-211. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 4. New York: International Publishers, 1975.
- 1846 "The German Ideology". Pp. 19-539. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 5. New York: International Publishers, 1976.
- 1848a "The Manifesto of the Communist Party". Pp. 477-519. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 6. New York: International Publishers, 1976.
- 1848b "The Civic Militia Bill". Pp. 256-265. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 7. New York: International Publishers, 1977.
- 1850a "'Les Conspireurs', Par A. Chenu, ...". Pp. 311-325. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 10. New York: International Publishers, 1978.
- 1850b "Review: May to October". Pp. 490-532. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 10. New York: International Publishers, 1978.
- 1850c "Manifesto of the German Communist Party". Pp. 161-162, 170-172, 181-183, 189-190. Translated by Helen Macfarlane. John Saville (ed). 'The Red Republican' and 'The Friend of the People': Volume 1: The Red Republican. New York: Barnes and Noble Inc., 1966.
- 1852 "The Great Men of the Exile". Pp. 227-326. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 11. New York: International Publishers, 1979.
- 1855 "Parliamentary and Military Affairs". Pp. 40-42. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 14. New York: International Publishers, 1980.
- 1873 "The Alliance of Socialist Democracy and the International Working Men's Association". Pp. 454-580. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: Collected Works. Volume 23. New York: International Publishers, 1988.
- 1888 The Communist Manifesto. Translated by Samuel Moore. London: Penguin Books, 1985.

Mason, Tim.

- 1977 "National Socialism and the Working Class, 1925 - May, 1933". New German Critique. Volume 11:49-93.

Mayhew, Henry.

- 1861a London Labour and the London Poor. Volume I: The London Street-Folk (Partial). London: Griffin, Bohn and Company. Reprinted by: New York: Dover Publications, Inc. (1968).
- 1861b London Labour and the London Poor. Volume II: The London Street-Folk (Continued). London: Griffin, Bohn and Company. Reprinted by: New York: Dover Publications, Inc. (1968).

McCarthy, Timothy.

- 1978 Marx and the Proletariat: A Study in Social Theory. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Inc.

McDonogh, Gary W.

- 1991 "Culture and Categorization in a Turn-of-the-Century Barcelona Elite". Cultural Anthropology. Volume 6(3): 323-345.

McLellan, David.

- 1980 Marx Before Marxism. 2nd. Edition. London: Macmillan.

Miller, Wilbut R.

- 1975 "Police Authority in London and New York City, 1830-1870". Journal of Social History. Volume 8(2): 81-101.

Mitchell, G. Duncan. (ed)

- 1968 A Dictionary of Sociology. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- 1979 A New Dictionary of the Social Sciences. New York: Aldine Publishing Company.

Montesquieu, Charles de Secondat, Baron de.

- 1748 "De L'esprit des Lois". Pp. 1-722. Translated by 1989 by Anne M. Cohler, Basia Carolyn Miller, and Harold Samuel Stone. The Spirit of the Laws. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Munford, C.J.

- 1972 "Social Structure and Black Revolution". Black Scholar. Volume 4(3):11-23.
- 1973 "The Fallacy of Lumpen Ideology". Black Scholar. Volume 4(10):47-51.

Naison, Mark.

- 1976 "Charles Valentine on 'Voluntary Ethnicity': A Fraternal Critique". *Journal of Ethnic Studies*. Volume 4(1):112-116.

Nikonenko, Stanislav.

- 1980 "Preface". Pp. xiii-xxxii. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels: *Collected Works*. Volume 14. New York: International Publishers.

Nowakowski, Stefan.

- 1975 "Changes in the Social Macrostructure and Their Influence on Local Urban and Rural Communities". *Kultura i Społeczeństwo*. Volume 19(1):89-104.

Ogura, Michiko.

- 1986 *Old English 'Impersonal' Verbs and Expressions*. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger.

Ollman, Bertell.

- 1968 "Marx's Use of 'Class'". *The American Journal of Sociology*. Volume 73(5):573-580.

Onions, C.T. (ed)

- 1966 "Lump". p. 539. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Ossowski, Stanislaw.

- 1963 *Class Structure in the Social Consciousness*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

Padover, Saul K.

- 1978 *Karl Marx: An Intimate Biography*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Pandey, P.S.

- 1978 "India's Population Problem - Myth and Reality". *Eastern Anthropologist*. Volume 31(3):313-318.

Paterson, R.W.K.

- 1971 *The Nihilistic Egoist Max Stirner*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pecqueur, Constantin.

- 1839 "Economie Sociale". Pp. 76-77. Partially translated by 1978 by Timothy McCarthy. *Marx and the Proletariat: A Study in Social Theory*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, Inc.
- 1842 "Theorie Nouvelle d'Economie Sociale et Politique ou Etudes sur l'organisation des Societes". Reprinted by 1971 by: New York: Burt Franklin.

- 1846 "Free Trade". Pp. 160-171. Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.
- Perkins, Stephen.
1993 Marxism and the Proletariat. London: Pluto Press.
- Petri, Barbara.
1958 The Historical Thought of P.J.B. Buchez. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press.
- Praver, S.S.
1976 Karl Marx and World Literature. Oxford, U.K.: The Clarendon Press.
- Proudhon, Pierre Joseph.
1840 "What Is Property". Pp. 201-229. Partially translated by 1964 by Benjamin Tucker. Albert Fried and Ronald Sanders (ed). Socialist Thought: A Documentary History. (Revised Edition). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Reynaud, Jean.
1832 "The Necessity of Special Representation For The Proletarians". Pp. 69-70. Partially translated by 1988 by David Lovell. Marx's Proletariat: The Making of a Myth. London: Routledge.
- Ritzer, George.
1991 Metatheorizing in Sociology. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Rose, R.B.
1978 Gracchus Babeuf: The First Revolutionary Communist. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
1981 "'Proletaires' and 'Proletariat': Evolution of a Concept, 1789-1848". Australian Journal of French Studies. Volume 18(3):282-299.
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques.
1762 "The Social Contract". Pp. 1-116. Translated by 1968 by G.D.H. Cole. The Social Contract and Discourses. London: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd.
- Russell, James.
1980 Marx-Engels Dictionary. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.
- Saffioti, Heleieth; and Vera Lucia Silveira Botta Ferrante.
1983 "Women and the Contradictions of Agrarian Capitalism". Perspectivas. Volume 6:67-75.

Saint-Simon, Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de.

- 1824a "The Class of the Proletarians". Pp. 239-240. Translated by 1976 by Ghita Ionescu. The Political Thought of Saint-Simon. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1824b "On the Social Organization". Pp. 219-238. Translated by 1976 by Ghita Ionescu. The Political Thought of Saint-Simon. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sarcinelli, Franco.

- 1994 "Pasolini and the Italian Case". *Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia*. Volume 35(2):205-230.

Scholze-Studenrecht, W.; and J.B. Sykes. (eds)

- 1990a "Armut". p. 86. The Oxford Duden German Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1990b "Aussteiger". p. 115. The Oxford Duden German Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1990c "Bosewicht". p. 169. The Oxford Duden German Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1990d "Fetzender". p. 281. The Oxford Duden German Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1990e "Gauner". p. 309. The Oxford Duden German Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1990f "Halunke". p. 358. The Oxford Duden German Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1990g "Kaseblatt". p. 425. The Oxford Duden German Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1990h "Lausbub". p. 473. The Oxford Duden German Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1990i "Lumpen". p. 491. The Oxford Duden German Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1990j "Schlawiner". p. 632. The Oxford Duden German Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1990k "Schlingel". p. 634. The Oxford Duden German Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1990l "Schlucker". p. 634. The Oxford Duden German Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1990m "Schuft". p. 645. The Oxford Duden German Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1990n "Schurke". p. 646. The Oxford Duden German Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1990o "Spitzbube". p. 674. The Oxford Duden German Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Seidman, Steven.

- 1994 *Contested Knowledge: Social Theory in the Postmodern Era*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Shipley, Joseph T.

- 1970 "Luncheon". pp. 219-220. *Dictionary of Word Origins*. Totowa, NJ: Littlefield, Adams and Co.

- Simpson, J.A.; and E.S.C. Weiner. (eds)
 1989a "Limp". pp. 969-970. The Oxford English Dictionary (2nd Ed). Volume 8. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 1989b "Lump". pp. 100-101. The Oxford English Dictionary (2nd Ed). Volume 9. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 1989c "Lumpenproletariat". p. 102. The Oxford English Dictionary (2nd Ed). Volume 9. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 1989d "Proletariat". p. 606. The Oxford English Dictionary (2nd Ed). Volume 12. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sismondi, Jean Charles Leonard Simonde de.
 1819 "New Principles of Political Economy. 1st ed.". Translated by 1991 by Richard Hyse. New Principles of Political Economy. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
 1827 "Forward to the Second Edition". Pp. 7-15. Translated by 1991 by Richard Hyse. New Principles of Political Economy. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
 1834 "Of Landed Wealth". Pp. 137-152. Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.
 1837 "Etudes sur L'Economie Politique: Tome Premier". Pp. 1-327. Reprinted by 1980 as: Etudes sur L'Economie Politique: I-II. Geneve: Slatkine Reprints.
 1838 "Etudes sur L'Economie Politique: Tome Deuxieme". Pp. 1-344. Reprinted by 1980 as: Etudes sur L'Economie Politique: I-II. Geneve: Slatkine Reprints.
- Skeat, Walter W.
 1910 "Lump". p. 351. An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Smart, Barry.
 1993 Postmodernity. London: Routledge.
- Spencer, Metta.
 1990 Foundations of Modern Sociology. (Canadian 5th Edition) Scarborough: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc.
 1993 Foundations of Modern Sociology. (Canadian 6th Edition) Scarborough: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc.
- Srinivasan, Shaila.
 1992 "The Class Position of the Asian Bourgeoisie". New Community. Volume 19(1):61-74.
- Steger, Manfred.
 1992 "Historical Materialism and Ethics: Eduard Bernstein's Revisionist Perspective". History of European Ideas. Volume 14(5):647-663.

Stirner, Max.

- 1844 **The Ego and His Own.** Translated by 1907 by Steven T. Byington. New York: Libertarian Book Club, 1963.
- 1844G **Der Einzige und Sein Eigenthum.** Reprinted by 1968 by Hans G. Helms. Munchen: Carl Hanser Verlag.

Sue, Eugene.

- 1842a **The Mysteries of Paris. Volume 1. Book 1. The Tapis Franc.** Pp. 11-346. Translated by 1903 by Anon. New York: The Century Company.
- 1842b **The Mysteries of Paris. Volume 1. Book 2. The Ball.** Pp. 11-333. Translated by 1903 by Anon. New York: The Century Company.
- 1842c **The Mysteries of Paris. Volume 2. Book 3. The Temple.** Pp. 11-327. Translated by 1903 by Anon. New York: The Century Company.
- 1842d **The Mysteries of Paris. Volume 2. Book 4. Rigolette's First Sorrow.** Pp. 11-338. Translated by 1903 by Anon. New York: The Century Company.
- 1842e **The Mysteries of Paris. Volume 3. Book 5. The Presentation.** Pp. 11-260. Translated by 1903 by Anon. New York: The Century Company.
- 1842f **The Mysteries of Paris. Volume 3. Book 6. Punishment.** Pp. 11-276. Translated by 1903 by Anon. New York: The Century Company.

Tannenbaum, Edward.

- 1981 **"The Beginnings of Bleeding-Heart Liberalism: Eugene Sue's 'Les Mysteres de Paris'".** Comparative Studies in Society and History. Volume 23(3):491-507.

Theodorson, George A.; and Achilles G. Theodorson.

- 1969 **A Modern Dictionary of Sociology.** New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

Traugott, Mark.

- 1980a **"Determinants of Political Orientation: Class and Organization in the Parisian Insurrection of June 1848".** The American Journal of Sociology. Volume 86(1):32-49.
- 1980b **"The Mobile Guard in the French Revolution of 1848".** Theory and Society. Volume 9(5):683-720.
- 1985 **Armies of the Poor: Determinants of Working Class Participation in the Parisian Insurrection of June 1848.** Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tristan, Flora.

- 1843 **"To Working Men and Working Women".** Pp. 113-125. Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

- Tucker, Robert C.**
 1961 *Philosophy and Myth in Karl Marx*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tunnell, Kenneth D.**
 1990 "Property Criminals as the Lumpenproletariat: A Serendipitous Finding". *Nature, Society and Thought*. Volume 3(1):39-55.
- Turner, Jonathan H.**
 1974 *The Structure of Sociological Theory*. Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press.
 1978 *The Structure of Sociological Theory*. (rev ed). Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press.
 1979 "The Disintegration of American Sociology". *Sociological Perspectives*. Volume 32(4):419-433.
 1980 "Toward a Social Physics: Reducing Sociology's Theoretical Inhibitions". *The Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*. Volume 7(1):140-155. Reprinted in pp. 7-16. *Classical Sociological Theory: A Positivist's Perspective*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers. (1993).
 1990 "The Misuse and Use of Metatheory". *Sociological Forum*. Volume 5:37-53. Reprinted as "Marx and Weber Meet the Modern-day Adam Smith". pp. 119-134. *Classical Sociological Theory: A Positivist's Perspective*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers. (1993).
 1991 *The Structure of Sociological Theory*. (5th ed). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Valentine, Charles A.**
 1975 "Voluntary Ethnicity and Social Change: Classism, Racism, Marginality, Mobility, and Revolution With Special Reference to Afro-Americans and Other Third World Peoples". *Journal of Ethnic Studies*. Volume 3(1):1-27.
 1976 "Class and Ethnicity, Marxism and Lumpenism: Notes in Response to a Critique of 'Voluntary Ethnicity'". *Journal of Ethnic Studies*. Volume 4(3):53-67.
- Varin, Emile.**
 1839 "To All". Pp. 93-97. Translated by 1983 by Paul E. Corcoran (ed). *Before Marx: Socialism and Communism in France, 1830-1848*. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel.**
 1973 "Imperialism and Capitalism: Are the Workers the Most Oppressed Class?". *Insurgent Sociologist*. Volume 3(2): 25-28.

- Wilczynski, J.**
 1981 **An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Marxism, Socialism and Communism.** London: The MacMillan Press Ltd.
- Woodward, Peter.**
 1978 **"Ambiguous Amin". African Affairs. Volume 77(307): 153-164.**
- Wright, Erik Olin.**
 1978 **Class, Crisis and the State.** London: Verso.
 1985 **Classes.** London: Verso.
 1994 **Interrogating Inequality.** London: Verso.
- Wright, Joseph; and Elizabeth Mary Wright.**
 1925 **Old English Grammar. (Third Edition).** Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, Richard A.**
 1980 **"The Technocratic Estate in Postindustrial Society: Marxian Political Economics Toward The Year 2000". International Review of Modern Sociology. Volume 10(1):125-139.**
- Zolberg, Vera.**
 1985 **"Workers in the French XIXth Century Novel: Myths and Realities". Sociologia Internationalis. Band 23(1-2):79-100.**

END

2 1 - 1 1 - 9 6

FIN