

and what is productive and non-productive service, Harry Braverman argues:

"...to hire the neighbor's boy to cut the lawn is to set in motion unproductive labor; to call a gardening firm which sends out a boy to do the job (perhaps even the same boy) is another thing entirely....The change in the social form of labor from that which is, from the capitalist standpoint, unproductive to that which is productive means the transformation from...simple commodity production to capitalist commodity production from relations between persons to relations between things." 39

Braverman maintains that

"...labor which is put to work in production of goods is not thereby sharply divided from labor applied to the production of services, since both are forms of production of commodities and of production on a capitalist bases, the object of which is the production not only of value-in-exchange, but of surplus value for the capitalist. The various forms of labor which produce commodities for the capitalist are all to be counted as productive labor." 40

As far as the class-location of clerical labor is concerned, he concludes:

"...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."

Braverman, thus, views clerical work as a capitalist labor process, and clerical workers as proletariat in new form.<sup>41</sup>

If we accept this argument as well as the notion of contradictory class-locations developed by Erik Olin Wright, as discussed in an earlier chapter, then we can reach the conclusion that the recently increasing labor mobility from industry and agricultural wage work into the service sector does not necessarily indicate a deproletarianization process. If so, the joint penetration of Arab and Jewish labor into services may in some ways (by sharing proletariat or contradictory class-locations) still promote the prospects for cross-national proletariat alliances.