

(as is the trend in the technical division of labor) are likely to be joining Jews in the social division of labor when those Jewish self-employed farmers become industrial wage-workers.

This analytical transformation from locations in the technical into locations in the social division of labor leads us directly into the essential distinction between concrete forms of labor performed and the social forms of that same labor. It is in this sense that employment data, as presented in bourgeois statistical abstracts, can at best provide clues, but not answers, regarding the class location which, in turn, depends on the particular position within the social division of labor and political-ideological relations.

The most serious limitation we therefore face lies in the fact that employment information refers merely to the concrete forms of labor performed, that is, the different tasks assigned to the members of the labor force as they are employed in a particular occupational capacity within a particular economic branch or industry. These tasks are designed and allocated on the basis of fixed or changing technical coefficients, assumed by conventional social theory to generate efficient growth patterns, and in the case of deviation, to result in some form of "malfunctioning" of the system. It is in this sense that we refer to the resulting employment structure as the technical division of labor or the design of the labor process by capital, matching people to jobs, guided by the profit imperative.

Bourgeois employment categories and information do not thus directly reflect the social form of labor performed. That is to say, they do not refer to the social context of work, the relations involved in a particu-