

division of labor, how he distinguishes it from the production process, and whether he equates it with the social formation, the site of class struggle and formation.

Can it possibly mean that relations to the ideological-political apparatus, outside the production process, may in some cases predominate? More concretely, is it likely that productive, manual, non-supervisory employees may belong to different social classes because one segment is ideologically and/or politically dominant and the other segment is subordinate by virtue of their differential relations to the State apparatus? This question remains also unanswered by Poulantzas. It brings to mind the notion of "contradictory class location" developed by Erik Olin Wright; and denoting that social agents can belong simultaneously to different class location. We reject this notion on the basis that it negates the concept of social classes as social forces with distinct interests that are objectively determined by the location and which fixes the horizon of the class' struggle. Classes can take contradictory class positions but contradictory class locations undermine the concept of class and class struggle.

To answer the question posed above, it is our position that the structural criteria (ideological-political relations to the State apparatus) do not affect the objective determination of class location -- the boundaries of social classes as such. It rather affects intra-class differentiation, meaning here the objective determination of class fractions. Furthermore, Poulantzas does not specify what kind of relation to the State apparatuses or degree of political-ideological domination/subordination defines the boundaries of different social classes, specifically the proletariat. Moreover, he does not specify the relation between the objective determina-