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scientific description in C17 but is not common before C19. The crucial transfer seems to take place in descriptions of material objects, with a strong sense of observation which is probably related to the earlier main sense of observable public conduct. Thus: ‘to watch ... the behaviour of the water which drains off a flat coast of mud’ (Huxley, 1878). But the term was also used in relation to plants, lower organisms and animals, and by IC19 was in general use in its still current sense of ‘the externally apparent activity of a whole organism’. (Cf. animal behaviour, and its specialized synonym ethology; ethology had previously been defined as mimicry, C17; the science of ethics, C18; the science of character (Mill, 1843). The range from moral to neutral definitions is as evident as in behaviour, and can of course be seen also in character.)

One particular meaning followed from the extension of the methodology of the physical and biological sciences to an influential school of psychology which described itself (Watson, 1913) as behaviourist and (slightly later) behaviourism. Psychology was seen as ‘a purely objective experimental branch of natural science’ (Watson), and data of a ‘mental’ or ‘experiential’ kind were ruled out as unscientific. The key point in this definition was the sense of observable, which was initially confined to ‘objectively physically measurable’ but which later developments, that were still called behaviourist or neo-behaviourist (this use of neo, Gk - new, to indicate a new or revised version of a doctrine is recorded from C17 but is most common from IC19), modified to ‘experimentally measurable’, various kinds of ‘mental’ or ‘experiential’ (cf. subjective) data being admitted under conditions of controlled observation. More important, probably, than the methodological argument within psychology was the extension, from this school and from several associated social and intellectual tendencies, of a sense of behaviour, in its new wide reference to all (? observable) activity, and especially human activity, as ‘interaction’ between ‘an organism’ and ‘its environment’, usually itself specialized to ‘stimulus’ and ‘response’. This had the effect, in a number of areas, of limiting not only the study but the nature of human activity to interactions determined (q.v.) by an environment, other conceptions of ‘intention’ or ‘purpose’ being rejected or treated as at best secondary, the predominant emphasis being always on (observable) effect: behaviour. In the human sciences, and in many socially applied (and far from neutral) fields such as communications (q.v.) and advertising (which developed from its general sense of ‘notification’, from C15, to a system of organized influence on consumer (q.v.) behaviour, especially from IC19), the relatively neutral physical senses of stimulus and response have been developed into a reductive system of ‘controlled’ behaviour as a summary of all significant human activity. (Controlled is interesting because of the overlap between conditions of observable experiment – developed from the sense of a system of checks in commercial accounting, from C15 – and conditions of the exercise of restraint or power over others, also from C15. The two modern senses are held as separate, but there has been some practical transfer between them.) The most important effect is the description of certain ‘intentional’ and ‘purposive’ human practices and systems as if they were ‘natural’ or ‘objective’ stimuli, to which responses can be graded as ‘normal’ or ‘abnormal’ or ‘deviant’. The sense of ‘autonomous’ or ‘independent’ response (either generally, or in the sense of being outside the terms of a given system) can thus be weakened, with important effects in politics and sociology (cf. ‘deviant groups’, ‘deviant political behaviour’), in psychology (cf. rationalization) and in the understanding of intelligence or of language (language behaviour), where there is now considerable argument between an extended sense of behaviourist explanations and explanations based on such terms as generative or creative (q.v.).

Apart from these particular and central controversies, it remains significant that a term for public conduct should have developed into our most widely used and most apparently neutral term for all kinds of activity.

BOURGEIOS

Bourgeois is a very difficult word to use in English: first, because although quite widely used it is still evidently a French word, the earlier Anglicization to burgess, from OF burgeois and ME burgeois, burges, borges – inhabitant of a borough, having remained fixed in its original limited meaning; secondly, because it is especially
associated with Marxist argument, which can attract hostility or
dismissal (and it is relevant here that in this context bourgeoís
cannot properly be translated by the more familiar English adjective
middle-class); thirdly, because it has been extended, especially in
English in the last twenty years, partly from this Marxist sense but
mainly from much earlier French senses, to a general and often
vague term of social contempt. To understand this range it is
necessary to follow the development of the word in French, and to
note a particular difficulty in the translation, into both French and
English, of the German bürgerlich.

Under the feudal regime in France bourgeoís was a juridical
category in society, defined by such conditions as length of residence.
The essential definition was that of the solid citizen whose mode of
life was at once stable and solvent. The earliest adverse meanings
came from a higher social order: an aristocratic contempt for the
mediocrity of the bourgeoís which extended, especially in C18, into
a philosophical and intellectual contempt for the limited if stable life
and ideas of this ‘middle’ class (there was a comparable English C17
and C18 use of citizen and its abbreviation cit). There was a steady
association of the bourgeoís with trade, but to succeed as a
bourgeois, and to live bourgeoisement, was typically to retire and live
on invested income. A bourgeois house was one in which no trade or
profession (lawyers and doctors were later excepted) could be carried
on.

The steady growth in size and importance of this bourgeois class
in the centuries of expanding trade had major consequences in
political thought, which in turn had important complicating effects
on the word. A new concept of society (q.v.) was expressed and
translated in English, especially in C18, as civil society, but the
equivalents for this adjective were and in some senses still are the
French bourgeois and the German bürgerlich. In later English usage
these came to be translated as bourgeois in the more specific C19
sense, often leading to confusion.

Before the specific Marxist sense, bourgeois became a term of
contempt, but also of respect from below. The migrant labourer or
soldier saw the established bourgeois as his opposite; workers saw
the capitalized bourgeois as an employer. The social dimension of
the later use was thus fully established by IC18, although the

essentially different aristocratic or philosophical contempt was still
an active sense.

The definition of bourgeois society was a central concept in Marx,
yet especially in some of his early work the term is ambiguous, since
in relation to Hegel for whom civil (bürgerlich) society was an
important term to be distinguished from state (q.v.) Marx used, and in the
end amalgamated, the earlier and the later meanings. Marx’s new
sense of bourgeois society followed earlier historical usage, from
established and solvent burgesses to a growing class of traders,
entrepreneurs and employers. His attack on what he called
bourgeois political theory (the theory of civil society) was based on
what he saw as its falsely universal concepts and institutions, which
were in fact the concepts and institutions of a specifically bourgeois
society: that is, a society in which the bourgeoisie (the class name
was now much more significant) had become or was becoming
dominant. Different stages of bourgeois society led to different
stages of the capitalist (q.v.) mode of economic production, or, as it
was later more strictly put, different stages of the capitalist mode of
production led to different stages of bourgeois society and hence
bourgeois thought, bourgeois feeling, bourgeois ideology, bourgeois
art. In Marx’s sense the word has passed into universal
usage. But it is often difficult to separate it, in some respects, from
the residual aristocratic and philosophical contempt, and from a later
form especially common among unestablished artists, writers and
thinkers, who might not and often do not share Marx’s central
definition, but who sustain the older sense of hostility towards the
(mediocre) established and respectable.

The complexity of the word is then evident. There is a problem
even in the strict Marxist usage, in that the same word, bourgeois, is
used to describe historically distinct periods and phases of social and
cultural development. In some contexts, especially, this is bound to be
confusing: the bourgeois ideology of settled independent citizens is
clearly not the same as the bourgeois ideology of the highly mobile
agents of a para-national corporation. The distinction of petit-
bourgeois is an attempt to preserve some of the earlier historical
characteristics, but is also used for a specific category within a more
complex and mobile society. There are also problems in the relation
between bourgeois and capitalist, which are often used
indistinguishably but which in Marx are primarily distinguishable as social and economic terms. There is a specific difficulty in the description of non-urban capitalists (e.g. agrarian capitalist employers) as *bourgeois*, with its residual urban sense, though the social relations they institute are clearly *bourgeois* in the developed C19 sense. There is also difficulty in the relation between descriptions of *bourgeois* society and the *bourgeois* or *bourgeoisie* as a class. A *bourgeois* society, according to Marx, is one in which the *bourgeois* class is dominant, but there can then be difficulties of usage, associated with some of the most intense controversies of analysis, when the same word is used for a whole society in which one class is dominant (but in which, necessarily, there are other classes) and for a specific class within that whole society. The difficulty is especially noticeable in uses of *bourgeois* as an adjective describing some practice which is not itself defined by the manifest social and economic content of *bourgeois*.

It is thus not surprising that there is resistance to the use of the word in English, but it has also to be said that for its precise uses in Marxist and other historical and political argument there is no real English alternative. The translation *middle-class* serves most of the pre-C19 meanings, in pointing to the same kinds of people, and their ways of life and opinions, as were then indicated by *bourgeois*, and had been indicated by *citizen* and *cit* and *civil*; general uses of *citizen* and *cit* were common until IC18 but less common after the emergence of *middle-class* in IC18. But *middle-class* (see CLASS), though a modern term, is based on an older threefold division of society – *upper*, *middle* and *lower* – which has most significance in feudal and immediately post-feudal society and which, in the sense of the later uses, would have little or no relevance as a description of a developed or fully formed *bourgeois* society. A *ruling* class, which is the socialist sense of *bourgeois* in the context of historical description of a developed capitalist society, is not easily or clearly represented by the essentially different *middle* class. For this reason, especially in this context and in spite of the difficulties, *bourgeois* will continue to have to be used.

See *capitalism*, *civilization*, *class*, *society*

**BUREAUCRACY**

*Bureaucracy* appears in English from mC19. Carlyle in *Latter-day Pamphlets* (1850) wrote of ‘the Continental nuisance called “Bureaucracy”’, and Mill in 1848 wrote of the inexpediency of concentrating all the power of organized action ‘in a dominant bureaucracy’. In 1818, using an earlier form, Lady Morgan had written of the ‘Bureaucratie or office tryanny, by which Ireland had been so long governed’. The word was taken from *fr* bureau, writing-desk and then office. The original meaning of bureau was the baize used to cover desks. The English use of bureau as office dates BC18; it became more common in American use, especially with reference to foreign branches, the French influence being predominant. The increasing scale of commercial organization, with a corresponding increase in government intervention and legal controls, and with the increasing importance of organized and professional central government, produced the political facts to which the new term pointed. But there was then considerable variation in their evaluation. In English and North American usage the foreign term, *bureaucracy*, was used to indicate the rigidity or excessive power of public administration, while such terms as *public service* or *civil service* were used to indicate impartiality and selfless professionalism. In German *Bureaueratie* often had the more favourable meaning, as in Schmoller (‘the only neutral element’, apart from the monarchy, ‘in the class war’), and was given a further sense of legally established rationality by Weber. The variation of terms can still confuse the variations of evaluation, and indeed the distinctions between often diverse political systems which ‘a body of public servants’ or a bureaucracy can serve. Beyond this, however, there has been a more general use of *bureaucracy* to indicate, unfavourably, not merely the class of officials but certain types of centralized social order, of a modern organized kind, as distinct not only from older aristocratic societies but from popular democracy (q.v.). This has been important in socialist thought, where the concept of the ‘public interest’ is especially exposed to the variation between ‘public service’ and ‘bureaucracy’.
sufficiently strong for it to retain some normative quality; in this sense civilization, a civilized way of life, the conditions of civilized society may be seen as capable of being lost as well as gained.

See CITY, CULTURE, DEVELOPMENT, MODERN, SOCIETY, WESTERN

CLASS

Class is an obviously difficult word, both in its range of meanings and in its complexity in that particular meaning where it describes a social division. The Latin word classis, a division according to property of the people of Rome, came into English in 1C16 in its Latin form, with a plural classes or classies. There is a 1C16 use (King, 1594) which sounds almost modern: 'all the classies and ranks of vanitie'. But classis was primarily used in explicit reference to Roman history, and was then extended, first as a term in church organization ('assemblies are either classes or synods', 1593) and later as a general term for a division or group ('the classis of Plants', 1664). It is worth noting that the derived Latin word classicus, coming into English in cC17 as classic from fw classique, F, had social implications before it took on its general meaning of a standard authority and then its particular meaning of belonging to Greek and Roman antiquity (now usually distinguished in the form classical, which at first alternated with classic). Gellius wrote: 'classicus ... scriptor, non proletarius'. But the form class, coming into English in C17, acquired a special association with education. Blount, glossing classe in 1656, included the still primarily Roman sense of 'an order or distribution of people according to their several Degrees' but added: 'in Schools (wherein this word is most used) a Form or Lecture restrained to a certain company of Scholars' – a use which has remained common in education. The development of classic and classical was strongly affected by this association with authoritative works for study.

From 1C17 the use of class as a general word for a group or division became more and more common. What is then most difficult is that class came to be used in this way about plants and animals, but without social implications of the modern kind. (Cf. Steele, 1709: 'this Class of modern Wits'.) Development of class in its modern social sense, with relatively fixed names for particular classes (lower class, middle class, upper class, working class and so on), belongs essentially to the period between 1770 and 1840, which is also the period of the Industrial Revolution and its decisive reorganization of society. At the extremes it is not difficult to distinguish between (i) class as a general term for any grouping and (ii) class as a would-be specific description of a social formation. There is no difficulty in distinguishing between Steele's 'Class of modern Wits' and, say, the Declaration of the Birmingham Political Union (1830) 'that the rights and interests of the middle and lower classes of the people are not efficiently represented in the Commons House of Parliament'. But in the crucial period of transition, and indeed for some time before it, there is real difficulty in being sure whether a particular use is sense (i) or sense (ii). The earliest use that I know, which might be read in a modern sense, is Defoe's 'tis plain the dearness of wages forms our people into more classes than other nations can show' (Review, 14 April 1705). But this, even in an economic context, is far from certain. There must also be some doubt about Hanway's title of 1772: 'Observations on the Causes of the Dissoluteness which reigns among the lower classes of the people'. We can read this, as indeed we would read Defoe, in a strictly social sense, but there is enough overlap between sense (i) and sense (ii) to make us pause. The crucial context of this development is the alternative vocabulary for social divisions, and it is a fact that until IC18, and residually well into C19 and even C20, the most common words were rank and order, while estate and degree were still more common than class. Estate, degree and order had been widely used to describe social position from medieval times. Rank had been common from IC16. In virtually all contexts where we would now say class these other words were standard, and lower order and lower orders became especially common in C18.

The essential history of the introduction of class, as a word which would supersede older names for social divisions, relates to the increasing consciousness that social position is made rather than merely inherited. All the older words, with their essential metaphors of standing, stepping and arranging in rows, belong to a society in
which position was determined by birth. Individual mobility could be seen as movement from one estate, degree, order or rank to another. What was changing consciousness was not only increased individual mobility, which could be largely contained within the older terms, but the new sense of a society (q.v.) or a particular social system which actually created social divisions, including new kinds of divisions. This is quite explicit in one of the first clear uses, that of Madison in *The Federalist* (USA, c. 1787): 'moneyed and manufacturing interests grow up of necessity in civilized nations, and divide them into different classes, actuated by different sentiments and views'. Under the pressure of this awareness, greatly sharpened by the economic changes of the Industrial Revolution and the political conflicts of the American and French revolutions, the new vocabulary of class began to take over. But it was a slow and uneven process, not only because of the residual familiarity of the older words, and not only because conservative thinkers continued, as a matter of principle, to avoid class wherever they could and to prefer the older (and later some newer) terms. It was slow and uneven, and has remained difficult, mainly because of the inevitable overlap with the use of class not as a specific social division but as a generally available and often ad hoc term of grouping.

With this said, we can trace the formation of the newly specific class vocabulary. Lower classes was used in 1772, and lowest classes and lowest class were common from the 1790s. These carry some of the marks of the transition, but do not complete it. More interesting because less dependent on an old general sense, in which the lower classes would be not very different from the common (q.v.) people, is the new and increasingly self-conscious and self-used description of the middle classes. This has precedents in ‘men of a middle condition’ (1716), ‘the middle Station of life’ (Defoe, 1719), ‘the Middling People of England ... generally Good-natured and Stout-hearted’ (1718), ‘the middling and lower classes’ (1789). Gisborne in 1795 wrote an ‘Enquiry into the Duties of Men in the Higher Rank and Middle Classes of Society in Great Britain’. Hannah More in 1796 wrote of the ‘middling classes’. The ‘burden of taxation’ rested heavily ‘on the middle classes’ in 1809 (*Monthly Repository*, 501), and in 1812 there was reference to ‘such of the Middle Class of Society who have fallen upon evil days’ (*Examiner*, August). Rank was still used at least as often, as in James Mill (1820): ‘the class which is universally described as both the most wise and the most virtuous part of the community, the middle rank’ (*Essay on Government*), but here class has already taken on a general social sense, used on its own. The swell of self-congratulatory description reached a temporary climax in Brougham’s speech of 1831: ‘by the people, I mean the middle classes, the wealth and intelligence of the country, the glory of the British name’.

There is a continuing curiosity in this development. Middle belongs to a disposition between lower and higher, in fact as an insertion between an increasingly insupportable high and low. Higher classes was used by Burke (*Thoughts on French Affairs*) in 1791, and upper classes is recorded from the 1820s. In this model an old hierarchical division is still obvious; the middle class is a self-conscious interposition between persons of rank and the common people. This was always, by definition, indeterminate: this is one of the reasons why the grouping word class rather than the specific word rank eventually came through. But clearly in Brougham, and very often since, the upper or higher part of the model virtually disappears, or, rather, awareness of a higher class is assigned to a different dimension, that of a residual and respected but essentially displaced aristocracy.

This is the ground for the next complication. In the fierce argument about political, social and economic rights, between the 1790s and the 1830s, class was used in another model, with a simple distinction of the productive or useful classes (a potent term against the aristocracy). In the widely-read translation of Volney’s *The Ruins, or A Survey of the Revolutions of Empires* (2 parts, 1795) there was a dialogue between those who by ‘useful labours contribute to the support and maintenance of society’ (the majority of the people, ‘labourers, artisans, tradesmen and every profession useful to society’, hence called People) and a Privileged class (‘priests, courtiers, public accountants, commanders of troops, in short, the civil, military or religious agents of government’). This is a description in French terms of the people against an aristocratic government, but it was widely adopted in English terms, with one particular result which corresponds to the actual political situation of the reform movement between the 1790s and the 1830s: both the self-conscious middle classes and the quite different people who by the end of this period would describe themselves as the working
classes adopted the descriptions useful or productive classes, in
distinction from and in opposition to the privileged or the idle. This
use, which of course sorts oddly with the other model of lower,
middle and higher, has remained both important and confusing.

For it was by transfer from the sense of useful or productive that
the working classes were first named. There is considerable overlap
in this: cf. ‘middle and industrious classes’ (Monthly Magazine,
1797) and ‘poor and working classes’ (Owen, 1813) – the latter
probably the first English use of working classes but still very
general. In 1818 Owen published Two Memorials on Behalf of the
Working Classes, and in the same year The Gorgon (28 November)
used working classes in the specific and unmistakable context of
relations between ‘workmen’ and ‘their employers’. The use then
developed rapidly, and by 1831 the National Union of the Working
Classes identified not so much privilege as the ‘laws ... made to
protect ... property or capital’ as their enemy. (They distinguished
such laws from those that had not been made to protect industry
(q.v.), still in its old sense of applied labour.) In the Poor Man’s
Guardian (19 October 1833), O’Brien wrote of establishing for ‘the
productive classes a complete dominion over the fruits of their own
industry’ and went on to describe such a change as ‘contemplated by
the working classes’; the two terms, in this context, are interchange-
able. There are complications in phrases like the labouring classes
and the operative classes, which seem designed to separate one
group of the useful classes from another, to correspond with the
distinction between workmen and employers, or men and masters: a
distinction that was economically inevitable and that was politically
active from the 1830s at latest. The term working classes, originally
assigned by others, was eventually taken over and used as proudly as
middle classes had been: ‘the working classes have created all
wealth’ (Rules of Ripponden Co-operative Society; cit. J. H.
Priestley, History of RCS; dating from 1833 or 1839).

By the 1840s, then, middle classes and working classes were
common terms. The former became singular first; the latter is
singular from the 1840s but still today alternates between singular
and plural forms, often with ideological significance, the singular
being normal in socialist uses, the plural more common in conserva-
tive descriptions. But the most significant effect of this complicated
history was that there were now two common terms, increasingly
used for comparison, distinction or contrast, which had been formed
within quite different models. On the one hand middle implied
hierarchy and therefore implied lower class: not only theoretically
but in repeated practice. On the other hand working implied productive
or useful activity, which would leave all who were not working
class unproductive and useless (easy enough for an aristocracy, but
hardly accepted by a productive middle class). To this day this con-
fusion reverberates. As early as 1844 Cockburn referred to ‘what are
termed the working-classes, as if the only workers were those who
wrought with their hands’. Yet working man or workman had a per-
sistent reference to manual labour. In an Act of 1875 this was given
legal definition: ‘the expression workman ... means any person who,
being a labourer, servant in husbandry, journeyman, artificer, hand-
craftsman, miner, or otherwise engaged in manual labour ... has
entered into or works under a contract with an employer’. The
association of workman and working class was thus very strong, but
it will be noted that the definition includes contract with an employer
as well as manual work. An Act of 1890 stated: ‘the provisions of
section eleven of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1885 ... shall
have effect as if the expression working classes included all
classes of persons who earn their livelihood by wages or salaries’.
This permitted a distinction from those whose livelihood depended on
fees (professional class), profits (trading class) or property
(independent). Yet, especially with the development of clerical and
service occupations, there was a critical ambiguity about the class
position of those who worked for a salary or even a wage and yet did
not do manual labour. (Salary as fixed payment dates from C14;
wages and salaries is still a normal C19 phrase; in 1868, however, ‘a
manager of a bank or railway — even an overseer or a clerk in a
manufactory — is said to draw a salary’, and the attempted class
distinction between salaries and wages is evident; by C20 the
salarial was being distinguished from the proletariat.) Here again, at
a critical point, the effect of two models of class is evident. The
middle class, with which the earners of salaries normally aligned
themselves, is an expression of relative social position and thus of
social distinction. The working class, specialized from the different
notion of the useful or productive classes, is an expression of
economic relationships. Thus the two common modern class terms
rest on different models, and the position of those who are conscious
hand, the class in its turn achieves an independent existence over
against the individuals, so that the latter find their conditions of
existence predestined, and hence have their position in life and
their personal development assigned to them by their class ... (German Ideology)

This difficult argument again attracts confusion. A class is some-
times an economic category, including all who are objectively in that
economic situation. But a class is sometimes (and in Marx more
often) a formation in which, for historical reasons, consciousness of
this situation and the organization to deal with it have developed.
Thus:

Insofar as millions of families live under economic conditions of
existence that separate their mode of life, their interests and their
culture from those of the other classes, and put them in hostile
opposition to the latter, they form a class. Insofar as there is
merely a local interconnection among these small-holding
peasants, and the identity of their interests begets no community,
no national bond and no political organization among them, they
do not form a class. (Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte)

This is the distinction between category and formation, but since
class is used for both there has been plenty of ground for confusion.
The problem is still critical in that it underlies repeated arguments
about the relation of an assumed class Consciousness to an
objectively measured class, and about the vagaries of self-description
and self-assignment to a class scale. Many of the derived terms repeat
this uncertainty. Class Consciousness clearly can belong only to a
formation. Class Struggle, Class Conflict, Class War, Class
Legislation, Class Bias depend on the existence of formations
(though this may be very uneven or partial within or between
classes). Class Culture, on the other hand, can swing between the
two meanings: Working-Class Culture can be the meanings and values
and institutions of the formation, or the tastes and life-styles of the
category (see also Culture). In a whole range of contemporary
discussion and controversy, all these variable meanings of class can
be seen in operation, usually without clear distinction. It is therefore
worth repeating the basic range (outside the uncontroversial senses of
general classification and education):

(i) group (objective); social or economic category, at varying
levels
(ii) rank; relative social position; by birth or mobility
(iii) formation; perceived economic relationship; social, political
and cultural organization

See Culture, Industry, Masses, Ordinary, Popular, Society,
Underprivileged

COLLECTIVE

Collective appeared in English as an adjective from C17. It was mainly a specialized development from
Collect, fw collectus, L – gathered together (there is also a fw
Collecter, of F – to gather taxes or other money). Collective as an
adjective was used from its earliest appearance to describe people
acting together, or in such related phrases as collective body
(Hooker, Ecclesiastical Polity, VIII, iv; 1600). Early uses of the noun
were in grammar or in physical description. The social and political
sense of a specific unit – ‘your brethren of the Collective’ (Cobbett,
Rural Rides, II, 337; 1830) – belongs to the new democratic (q.v.)
consciousness of eC19. This use has been revived in several subsequent
periods, including mC20, but is still not common. Collectivism, used mainly to describe socialist economic theory, and
only derivatively in the political sense of collective, became common
in 1C19; it was described in the 1880s as a recent word, though its use
is recorded from the 1850s. In France the term was used in 1869 as a
way of opposing ‘state socialism’.

See Common, Democracy, Masses, Society