

Other Marxists like Nicos Poulantzas disagree with Braverman's interpretation of the Marxist definition of capitalist productive labor, and therefore disagree with his conclusion regarding the class location of service employees,⁴²

Poulantzas argues that service employees (along with other new wage-earning groupings that are organically linked to the emergence and reproduction of monopoly capitalism) are unproductive workers. They are so regardless of the fact that they have overwhelmingly become employees of capital and that they, too, sell their labor-power for wages that roughly correspond to the cost of reproduction of their labor-power and even provide a portion of their labor without payment. Despite the above, they have not become productive labor because services belong to circulation capital, not to productive capital. Even when the service performed has both use and exchange value, i.e., represents a commodity, the service wage-workers, whether performing in mental or manual labor categories, are yet unproductive laborers, since they are not engaged in the creation of surplus value. They are rather engaged in redistribution within the sphere of capital, that is in the transfer of surplus value that is produced by productive capital in favor of the capital that appropriates their labor-power. Their exploitation is therefore similar to that of wage-earners in the sphere of capital circulation. Poulantzas recalls from Marx himself that products can assume the "price form" and the "commodity form" without thereby possessing value. Due to the generalization of the commodity form under capitalism, labor can take the commodity form without producing surplus value for capital. Although all capitalist productive labor takes the commodity form, not all commodities represent productive labor.⁴³