This tremendous growth in the workforce is in a sociological sense a growth of the working class, who while they may be scattered, as yet poorly organized, and virtually driven underground—as are the undocumented workers, in agriculture as well as in industry generally—are nevertheless a social factor of tremendous objective significance in the light of a developing class struggle.

This is obscured by a lot of glib and ignorant talk about the growth of the middle class, which, by the way, keeps forever sinking into the working class. Little is said about the growth of the working class—as though the millions who have been forced from rural areas into small factory towns and to big cities and the new millions in the service industries are not workers and have supposedly become middle class.

But no matter how capitalist propaganda distorts all this, the U.S. Department of Labor cannot but say that of the hundred million who are considered in the workforce today, counting millionaires, supervisors, bosses, bankers, you name it, there are 80 million solid members of the working class community. They are oppressed and exploited. They are robbed by inflation, cheated by their government, and persecuted by it when they fight back with vigor and determination but without mass organization.

It is true that the industrial working class has declined relative to the rest of the working class. But that does not negate the fact that all are exploited and oppressed. For no matter how capitalist industry and agriculture progress they can only garner profits from the sweat and blood of those who work.

The relations between capitalist industry and agriculture so far as the working class is concerned become narrower. The wide gulf that separates industrial and other workers narrows. And the common bond of exploitation remains.

Just as the barons of auto, steel, and other industry have eroded their industrial base because of their insatiable drive for profits, so has agribusiness been destroying in an even more dramatic manner the very basis of life and agriculture.

It is estimated that between six to eight million acres of agricultural land is being annually lost, eroded, destroyed. How? By the avarice of huge conglomerates, of so-called land developers who ravage the land, spur erosion, and employ reckless agricultural practices which can only lead to the irretrievable loss of land.

Nonetheless, just as capitalism on a world scale brings havoc, chaos, and destruction, it also erects a foundation in the form of millions of agricultural and food workers who will be the grave diggers of the new forms of monopoly capitalism.

Enemy is agribusiness

Food, said the Secretary of Agriculture, should be used by the U.S. as a weapon against its enemies. In the eyes of the millions of new workers born out of what are virtually new industries, their enemy is agribusiness and no amount of bellicose talk of diverting capitalist over-production in agriculture to serve the war purposes of the U.S. war machine can change that.

From the sunny fields of California where the migrant workers by the hundreds of thousands are organizing to the animal factories of Arkansas, New England, and the Midwest, to the groceries, the supermarkets, and the hundreds of thousands of small little satellites around these supermarkets, are a new, growing, and restless army to add to the strength of the working class as a whole. All their interests as well as their historic destiny show that they will be in the battle against capitalism and imperialist war.

The new resurgence in the anti-war movement should not overlook this. It should not merely look to the old and established trade union movement, which of course is vital and indispensable. But it should direct its attention as well to the new divisions of the great army of the working class in the struggle against the capitalist class for the socialist transformation of society and to free it from exploitation and oppression.

April 12, 1981

El Salvador:

Workers World Vol. 23 No. 16, April 17, 1981

On a negotiated settlement and the right of self-determination

What is behind all the recent hints in the capitalist press of a negotiated settlement in El Salvador?

Who is pushing it and **on behalf of whom?**

It is impossible to discuss this question as it relates to the U.S. and El Salvador unless it is viewed from the perspective of the relationship between an oppressing, imperialist power and an oppressed people. No correct appreciation can possibly be made of this relationship unless it is seen precisely from the viewpoint of the predatory and expansionist character of finance capital.

Involved here, of course, is the right of nations to self-determination. An oppressed people in the throes of a bloody conflict in which they are seeking their liberation has an inalienable right to self-determination and to define its relationship to the oppressing imperialist power.

It is not unusual for an oppressed country, especially in the contemporary international situation, to call for unconditional withdrawal of the imperialist power or to call a conference for the purpose of consummating a

withdrawal agreement. It is also possible, as history has shown in the struggles of oppressed people in Asia, Africa, as well as Latin America, that the oppressed country may attempt to negotiate an agreement or may call for the negotiation of an agreement with the objective not only of obtaining full sovereignty but of becoming completely independent on the basis of the ultimate withdrawal of the imperialist power.

Under any and all circumstances, it is the right of the oppressed country to set the conditions and the specific immediate objectives for which it is struggling. On innumerable occasions, the oppressing and the oppressed contenders have carried out protracted negotiations, some lasting years, before any settlement is arrived at. On other occasions, no settlement is reached until the oppressor is militarily overwhelmed and thrown out, as in Viet Nam, Cuba, and other countries.

During the course of these long, bitter, and bloody battles, international solidarity with the oppressed people by the anti-imperialist forces worldwide is most important and contributes significantly to the ultimate victory of the oppressed country.

Unconditional support to oppressed people

Revolutionary Marxism-Leninism has always recognized the obligation of the working class in the imperialist, oppressing country to support unconditionally the struggle of the oppressed peoples against imperialism.

"Unconditional support" means the complete independence of the anti-imperialist movement from the maneuvers of the imperialist, oppressing bourgeoisie. "Unconditional support" means that the anti-imperialist and working-class forces in the metropolitan imperialist country have the duty to support the oppressed people free from any and all conditions that the imperialist powers may, as is almost always the case, seek to foist upon the oppressed people.

Of course, there always may be tactical variations on presenting this general Leninist principle based on the development and consciousness of the anti-war movement. But the working class in the imperialist country has an internationalist obligation to the oppressed people to be completely free from defending any conditions which the imperialists seek to impose upon the workers' class brothers and sisters in the oppressed country.

For that reason, slogans such as those demanding unconditional withdrawal and U.S. out of Viet Nam, Nicaragua, Turkey, Iran, or any other oppressed country, including El Salvador of course, are absolutely correct. In addition to these general slogans, there are also slogans which are derivative from the principled position of unconditional withdrawal which are correct, such as No U.S. aid or advisers, Not one penny for war, etc.

On the other hand, the slogan of unconditional withdrawal **should in no way be intended as a condition put upon the embattled oppressed people** whose struggle depends upon the measure of their strength and the collective strength that they can garner nationally and worldwide in the struggle against imperialism.

For the working class in the imperialist countries to do otherwise is to infringe upon the right of self-determination. The oppressed and the oppressed alone have the right to determine whether to fight for full withdrawal under the circumstances, how and by what means to arrive at a political settlement, if that is desirable, and what conditions should be embraced in any agreement.

It is a gross violation of the right of oppressed people to self-determination for working-class and progressive organizations to take up the slogan or to push the idea of a negotiated settlement if it is the imperialist bourgeoisie that is initiating and pushing it and not the leaders of the embattled, oppressed people.

One would think that this would be elementary more than 80 years since Lenin first began to expand on Marx's ideas. Nevertheless this is not understood in some quarters in this country and is adding to the confusion in the ranks of the anti-war movement—precisely at the moment when the resistance to the struggle against U.S. intervention is taking on momentum.

How imperialists view negotiated settlement

Of late, there has been talk in the imperialist countries of a negotiated settlement. But those who raise this never bother to ask what the revolutionary masses of oppressed people in El Salvador are thinking or what their leaders are proposing.

So that even two months ago, the West European imperialist countries, led by the prominent Social Democrats, jumped the gun and came out for a negotiated political settlement.

Their view of a negotiated settlement is to arrive at some sort of a modus vivendi between the fascist murderous junta and the revolutionary opposition. What this amounts to is an imposition upon the oppressed people.

It is one thing when a beleaguered oppressed country after years of almost super-human struggle, such as was the case with Viet Nam, negotiated a settlement with the imperialists which it found for the time being as correct and appropriate for the Vietnamese people. Such was the case with the peace treaty signed in 1973.

Under such circumstances it was correct for the working class in the imperialist countries to support the agreement, not because the imperialist powers wanted it but because the oppressed people found it necessary and desirable for the moment. Propagating and promoting support for the agreement was part and parcel of the anti-imperialist struggle and consistent with international solidarity with the Vietnamese.

But what about the call for the negotiated settlement in El Salvador currently being pushed by the bourgeoisie?

It is not the Salvadoran people who have raised the demand. When and if they raise the question of a negotiated settlement between them and the U.S., it would be another matter.

Supporting **their** demand is support for the right of self-determination. Supporting the demands put forth by sections of the U.S. bourgeoisie and others for the kind of settlement imposed from the outside is an imperialist imposition and a violation of the right of the Salvadoran people to determine their own destiny.

U.S. seeking to soften opposition

It is especially important now to have clarity on this question. Only yesterday, April 11, 1981, the *New York Times* carried one of its fraudulent editorials on the Salvadoran situation.

"Bit by bit," it said, "the Reagan administration is retreating in its El Salvador policy. . . . The tune is changing. After more than 20 civilians were murdered . . . a State Department spokesman demanded an end of acts of violence 'by all parties.' And for the first time in this administration, a particular atrocity by right-wing death squads was noted and deplored."

And what is the conclusion of the