

class. The latter formulation assumes that although all those who belong to proletariat class-locations do necessarily perform productive labor, not all productive laborers belong to proletariat class-locations. In this sense, our question is essentially two-fold, combining both the productive/unproductive division and the manual/mental division of labor. The latter thus goes beyond the economic criteria for class determination and enters the domain of structural determination of class-location, where the criteria are politico-ideological relations of subordination/dominance in and beyond the social division of labor. This domain was cogently developed for the first time by Nicos Poulantzas, whose novel contribution lies precisely in seeing the three criteria (economic, political, and ideological) to inseparably determine the boundaries of social classes.

According to Paul Sweezy and Paul Baran, arms have no use-value. Therefore, armament is unproductive and employees in the arms industries are necessarily unproductive laborers. This is to say that military (including high technology) production involves no productive labor. This is, indeed, missing the whole point regarding what is productive labor for the capitalist mode of production, which is essentially indifferent to the utility of the product. Because utility of commodity is irrelevant to the creation of surplus value.<sup>50</sup>

Examining the first dimension of the question we have posed above requires a far more rigorous understanding of Marxism than the one provided above by Sweezy and Baran. To do so, however, is to break this dimension into two further questions:

- (a) the extent to which mental labor can be productive labor;
- (b) the extent to which labor categories performed in high tech-