

proletariat.²² Others, like A. Szymanski, argue that the proletariat includes low-level, routinized white collar employees as well.²³ Harry Braverman, the advocate of the proletarian location of clerical labor, maintains that "while the working class in production is the result of several centuries of capitalist development, clerical labor is largely the product of the period of monopoly capitalism.... Clerical work as a capitalist labor process and clerical worker as proletariat in new form."²⁵

At this point, the controversy enters another level of complexity, focusing mainly on why productive labor? What labor is productive? Whether or not the new wage-earning groupings who belong to the mushrooming service sector belong also to the proletariat.

As summed up by Jan Gough:

"In his theories of surplus-value, Marx defined productive labor under capitalism as labor which produces commodity value and hence surplus value for capital; this excludes all labor which is not exchanged against capital, self-employed proprietors-farmers, artisans, handicraftsmen, tradesmen, professionals, all other self-employed -- are according to this definition not productive workers because their labor is not exchanged for capital and does not contribute directly to the increase of capital. Even more, they fall outside of the distinction between productive and unproductive labor, because they are outside the capitalist mode of production." 26

This is, in fact, a distinction between capitalist productive labor and non-capitalist productive labor. This is inadequate. For our purpose, it is equally important to draw the line between productive and unproductive labor under capitalist relations.

Poulantzas argues that in Marx's analysis, the working class is defined not by wage-labor (purchase and sale of labor power) but by productive-labor (which, under capitalism, means labor that directly produces surplus-value). Therefore, it is only those earners who depend on produc-