

and other grounds; that is, the "global reach" of the unit of monopoly capital, the so-called "multi-national" which is so (i.e., multi-national) insofar as it employs a multi-national labor force, specifically in proletarian social forms of labor (productive, manual, non-supervisory). It is wrong, therefore, to talk in terms of an "American" working class and its size compared with the bourgeoisie, for example, which is an essentially U.S.-based international monopoly controlling the labor process of an international labor force engaged in production for United States companies within the United States (immigrant workers, especially illegal aliens) and within very many other national boundaries. The latter may explain the underlying reason behind the objectively small size of the American working class; and it may also explain the incredibly large portion of the American labor force that occupies supervisory positions in the social division of labor.

According to Wright himself, almost half of the economically active population in the United States are supervisors; only 51.9 percent are non-supervisory wage-earners.⁶¹ Maintaining only a small working class as a privileged labor aristocracy is likely to be the ultimate bourgeois strategy to prevent the imposition of a socialist alternative at home, unless through immigrant workers.

One may suggest, in light of the above, that the minority size of the working class (the actual proletariat in Poulantzas' criteria) is peculiar to the centers, as compared to the peripheries of world capitalism; to advanced capitalism as compared to dependent capitalist peripheries. This is only an hypothesis for future research,

In Israel's social formation, the proletariat are the great majority