

wage-earners perform productive or unproductive labor, hence do or do not belong to the proletariat class. For bourgeois social scientists, who agree on denying the class specificity of these new wage-earning groupings, the controversy lies in how to dissolve the latter among existing social classes. Renner, Croner, Bendix and others, for example, dissolve them into the bourgeoisie. T. Geiger, C. Wright-Mills, and others, place them within the boundaries of the working class. Dahrendorf divides them into bourgeoisie and working class, depending on their relation to the exercise of power and authority. Others like Fossaet 1961 and Praderie 1968 consider them a "Third Force", members of the "Tertiary" sector, and therefore belong to the traditional petty bourgeoisie. In our analysis, we choose to ignore these considerations simply as irrelevant because bourgeois social scientists are incapable of relating to real social class, since by definition they cannot conceive of social classes as existing and being defined only in class struggle. The latter is precisely the paradigm they essentially oppose. Prominent examples of the incorrect conception of social classes as they exist in reality are: the concept of the "service class" in Industrial Man (ed., T. Burns), 1969; and the more recently developed concept of the "welfare class" by M. Rien, 1977, in his article, "Is There a Welfare Class?". Not only that both see social classes as external to the production process itself and its social division of labor, but also that, as is the first case, they define class in terms of the concrete content or form (service) but not social form of the labor performed by these wage-earners. In the second case, class is even indifferent to labor regardless of its form; it is rather defined by the form or source of revenue for subsistence.

All "social stratification" categories derived by bourgeois social scientists from the surface-structure of society, from the technical division of labor, and unilaterally from the sphere of distribution have indeed nothing to do with social classes as real social forces in the real world. Therefore, we cannot take seriously either, their controversy regarding the class-location of service employees.

39. Harry Braverman, Labor and Monopoly Capital, Monthly Review Press, New York, 1974, p. 412.
40. Ibid., p. 410.
41. Ibid., pp. 348, 355.
42. Nicos Poulantzas, Classes in Contemporary Capitalism, NLB, London, 1975, pp.
43. Poulantzas is referring to Marx in Capital, Vol. III, p. 294.
44. Karl Marx, "Results of the Immediate Production Process," in Capital, Vol. I, Penguin, 1975, Appendix.