

nology production are predominantly mental.

(a) "Marx never reduced mental labor to non-material production," says Poulantzas.⁵¹ Marx's main discussions of the capitalist division of mental and manual labor are situated in the context of the capitalist socialization of labor, of machinery and large-scale industry:

"...as the co-operative character of the labor process becomes more and more marked, so, as a necessary consequence, does our notion of productive labor, and of its agent, the productive laborer, become extended. In order to labor productively, it is no longer necessary for you to do manual work yourself; enough if you are an organ of the collective laborer and perform one of its subordinate functions..." 52

The sophisticated technicians and engineers (unlike the foremen, for example) do tend to form part of capitalist productive labor because they directly valorize capital in the production of surplus-value. The labor of the technician and engineer in industry represents the appropriation of scientific discoveries by capital in the process of material production.⁵³ The latter is nothing but innovation, and innovation is the very appropriation of invention by capital in furthering the development of its productive forces. The appropriation of science (and more specifically, its applications, i.e., the technique or the know-how) by capital in the development of the forces of production is the most distinctive feature of military production; specifically, its high technology forms. In this sense, armament is therefore a very productive industry and, concluding the first issue, is to affirm that mental labor can be productive labor, specifically in the cases of possessing the technique.

(b) The extent to which labor categories performed in high technology production are predominantly mental can be simply answered by a