

THE BUOYANT BOURGEOISIE OF CHILE

Paul W. Drake

University of California, San Diego

- CHILE IN THE NITRATE ERA: THE EVOLUTION OF ECONOMIC DEPENDENCE, 1880–1930.* By MICHAEL MONTEON. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982. Pp. 256. \$30.00.)
- PARTY COMPETITION IN ARGENTINA AND CHILE: POLITICAL RECRUITMENT AND PUBLIC POLICY, 1890–1930.* By KAREN L. REMMER. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984. Pp. 296. \$19.95.)
- A FUNCTIONAL PAST: THE USES OF HISTORY IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY CHILE.* By ALLEN WOLL. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982. Pp. 211. \$25.00.)
- LANDOWNERS AND REFORM IN CHILE: THE SOCIEDAD NACIONAL DE AGRICULTURA, 1919–1940.* By THOMAS C. WRIGHT. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982. Pp. 249. \$21.00.)
- BARROS ARANA'S HISTORIA JENERAL DE CHILE: POLITICS, HISTORY, AND NATIONAL IDENTITY.* By GERTRUDE MATYOKA YEAGER. (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1981. Pp. 187. \$12.00.)
- THE CIVIL WARS IN CHILE (OR THE BOURGEOIS REVOLUTIONS THAT NEVER WERE).* By MAURICE ZEITLIN. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984. Pp. 265. \$25.00.)

We have here a welcome wave of studies on Chilean elites, perhaps because those groups have proven so durable. These books complement additional recent investigations of the nitrate industry by Thomas O'Brien, of the Roman Catholic Church by Brian Smith, of business organizations by Guillermo Campero and Manuel Montt Balmaceda, and of the military by Augusto Varas and his colleagues.¹ This focus on the upper strata seems to run against the tide of professional concern with popular masses and culture, but the workers are also receiving extensive attention from Peter DeShazo, Charles Bergquist, Peter Winn, and Guillermo Campero.² The six monographs assessed in this essay cover broad time periods and fill huge gaps on the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when the foundations were laid for more contemporary events. To varying degrees, the six books all shed light on the anomalous evolution of a dependent, underdevel-

oped economy alongside a stable, liberal political system, two patterns that finally came into irreconcilable conflict in the 1970s.

All these authors also touch upon frustrated attempts to invent a different Chile, whether one that is more democratic politically, one more independent economically, or one more egalitarian socially. Those lengthy struggles for political, economic, and social “development,” despite significant achievements, repeatedly foundered on the shoals of conservative opposition. Paradoxically, Chile’s highly “Westernized” political system persevered in juxtaposition with typically “Third World” economic structures precisely as long as it did not open the way to assaults on traditional powers and privileges.

The constitutional order proved remarkably durable as long as the upper class remained committed to it as a repository of their values and a bulwark of their essential interests. The six writers document well the recurrent triumphs of these resilient and tenacious elites. Allen Woll and Gertrude Matyoka Yeager demonstrate the elites’ success in defining and enshrining their vision of the national past as a prescription for the future. Maurice Zeitlin and Michael Monteón unravel the elites’ debates and decisions on how to maximize their gains as participants in national and international capitalism. Thomas Wright traces their ability as an interest group to pressure the government, while Karen Remmer examines their talents and tactics as actors within the parliamentary arena.

Except for the two historians of ideas, these analysts try not only to unveil the mysteries of the past but also to construct parallels to the present. By digging into the roots of long-lasting political structures, practices, and ideas, these scholars speak to gripping debates in Chile today about that nation’s heritage and possibilities. Some of those crucial questions include the role of the urban and rural “bourgeoisie” in a fragile export economy on the periphery of the world market, in the potential revival of a political system founded on democratic participation, and in the continuing struggle over the past identity and future essence of the nation.

Intellectual Elites

Both Allen Woll and Gertrude Matyoka Yeager describe the key historical writers, publications, and issues of the nineteenth century, when Chilean elites first thrashed out the meaning of their past and the promise of their independent future. Woll provides a broader, more penetrating treatment, although neither author approaches the sophistication of a Charles Hale. Nevertheless, because intellectual history, historiography, and biography are usually neglected by Latin Americanists, these two contributions begin to fill a void.

In *A Functional Past: The Uses of History in Nineteenth-Century Chile*, Woll traces the debate over history as scientific, objective scholarship or as passionate, political partisanship. That discussion took place among writers who sought to be detached but who got swept up in a young nation's political conflicts and commitments. In the "land of historians," (p. 1), they abandoned the ivory tower for government posts, although Woll exaggerates their significance when he claims that "Chile's greatest historians also emerged as their nation's foremost political figures" (p. 192). Initially, Andrés Bello carried the day with his argument that scholars had to eschew political entanglements. From the 1850s on, however, historians increasingly oriented their craft toward party or national objectives. Woll stakes a claim to revisionism by showing that despite their protestations of untainted neutrality, these men of letters colored their topics and interpretations to serve political aims. That Chilean historians dipped their pens in conservative or, more commonly, liberal inkwells is scarcely news, but Woll clearly delineates those biases and the familiar intellectual dilemmas they entailed.

After detailing the dispute during the 1840s between Bello and José Victorino Lastarria over the purposes and methods of history, Woll follows writers and their works as they grappled with the Black Legend of the Spanish empire, battles over democratic rights under postindependence governments, the secular role of the Roman Catholic Church, and boundary conflicts with neighboring countries. He also discusses noteworthy foreign influences, such as positivism. Equally interesting is his account of the evolution of the teaching of history in the national educational system. Throughout all these controversies, Woll concentrates on the giants in the field—Miguel Luis Amunátegui, Diego Barros Arana, and Benjamín Vicuña Mackenna—while skimming over lesser figures such as Valentín Letelier.

What Woll discovers, not surprisingly, is that these historians labored not only to recapture bygone years but also to enlighten and promote a Europeanized version of liberal elite interests and values. Without questioning the social and economic underpinnings of the republic, they extolled and advanced its constitutional order. According to Woll, Chilean historical writings from the 1840s to the 1880s served four main ulterior purposes: to attack domestic and foreign adversaries, to defend prestigious families and individuals, to instill civic virtues in the young, and to illuminate moral laws that should govern the construction of the nation. Although sometimes discursive and seldom exciting, *A Functional Past* builds a convincing case on a sturdy bibliographic foundation.

Less ambitious is Gertrude Yeager's *Barros Arana's Historia Jeneral de Chile: Politics, History, and National Identity*, which chronicles nineteenth-century politics, the career of Diego Barros Arana, and the

content of his voluminous writings. Like Woll, she discovers that contemporary events and political sympathies skewed the interpretations of this (and every other) historian. Confronting the dichotomy cited by Woll between “scientific” and “interpretative” historians, Barros Arana reconciled the two positions by arguing that objectivity and analysis were not incompatible. Borrowing most of his ideas from European liberals and positivists, he also synthesized liberal premises and conservative practices. Thus he forged a consensual view of national history that gave the Chilean upper class (but not the general populace, as Yeager asserts) a coherent compendium of facts, myths, and lore upon which to build unity and identity. That essence, according to Barros Arana, was a constitutional republic guided by learned and benign aristocrats.

Yeager provides a useful description of the great man’s activities as a journalist, educator, diplomat, politician, and scholar. She also synthesizes the content of his seminal writings, especially the sixteen-volume *Historia Jeneral de Chile*. Perhaps because Yeager finds nothing exceptionally profound or original to say about the man, his times, or his ideas, she (like Woll) overstates the significance of her topic: “Chile is perhaps unique in the inordinate role it has assigned history and historians. Chilean historical scholars have, with uncommon frequency, directed the course of national development, and Chilean political figures have often consulted the past in order to chart the appropriate policy” (p. 53). What Chilean historians actually did, as Yeager makes clear, was to legitimize upper-class rule through liberal institutions that guaranteed freedom for the elites and order for the masses.

Economic Elites

While the books discussed thus far try to explain elite consensus about hammering together a nation, *The Civil Wars in Chile (or the Bourgeois Revolutions That Never Were)* seeks to uncover the causes of upper-class discord. In contrast to the cautious, but competent, treatises of Woll and Yeager, sociologist Maurice Zeitlin’s book bursts into the historical domain bristling with scintillating conceptualizations and interpretations. Unfortunately, however, he did not test his provocative insights with archival research. His study relies instead on secondary sources, although it omits even some key writings in this category, such as works by Diego Barros Arana, Simon Collier, Jaime Eyzaguirre, and Brian Loveman. The result is an engaging, but unproven, chain of hypotheses about the development of the liberal state as an outcome of struggles among factions of the bourgeoisie.

In the abstract, Zeitlin’s model is quite attractive. He argues that dependency and world-system theories are too deterministic regarding

the role of peripheral countries in the global division of labor. Rather than being predestined by inexorable external forces, Chile's role in international capitalism was shaped at decisive junctures by domestic intraclass conflicts over governmental economic policies. Historians will applaud Zeitlin's call for in-depth dissection of the evolution of local means of production, class relations, and political results as factors conditioning each country's place on the world stage. This focus inspires him to speculate about counterfactual conclusions to those political battles that might have produced more autonomous and dynamic processes of national development.

Specifically, Zeitlin suggests that the civil wars of 1851–59 and 1891 constituted aborted attempts by nationalist capitalists to steer a more independent course. By implication, they (like Salvador Allende) were thwarted by reactionary domestic and foreign elites. Consequently, Chile remained until the 1970s a peculiar "bourgeois democracy" that was heavily reliant on latifundia and foreign capital.

Zeitlin claims that in the first upheaval in the middle of the nineteenth century, mining capitalists rallied peasants and artisans against the landed aristocracy. These rebels demanded more democratic distribution of property and political power. As Woll and Yeager establish, the liberal historians Lastarria, Amunátegui, Vicuña Mackenna, and Barros Arana all sided with these protests against authoritarian government measures. But the liberalism of these intellectuals proved far more limited than Zeitlin's thesis implies because they only opposed despotism, not the socioeconomic status quo. Indeed, the popularity of their writings connoted a great deal of consensus within the upper class, except on the issue of the church, rather than the deep cleavages posited by Zeitlin. His major evidence consists of a prosopographical profile on the insurgents, but his sample is small and suggestive rather than conclusive. Moreover, no control group of the opponents of the rebellion exists to establish that partisan positions cut mainly along occupational, rather than regional or clientelistic, lines. Zeitlin has spotlighted a tantalizing possibility in *The Civil Wars in Chile*, one that will have to be pursued more assiduously before this revisionist thesis will be widely accepted.

Zeitlin perceives in the second cataclysm under José Manuel Balmaceda a nationalist capitalist revolution from above subverted by the proprietors of the great estates, other entrenched privileged sectors, and the captains of foreign enterprises. Even Chilean nitrate mineowners, bankers, and liberal historians (for example, Barros Arana) denounced the threat of tyrannical state intervention. They defeated other segments of the bourgeoisie who were wedded to copper, silver, and coal-mining interests seeking government protection. By overthrowing Balmaceda, the insurgents preserved both their brand of economic un-

derdevelopment and parliamentary democracy. Although Zeitlin furnishes more detailed prosopographical data for this second case, most readers will conclude that more original research is needed to prove that the essence of these conflagrations was the suppression of nationalist capitalists.

Even if Zeitlin's stimulating historical imagination were matched by equivalent archival investigation, doubts would remain about his theoretical construct. He proposes a fruitful line of inquiry by analyzing economic disputes between fractions of the ruling class as one source of political friction. He contends that those struggles largely determined the character and policies of the state, which in turn molded the pattern of the nation's development and its place in the international market. Obviously, this formulation is preferable to any simplistic assumption that Chile was mere putty in the hands of the "world system." But Zeitlin strains credulity when he asserts that those intra-elite economic disagreements in the nineteenth century constituted the fundamental causes of political strife and that alternate resolutions of those feuds might have drastically transformed the trajectory of national development or underdevelopment. Although the world economy did not orchestrate every twist and turn in Chile, it undoubtedly imposed formidable constraints upon local decision makers and their options. If domestic intraclass conflicts particularly accounted for the failure of nationalist capitalism in Chile, why did scores of different clashes within the dominant sectors throughout Latin America all have the same outcome of perpetuating latifundia and dependency?

In *Chile in the Nitrate Era: The Evolution of Economic Dependence, 1880–1930*, Michael Monteón describes the Chile resulting from upper-class acceptance of a peripheral position in the global economy as an exporter of raw materials dominated by foreign companies. Like Zeitlin, he spotlights decisions by national elites that allowed the foreign sector and foreigners to warp national development, in this case through control over nitrates. Monteón also explores the impact of that export enterprise on domestic economic structures, political alliances, and labor movements. His central thesis is that elite desires for a powerful central government necessitated reliance on returns from foreign trade. Sketching the evolution of this system, his narrative of fifty years of Chilean history supplies interesting information on the scramble for government nitrate revenues, on monetary inflation as a spur to working-class discontent, and on the failure of labor and the left to pressure the aristocracy into adopting a more autonomous and egalitarian model of development.

Although a few studies have been made of the dependence of individual Latin American countries on Great Britain or the United States, Monteón has written one of the only books describing the tran-

sition from dependency on one central power to the other. His emphasis on decision-making by local elites is also useful, but it raises the same question as the Zeitlin book: if national leaders really could have embarked on dramatically divergent paths of development, why did all of Latin America fall into virtually the same trap? If such malevolent subservience to external forces could have been avoided, rather than just mitigated, during the era, Monteón should have elaborated on the theoretical and practical alternatives. Moreover, reiterating all the well-known drawbacks of “dependent development” does not explain why, within those severe limitations, Chile (at least, when compared with its neighbors) experienced rather high levels of economic growth, industrialization, constitutional stability, and even political reform.

Within that framework, Monteón’s coverage of political events emphasizes the downfall of Balmaceda and the vacuity of the subsequent República Parlamentaria. In describing that first controversial episode, he stakes out a middle ground, noting the machinations of British and Chilean capitalists without exaggerating their role or the innovative possibilities inherent in the challenge from Balmaceda. Monteón also takes a standard position on the 1891–1925 regime, stressing its elitism, conservatism, and corruption. His underscoring of the narrow substantive boundaries of that oligarchic political system complements Karen Remmer’s investigation of party competition within that constricted congressional theater.

While *Chile in the Nitrate Era* fills a lacuna on a crucial topic and time period, Monteón tries to cover too many issues. Deeper analysis of the origins and functions of the nitrate system would have been more germane than the interesting, but tangential, disquisitions on such institutions as the church and the national police. Monteón could have examined more intensively the behavior, motives, and capabilities of both the upper and working classes, instead of attributing their failure to impose alternative models of development to shortsightedness. The uneven bibliography also suggests that the central questions could have been pursued further. While a vast array of excellent primary and secondary sources are cited, no mention is made of essential works by such writers as Robert Burr, Alberto Cabero, Julio Heise González, Brian Loveman, Markos Mamalakis, James O. Morris, John Reese Stevenson, or Arturo Valenzuela. Although more depth and less breadth might have improved this monograph, the conclusion on continuities into the 1970s is well done. Monteón argues cogently that Allende’s attempt to break out of the longstanding mold of dependent development inspired his destruction by the foreign and domestic elites who had profited for so many decades from that inequitable system.

Whereas Monteón studies the persistence of the dependency that Zeitlin associates with underdevelopment, Thomas Wright investi-

gates the tenacity of that other culprit, the great estates, in *Landowners and Reform in Chile: The Sociedad Nacional de Agricultura*. Zeitlin focuses on the oligarchy's defense of its interests through civil wars, but Wright zeroes in on day-to-day maneuvers during peacetime. He establishes that during the first half of the twentieth century, the landowners and their rightist allies repeatedly granted tactical concessions to reformist pressures in order to safeguard their fundamental privileges. This flexible "insider" strategy deflected leftist threats and preserved constitutional stability. The interlocking bourgeoisie grudgingly sacrificed some minimal latifundista perquisites in the name of broader class interests until the limits of their tolerance were reached in the sixties and seventies.

The agrarian elites engaged in political jousting by expanding their Sociedad Nacional de Agricultura (SNA) from a technical interest organization in the nineteenth century into an effective pressure group in the twentieth. Interestingly, historian Benjamín Vicuña Mackenna served in the 1850s as president of the Sociedad Chilena de Agricultura, the predecessor of the SNA. After setting forth the organization and evolution of the "gremio," *Landowners and Reform in Chile* chronicles the SNA's responses to the challenges of controls on soaring food prices, demands for land reform, and calls for peasant unionization and welfare benefits. The result is one of the few thorough studies of an elite sectoral organization in Latin America.

Wright's pioneering institutional history reinforces the discovery by Brian Loveman that agrarian issues were much livelier in the early twentieth century than scholars previously presumed. After World War I, Chile underwent a dress rehearsal for the later rural struggles under the Christian Democrats and Unidad Popular. Until the 1950s, the aristocracy proved capable of containing those conflicts because it alternately posed as the "buen patrón" and employed repression, and also because the left preferred urban mobilization to rural mobilization. At the same time, the SNA infiltrated relevant government agencies, thus exemplifying a classic case of creeping corporatism. As a result, timid reform efforts under Presidents Arturo Alessandri, Carlos Ibáñez, and Pedro Aguirre Cerda produced minuscule changes in the countryside. Like Zeitlin and Monteón, Wright speculates about how later pent-up crises of underdevelopment might have been averted if earlier attempts to redress socioeconomic injustices had been more successful.

Landowners and Reform in Chile is a crisply written, convincing monograph that rests on a firm foundation of key primary and secondary sources. Wright uses these materials not only to probe the SNA and its role in national politics but also to cut into related questions, such as the causes of the landowners' negative public image, particularly as perpetrators of price inflation. Like Zeitlin and Remmer, Wright also

establishes the socioeconomic makeup of his elites, although he never stretches the evidence to sell a hypothesis. The only flaw seems to be Wright's claim that SNA membership expanded in reaction to the menace from the Frei and Allende governments, while his own data exhibit a sharp decline during the years between 1968 and 1971 (p. 58). Nevertheless, the epilogue covering the period from the Frente Popular to the ascendancy of Augusto Pinochet provides an excellent introduction to the landed elites' gradual abandonment of democratic bargaining as a way to cope with escalating mass demands for the redistribution of property and authority.

Political Elites

Overlapping the time periods covered by Monteón and Wright, Karen Remmer's *Party Competition in Argentina and Chile: Political Recruitment and Public Policy, 1890–1930* delves into the internal workings of the República Parlamentaria, the recruitment and behavior of congressmen, and their impact on public policies. Like Zeitlin, she utilizes collective biographies to delineate elite political divisions prior to the upsurge of mass politics. Although both researchers are applying the methods of political sociology to distant historical epochs, Zeitlin stands out for the audacity of his interpretations while Remmer excels in the solidity of her data. Her prudent judgments and interpretations grow out of arduous research among a wide range of sources. In contrast with sociologist Zeitlin, this political scientist espouses the more standard view that partisan alignments were based mainly on clientelistic loyalties rather than on economic cleavages. Remmer adheres to the traditional interpretations of the upheavals of the 1850s and 1890s as primarily "political," not "economic," showdowns. Both writers agree, however, that the seemingly contradictory willingness of the ruling class to embrace sophisticated constitutional republicanism alongside retrograde social and economic structures resulted from their ability to manipulate the open political system in order to keep the door closed to significant changes on behalf of the disadvantaged majority. Although recognizing the limited scope of the República Parlamentaria, Remmer joins Chilean scholars like Julio Heise González in rediscovering the virtues of that oft-scorned system as at least a training school for pluralistic party competition, one that laid the groundwork for later entry by more representative organizations.

Remmer also erects a tight framework for comparative analysis of the Argentine and Chilean experiences prior to political mobilization of the popular sectors. After providing two chapters that rehash the background in both countries, she contrasts the ways in which those two competitive regimes accorded access to different political actors and

therefore generated divergent economic, social, and civil programs. Despite their excluding most immigrants in that era, Argentine parties enrolled a broader social spectrum than did their counterparts in Chile, where an enclave export economy left the political domination of rural barons intact. Argentine politicians therefore had to take more middle- and lower-class aspirations into account. The temptation to rally mass support was also encouraged by polarization between “ins” and “outs,” contrasted with the shifting multiparty alliances available to Chilean “*políticos*.” Remmer’s depiction and analysis of these two republican systems of government constitute a major contribution to the political history of both countries. Her attempt to demonstrate the distinctive social origins of the two political classes and the consequent contrasting policies that they endorsed turns up rather minor differences, however.

In both countries, Remmer finds that political competitors were divided mainly by clientelistic, rather than socioeconomic, criteria. Her valuable background data on legislators show that party competition failed to elevate many non-elites to the Chilean congress, but her thinner evidence for Argentina does not unearth a much more egalitarian trend there. Although her equally welcome statistics on government expenditures and laws indicate slightly more expansive and progressive policies in Argentina, the contrasts with Chilean legislative and budgetary actions are neither dramatic nor necessarily directly attributable to the composition of the congress. Rather than extensively investigating the motives and moves of new congressional arrivals, Remmer mainly correlates the rise of party competition with the appearance of fresh policies, an indirect connection. Although somewhat more elitist congressional representation in Chile resulted in somewhat more conservative policy-making, programmatic similarities overshadowed stark differences between the two countries, as Remmer admits.

Indeed, *Party Competition in Argentina and Chile* successfully demonstrates the incorrectness of the theoretical proposition that political systems that facilitate party competition will necessarily generate more egalitarian representation (inputs) and policies (outputs). Remmer argues that outcomes will depend on the breadth and character of popular participation in that contestation. Her Chilean material certainly proves that party competition is not a sufficient condition for social progress, but her contention that the more participatory Argentine system unleashed strikingly more advanced initiatives is not as compelling. Although noteworthy differences existed, this insightful monograph really suggests for both countries that freewheeling give-and-take among parties was unlikely to foster significant reforms for the underprivileged so long as the upper class dominated the political system, not to mention the means of production.

Before the later periods of mass politics, negotiations among

wealthy interest groups and the state normally determined governmental policies, almost regardless of the vicissitudes of parties. Thus for Chile, and to a lesser extent for Argentina, Remmer mainly confirms the venerable picture of political systems of, by, and for the oligarchy. In both cases, she argues persuasively that broadening political competition and recruitment eventually spawned social reforms that turned the elites against democratic participation. This careful and nuanced study does not draw any crude parallels to the present. Nevertheless, Remmer clearly has the 1980s as well as the 1920s in mind when she concludes that "If a single lesson is to be drawn from the complex evidence concerning the introduction of competitive party politics in the two countries, it is that the consolidation of liberal democratic institutions depends not upon their effectiveness in equalizing the distribution of political power, but upon their acceptability to the propertied and powerful" (p. 222).

Thus all six of the authors discussed here address, however indirectly, the current intellectual and political anxieties in Chile about redemocratization. Outside government circles, at least, both scholars and public figures are debating how a representative system can be reconstituted that will both thrive in and help transform an underdeveloped, dependent socioeconomic order. Some opponents of the current dictatorship wonder if sufficient guarantees of economic security will have to be extended to the upper class in order to reawaken the right's liberal avocation. Analysts ponder whether military rule can be ended without assuring the elites of other protections for their interests, barring a social revolution to eliminate the bourgeoisie. But given all the changes from the 1920s to the 1980s, can the older coexistence of a relatively open polity in a relatively closed society be restored? What used to be a paradox has become a dilemma: if Chile reinstates an unusually egalitarian political system in the context of an extremely inegalitarian society, how long will both the rich and the poor accept the limits on their shares? Whatever the future holds, these books indicate (as does the intransigence of the authoritarian regime) that the survivability of the Chilean elites should never be underestimated.

NOTES

1. See Thomas F. O'Brien, *The Nitrate Industry and Chile's Crucial Transition: 1870-1891* (New York: New York University Press, 1982); Brian H. Smith, *The Church and Politics in Chile: Challenges to Modern Catholicism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982); Guillermo Campero, *Los gremios empresariales en el período 1970-1983: comportamiento sociopolítico y orientaciones ideológicas* (Santiago: Instituto Latinoamericano de Estudios Transnacionales, 1984); Manuel Montt Balmaceda, *Organizaciones de empleadores en Chile: reseña histórica* (Santiago: Universidad de Chile, 1983); Augusto Varas, Felipe Agüero, and Fernando Bustamante, *Chile, democracia, fuerzas armadas* (Santiago: Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, 1980); Hugo Frühling, Carlos

- Portales, and Augusto Varas, *Estado y fuerzas armadas* (Santiago: Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, 1982); and Augusto Varas and Felipe Agüero, *El proyecto político militar* (Santiago: Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, 1984).
2. See Peter DeShazo, *Urban Workers and Labor Unions in Chile, 1902–1927* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983); Charles Bergquist, *Workers in the Making of Modern Latin American History: Capitalist Development and Labor Movement Formation in Chile, Argentina, Venezuela, and Colombia* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, forthcoming); Peter Winn, *Yarur: The Chilean Revolution from Below* (New York: Oxford University Press, forthcoming); and Guillermo Campero and José A. Valenzuela, *El movimiento sindical chileno en el capitalismo autoritario (1973–1981)* (Santiago: Instituto Latinoamericano de Estudios Transnacionales, 1981).