

ORAL HISTORY AND THE FACTORY STUDY: New Approaches to Labor History¹

Peter Winn
Columbia University

The study of Latin American labor history is at a crossroads. It is now an established field, with a growing body of scholars and research and opportunities for major advances. At the same time, it is in danger of isolating itself from promising intellectual and methodological currents and confining itself to institutional chronologies and ideological controversies. To avert this danger and take advantage of these opportunities, Latin American labor history must both become more fully the history of labor and transcend the limitations of that definition.

On the one hand, it must become more fully the history of work and workers, studying not just structural and statistical parameters, national organizations, and major strike movements, but also the concrete everyday experience of workers in the factory and community, their living standards and life styles, culture and consciousness, internal divisions and relations with other groups. On the other hand, labor history must transcend its parochialism, linking itself up with the mainstream of economic, social, and political history and drawing upon the methodological advances of other fields and disciplines. Labor historians should relate the historical experience of the worker to technological and other changes in the production process, to urbanization and migration patterns, to national politics and social politics, to the histories of imperialism and revolution. They should also look to such new techniques as quantitative and oral history and to the methodologies and paradigms being developed in such sister disciplines as anthropology. In this way, labor history can fulfill its original purpose of rescuing the historical experience of the majority of Latin Americans, while drawing upon the most promising insights and methodological advances in related fields to enrich and extend its own frontiers.

Most research in Latin American labor history to date has been institutional, statistical, or ideological analysis. This work has added to our knowledge and laid the foundations of the field. These approaches have their limitations, however, which may prove obstacles to further development if they are converted into methodological dogma. They are too general or too abstract to answer some of the most significant questions, views from above or structural analyses that have failed to capture the concrete historical experiences of work-

ers, both in themselves and in their relation to more general historical events and processes.

The history of labor in Chile is a good example of the accomplishments of existing scholarship, the limitations of previous approaches, and the promising possibilities offered by new ones. Some studies have sketched the outlines of the origins and development of labor organizations and militancy in Chile, but rested frequently tendentious interpretations upon a slender body of research.² Others have demarcated the pattern of wages and prices, strikes and voting behavior,³ or analyzed in a general way labor relations or the ties between labor and political parties.⁴ There have also been a few biographies of union leaders and recently some suggestive writings based upon survey data.⁵

These studies provide a framework for future research, but almost all are descriptions of a labor iceberg from the tip that appears above the national waterline. Leaders, institutions, ideologies, statistical averages, and structures are discussed. The workers—the presumed protagonists of labor history—only appear in these studies as institutional, theoretical, or statistical abstractions; the concrete and complex realities of their experience are conspicuous by their absence.

A more promising approach to these elusive questions is the factory study. In the micro-history of the case study, it should be possible to reconstruct the reality of workers' lives—inside and outside the work place—and to trace changes over time. Within this context, the historian can hope to illuminate many of the neglected areas of Latin American labor history—from the history of work and the quality of life to the divisions among workers and their manifestation in differences in consciousness and political behavior. The factory study should also enable the historian to explore the relationship between changes in different areas of a worker's life and to compare the experience of industrial workers with that of other groups in the society or that of workers in other societies. A case study can also illuminate more global historical processes—national politics, for example, or international economics. As William Allen demonstrated in his seminal study of the Nazi seizure of power in one German town,⁶ the exploration of the local experience of a broader historical experience can also shed light upon the larger process itself.

My research on a Chilean cotton mill during the Popular Front and Popular Unity periods suggests that this is equally true of a well-chosen factory study. The Yarur mill was a classic case of the import substitution industrialization and labor organization that characterized the Popular Front era. During the Allende years, it was the first factory to be seized by its workers and in the vanguard of a revolution from below that powerfully influenced the pace, direction, and outcome of the revolutionary process that shaped that period. The history of an epoch in which industrialists and workers played important roles can be fully articulated in the micro-history of a factory. Moreover, the way in which national events were perceived and experienced by workers and businessmen, as well as their reactions and responses to them, can advance our understanding of these events and the eras that they shaped. An imaginative and thoughtful

factory study can reveal the history of the nation as well as the lives of its workers.

What sources and techniques can be drawn upon for the factory study? As usual, the historian must make use of whatever is available: statistical materials (whether company books, wage-price data, census returns, or personnel records); ecological analyses (of residential and transportation patterns); correspondence and diaries (of managers and workers, government officials and labor leaders); minutes (of union meetings, boards of directors, or mediation panels); reports (of government inspectors, legislators, police, or journalists); legislative debates and judicial records; contemporary newspapers, journals, and pamphlets. However, while these written sources may contain valuable information, they are unlikely to be rich enough in themselves to suffice. Moreover, many of these archives and periodicals may be inaccessible to the historian or destroyed by accident or design.

The alternative is oral history, conceived of neither as folklore nor sacred text, but as an historical source like any other, whose information and arguments have to be evaluated in the same way an historian would evaluate a written source. (For a discussion of oral history methodology, see the appendix.) Within its limitations, it can be a particularly exciting and rich source of labor history, revealing aspects of the workers' historical experience never recorded in written documents and permitting historians the luxury of asking their sources the important questions.

Clearly, "oral" history implies "contemporary" history; it is not good advice to the student of the eighteenth century. Fortunately, the recent nature of most Latin American industrialization offers us an opportunity denied the historian of the comparable European historical epoch. For oral history is the story of the inarticulate while they are still able to speak, and workers can be as articulate about their historical experience as presidents—and less prone to alter that experience in the telling. Moreover, workers—all kinds of workers, not just union leaders or other labor elites—are the most direct source for the labor historian. Diplomatic history would not be written without consulting the correspondence and memoirs of the relevant diplomats and policymakers, but few Latin American labor histories are based upon the words of workers.

The promise of an approach to labor history that combines the factory study with oral history is strongly suggested by my research on the Yarur textile plant, from its founding as Chile's first modern cotton mill in 1937 to the coup of 1973. My study relied heavily upon oral history interviews, complemented by more traditional written and statistical sources. This approach yielded information and insights of considerable significance, which could not have been obtained using other research methods. A brief account of a few of my conclusions should suffice to illustrate this methodological point.

The intimate relationship between electoral politics in the nation and social politics in the factory is strongly suggested by my research. It was no mere coincidence that four of the five strike movements at Yarur followed presidential elections perceived by the workers as openings to the Left—Aguirre Cerda, Gonzalez Videla, Ibáñez del Campo, and Allende Goosens—while the outcome

of these labor struggles reflected the attitudes and actions of these governments and revealed their character. This relationship is perhaps clearest with Allende, whose election victory unleashed at Yarur a revolutionary process from below, which began with the conquest of an independent union and collective bargaining and culminated in the seizure of the factory, the establishment of worker self-management, and the organization of a regional workers council.

Within the industrial theater of Yarur, the social politics of successive Chilean governments emerge with clarity, while the impact of government upon the workers—their conditions, consciousness, organizations, and activity—is revealed in both the everyday implementation (and nonimplementation) of the Chilean labor code and in the resolution of major conflicts. One conclusion is that the Popular Front experience inculcated a legalistic mentality and reformist tradition among Chilean workers, but also generated a distrust of government and labor bureaucracy and a contrary tendency to direct social action. Another points to the changing forms and unchanging substance of co-optation and repression as mechanisms of social control and to the underlying antagonism between capital and labor beneath a seemingly harmonious surface.

Also significant was the impact on the workers of technology and other forms of economic modernization. In Chile, modern industrial process in manufacturing came late, primarily with the expansion of multinational companies (chiefly North American) after 1955. At Yarur, the most important change in the production process was the introduction of the Taylor system in 1959—on the advice of the accounting firm of Price, Waterhouse and under the influence and direction of Burlington Mills International. Time-and-motion studies doubled or tripled labor productivity and permitted the reduction of the blue-collar work force by one-third. The workers, however, experienced this increase in industrial efficiency as an infernal speed-up, which exhausted their strength and converted them into perpetual motion extensions of the machines they tended, while reducing their job security and subjecting them to an inhuman industrial discipline and an accompanying repression of their manifestations of discontent.

Significantly, despite the new production system's higher wages, its introduction evoked the longest and most violent strike in the factory's history. This experience of economic modernization as a trauma that stripped the mask of paternalism from capital and sharpened the consciousness of labor was common to many Chilean industries during the two decades preceding Allende's election and may help explain both that election and the militancy of textile and other workers during the events that followed.

Economic modernization, national politics, and the labor struggles they elicited were the most important accelerators of consciousness among Yarur workers before the revolutionary process of 1970–73 proved itself the most powerful transformer of consciousness. These events, however, were inscribed upon an implicit ground of consciousness, the composite product of social origin and subsequent socialization, the daily experience of hard work for low wages in an atmosphere of industrial discipline, social hierarchy and political repression, and the chronic problems of the Chilean working class household—inadequate nutrition, housing, transportation, medical care, and education.

These daily and extraordinary events, however, were neither perceived nor experienced in the same way by all the workers in the factory, nor did they evoke similar reactions or lead to a uniform class consciousness. One of the most suggestive results of my research was the illumination of divisions and differences in consciousness among the workers at Yarur.

The clearest division was between *obreros* and *empleados*, roughly corresponding to a distinction between blue- and white-collar workers, but with *empleado* status also granted to some skilled blue-collar workers. This legal separation had been written into the first Chilean labor code in 1924 and remained a serious barrier to working-class unity during the succeeding decades. Separately organized, enjoying somewhat higher wages and greater social benefits, the *empleados* tended to stress the differences between themselves and the *obreros*. Although both *obreros* and *empleados* were working class in the sense that they were wage earners, the differences in income, life-style, and perceived status were sufficient to permit most *empleados* an essentially middle-class identification, world view, and politics.

Even among the *obreros*, however, there were marked differences. Rural migration, economic modernization, and the passage of time had transformed the factory's labor force into a complex amalgam during the postwar decades. The blue-collar workers at Yarur could be divided into three groups along lines of age, social origin, and historical experience.

There was an old working class, urban by life experience but not by birth, with little education or social mobility and a wide variety of consciousness and politics, acquired through a lifetime of socialization and struggle. By 1970 there were also two new groups of blue-collar workers. One consisted of the children of the old working class, who had come to adulthood and the factory during the preceding decade. Younger, more urban, and better educated, they had grown up in the class communities and class culture of urban Chile and begun adult life with an implicit Marxist world view and less patience than their parents with the slow gains of a "generation of struggle." A third group were the recent rural migrants. Young and poorly educated, they had been brought up in the countryside, within a context of paternalism and populism, but were open to new forms of consciousness and politics, provided they were relevant to their concrete situations and immediate needs.

Most workers at Yarur identified themselves as working class, but that term masked a wide variety of consciousness. Although each worker embodied a unique mix of world view, attitudes, beliefs, and social politics, five "poles" or "types" of consciousness emerged from my interviews. At one extreme was the "*apatronado*," who recognized the inequality between social classes, but considered them just, the reflection of an unquestioned natural order. The boss (*patrón*) was seen as omnipotent and paternalistic, willing to respond with benevolence to the workers' deference and loyalty. The *apatronado* workers identified with their *patrón*—from whose wealth and power they derived self-esteem by association—and not with their class or coworkers. In politics, they were antiunion, anticommunist, and authoritarian rightists.

A second type was the "populist," with a crude sense of class conscious-

ness and solidarity, but without rigor or delineation. The existing inequality between rich and poor was perceived as unjust and requiring reform, but there was skepticism that the poor could bring about change through their own unity and actions. Hope lay in a leader from the elite, whose disinterested benevolence and charismatic power would lead his people to the promised land. Although they felt a loyalty to their coworkers, the patrón was seen as a powerful authority figure who had to be propitiated. The populist workers were in favor of a union, but did not expect much from it; they had no firm political affiliations, looking more to the leader than to a specific party or program.

A third type was essentially a "trade union" consciousness, although a Chilean might call it "communitarian," because of the Christian Democrat language in which it was expressed. More typical of white-collar employees, it also reflected the views of a significant number of blue-collar workers. While recognizing the existence of a class structure in society, the communitarian workers did not see these divisions as necessarily conflictual and were anti-Marxist in their ideology. Indeed, class conflict was perceived as both unnecessary and undesirable, outmoded by the mutual enlightenment of worker and management. There were inequalities and social injustices to be corrected, but this could be done through negotiation and piecemeal reform. There was a sense of class, but a strong belief that labor unions should be apolitical, confining themselves to collective bargaining and bread-and-butter issues.

A fourth consciousness was the "radical reformist." Its point of departure was a strong class consciousness and an explicitly Marxist world view. Society was understood in terms of class conflict, with class struggle the motor of history and socialism the goal. There was an acute sense of social injustice, which was ascribed to capitalism and identified with the patrón, but this was combined with a belief in the unique ability of Chilean institutions and democratic traditions to mediate the class struggle, peacefully channelling it to socialism. In social relations, the patrón was the enemy, to whom the workers should respond with class solidarity and a militant labor union. There was great faith in working-class institutions and in the wisdom of their leaders. Typically, the radical reformist workers combined revolutionary rhetoric with reformist positions and a rote Marxism-Leninism. They wanted socialism, but would have been satisfied with a radical social democracy.

A fifth type, the "revolutionary," espoused a conflict model of society and a militant class consciousness, but doubted the viability of a democratic and peaceful road to socialism and was more prepared to face the prospect of civil war. The revolutionary worker distrusted bureaucracy and institutions—even those of the Left—preferring participatory democracy and direct action based upon mass mobilization. Ideologically, they were Marxist-Leninists, influenced by the diverse ideas of Trotsky, Mao, and Guevara, with a residue of anarchist feeling.

Although a traditional notion of consciousness might view these five "types" as discrete stages in some inexorable progression to revolutionary class consciousness, the reality was far more equivocal and complex. Aspects of these different types of consciousness existed simultaneously within an individual

worker (or group of workers) and even coexisted in apparent harmony. Moreover, workers did not necessarily move through ever higher stages of consciousness; many remained at some point en route.

The most illuminating paradigm is perhaps that of a "spectrum of consciousness," in which the poles of consciousness are ideal types rarely (if ever) perfectly incarnated in reality. Most workers manifested a contradictory (but compatible) consciousness that combined elements of populism and radical reformism with a rhetorical admixture of the revolutionary. A significant number of workers, however, adhered to an apatronado or communitarian consciousness and were predisposed to react negatively to rapid or extensive structural change, particularly if it had a Marxist label or leadership.

The importance of consciousness is that it mediates between conditions and behavior. The spectrum of class consciousness that I encountered at the Yarur mill suggests the complexity of Allende's mass base and predicts that they would respond in differing ways to the challenges and changes of the Popular Unity era. The implications for our understanding of the politics of that period are clear. At the same time, the multiplicity of factors responsible for these divisions and differences of consciousness among Yarur workers casts into relief important questions for further research in Chile and elsewhere.

The formation (and transformation) of class consciousness, however, is only one of the issues of historical significance illuminated by oral history. My research points as well to the importance of studying the qualitative dimensions of mass migration, the social ecology of urbanization patterns, and the impact of popular culture. It also suggests the utility of a research methodology that combines oral history with the factory study in pursuing these questions.

Unfortunately, a mere mention of these themes must suffice. The history of the Yarur factory—like the history of Chile that it reflected and refracted—is too complex and rich to be summarized in so brief a research report.⁷ The ability of the oral history factory study to generate so suggestive a set of hypotheses and to point to so many subjects for further research, however, is one of my most promising conclusions.

Clearly, like all historical approaches, the factory study has its limitations. A case study can be suggestive, but not definitive. A judicious selection of the case to be studied, however, can increase its interpretive power. Moreover, we are at a point in the development of the labor history of Latin America where what is needed are suggestive studies—to provoke and orient further research and to provide the empirical basis for more general hypotheses. It is only the accumulation of such studies that will permit more definitive syntheses and comparative generalizations in the future. Moreover, if we can base these syntheses and comparisons upon such promising new approaches as the factory study, labor history will become the study of the concrete historical experience of the majority of Latin Americans.

There is yet another, more somber reason to urge Latin Americanists to give priority to studies of this kind. It would not be possible to undertake such a study in Chile today. Even a future restoration of democracy, moreover, is unlikely to restore the confidence in the immutability of their civil and human

rights that encouraged the workers of Yarur to speak so openly about their lives and opinions in the past. During the last decade, military coups in Argentina, Uruguay, and Bolivia have circumscribed the possibilities of carrying out this kind of research in three nations with interesting and important labor movements. I began this research report as a herald of opportunity, announcing a promising new approach to labor history, but I must close it as a Cassandra, urging scholars to undertake similar studies where they are still possible—and before it is too late.

APPENDIX: THE INCOMPLETE ORAL HISTORIAN

Although oral tradition is the most ancient form of history, modern oral history dates from the invention of the tape recorder. The W.P.A. projects of the depression years and Allan Nevins' postwar interviews were significant early milestones in the field. Among Latin Americanists, anthropologists have long used the technique, but it is only during recent years that oral history has become a legitimate research method for historians of Latin America.

For the most part, oral history research in Latin America has been national in focus. Important projects have been initiated in Mexico, Argentina, and Brazil, by both Latin and North American scholars, but they have concentrated upon the elites of those countries, even where labor history was concerned.⁸ Where my research differs is in its use of oral history as a central source for labor history—rather than as a source of anecdotal color and pithy quotes with which to complement more traditional written sources—and in making nonelites the major oral authors of my study. Also new is my effort to combine oral history with the factory study, creating a more intensive and systematic focus for my research and making possible multiple corroboration of accounts and interpretations.

As a method, oral history is deceptively simple: all that is needed is a tape recorder and an oral author.⁹ The quality of the interview, however, varies greatly, depending upon the skill of the historian and the knowledge and articulateness of the oral author. In part, the qualities of the good oral historian are those characteristic of any good historian: the ability to ask significant questions, assess and explicate sources, and integrate diverse accounts into a coherent and persuasive historical interpretation. In addition, however, the oral historian must have the ability to relate to live sources, win their trust, elicit their cooperation and evoke their memories; skills normally associated with the psychologist or the lawyer are useful as well. Oral historians vary greatly in their methods of interviewing. Some are nondirective, others highly interventive. The former approach limits the impact of the interviewer's bias, the latter allows the historian to press for answers to important questions. My advice to beginning oral historians is to select the approach most in accord with their own personalities and the characters of their subjects and to be flexible in adjusting it to differing circumstances.

What I found most effective was a combination of the passive and active approaches, particularly where multiple interviews were possible. During the first interview, I encouraged the oral authors to tell their stories as they re-

membered them, with minimal direction and prompting. In subsequent interviews, I was more interventive, posing questions not raised in the subject's initial account, encouraging the elaboration of themes that had been inadequately explored in the first interview and pressing the subject on statements that conflicted with other sources (sometimes even confronting the subject with these differences in account and interpretation). My experience underscores the importance of the oral historian's own skill in establishing a relationship of increasing confidence, intimacy and respect, selecting significant questions to ask, eliciting full and accurate answers, and deepening the dialogue as the interviews advance. While a course at an oral history office might be useful, it is not indispensable. Training seminars in oral history are given at several universities, but there is no universal methodology and an oral historian's best training is in history, with empathy and imagination the most valuable allies.

The creation of the taped interview, however, is only the first step. Although the oral historian will want to refer to the tape for nuance and tone, the tape itself must be transcribed before it can be used. Transcription is tedious and difficult, particularly where the language is spoken by the less-educated and is not one's own. Hiring a native speaker to do the transcriptions can save considerable time, but an hour interview may still require four to five hours to transcribe. The cost of oral history research, therefore, will vary with the number and length of tapes to be transcribed and local labor costs. Where transcriptions are made by hired assistants, they should be checked for accuracy against the original tapes by the researchers themselves.

Oral history is a laborious process and transcription itself is only a preliminary stage. Opinions on how to treat the transcript vary greatly. Oral history offices themselves differ on whether a transcript should be edited to eliminate repetitions and increase coherence. The oral historian, however, has little choice: the unedited transcript is authentic but unpublishable. Transforming the transcript into published history presents different problems and involves still other issues. Some scholars subscribe to what might be called the "sacred text" approach, in which the words of the oral author alone are presented, forming an autobiographical account "uncontaminated" by the social scientist (aside from judicious editing). Unedited oral history, however, is repetitive, discursive, and frequently boring and the same is true of most edited oral history "autobiographies." Unsung Homers like Nate Shaw¹⁰ are few and far between and the same is true for master "editors" like Oscar Lewis. Moreover, most sacred text oral histories share the limitations of autobiography and are restricted to subjects whose unusual eloquence can sustain the form. Including the historian's questions in the published text recreates the interview and creates the illusion of a dialogue, but does not transcend these limitations.

The alternative is what might be called the "primary source" approach. With the transcription of the interview, the oral historian has created a written primary source, which must then be researched, assessed, and integrated into an historical interpretation, as any other written source would be. In general, historians of Latin America have turned to oral history as a way to extend and supplement their archival research, even in labor history. As a result, this approach was the natural one for them to adopt and characterizes most of the

published use of oral history in the field. Although oral history has a more central place in my own research, the primary source approach is the one that I found most appropriate and useful.

Oral historians, however, should think these questions through for themselves, adapt these approaches to their sources, situations, and purposes, and not follow rigidly any particular model. Although one expert described oral history as more than a tool and less than a science, my experience is that it is more art than science and that the state of the art is still quite primitive, leaving ample room for both experimentation and development. Oral history remains a methodological frontier, as well as an unexplored extension of the historian's possibilities. In approaching oral history, dogmatism should be discouraged and pluralism practiced.

NOTES

1. Except where noted otherwise, this paper is based upon my research in the business, personnel, and union archives of the Yarur cotton textile factory in Santiago and, in particular, upon more than two hundred oral history interviews with its past and present blue- and white collar workers, supervisors and technical personnel, managers and owners, as well as other interviews with labor, political, and business leaders. It is also based upon my research in various Chilean government archives (Ministry of Labor, Corporación de Fomento, Superintendencia de Sociedades Anónimas, judicial and notarial) and in my reading of legislative debates and the contemporary press.
2. See, for example, the works of Moises Poblete Troncoso, of which his volume with Ben Burnett, *The Rise of the Latin American Labor Movement* (New Haven, 1960) is the most accessible, for a liberal anticommunist interpretation of this kind. Other surveys in this genre are Robert J. Alexander, *Organized Labor in Latin America* (New York, 1965) and Victor Alba, *Politics and the Labor Movement in Latin America* (Stanford, 1969). Interpretive surveys from a socialist perspective are offered by Jorge Barria Seron in several works, the most recent and comprehensive of which is his *El movimiento obrero en Chile* (Santiago, 1971). A communist view of the nineteenth century, Hernán Ramírez Necochea's *Historia del movimiento obrero en Chile* (Santiago, 1956) is useful as are Barria's *Los movimientos sociales de Chile desde 1910 hasta 1926* (Santiago, 1960), *Trayectoria y estructura del movimiento sindical chileno, 1946–1962* (Santiago, 1963), and *Historia de la CUT* (Santiago, 1971). Also interesting are the interpretive essays of Marcelo Segall, *Desarrollo del capitalismo en Chile* (Santiago, 1953) and Julio César Jobet, *Ensayo crítico del desarrollo económico-social de Chile* (Santiago, 1955). Mention should also be made of Enrique Reyes' work on the nitrate industry, intended as a first step toward a regional history of the Norte Grande, *El desarrollo de la conciencia proletaria en Chile: el ciclo salitrero* (Santiago, 1970). A convenient summary of the literature is provided in Alan Angell, *Politics and the Labour Movement in Chile* (London, 1972), while a critical evaluation of the state of knowledge in the field is given in Kenneth Erickson, Patrick Peppe, and Hobart A. Spalding, Jr., "Research on the Urban Working Class and Organized Labor in Argentina, Brazil and Chile: What is Left to Be Done?," *LARR* 9, no. 2 (Summer 1974):115–42.
3. For wages and prices, see Peter Gregory, *Industrial Wages in Chile* (New York, 1967); Markos Mamalakis and Clark Reynolds, *Essays on the Chilean Economy* (Homewood, Illinois, 1965); and Mamalakis' four volumes of unpublished historical statistics at the Yale Economic Growth Center library. The best analysis of strike patterns can be found in Manuel Barrera, "Perspectiva histórica de la huelga obrera en Chile," *Cuadernos de la Realidad Nacional* (Santiago), 9 (Sept. 1971). Voting behavior of Chilean workers is discussed in James Petras and Maurice Zeitlin, *El radicalismo político de la clase trabajadora chilena* and in Petras' article, "The Working-Class Vote in Chile: Chris-

- tian Democracy versus Marxism," in *Workers and Managers in Latin America*, S. M. Davis and L. W. Goodman, eds. (Lexington, Mass., 1972). It is also assessed from a very different perspective in several more conservative studies, which are conveniently summarized in James Prothro and Patricio Chaparro, "Public Opinion and the Movement of the Chilean Government to the Left, 1952-1972," *Journal of Politics* (1974):2-43.
4. For labor relations, see, for example, James Morris, *Elites, Intellectuals and Consensus: A Study of the Social Question and the Industrial Relations System in Chile* (New York, 1966) and J. Samuel Valenzuela, "The Chilean Labor Movement: The Institutionalization of Conflict," in *Chile: Politics and Society*, Arturo and J. Samuel Valenzuela, eds. (New Brunswick, N.J., 1976), pp. 135-71. For labor and political parties, see James Petras, *Politics and Social Forces in Chilean Development* (Berkeley, 1969) and especially Angell, *Politics and the Labour Movement in Chile*, in addition to the works cited in the previous note on voting behavior and the Peppe dissertation cited in the following note.
 5. The most illuminating biographies are Julio Cesar Jobet's broadly conceived *Recabarren y los orígenes del movimiento obrero y del socialismo chileno* (Santiago, 1955) and the autobiography of Elias Laferte, *Vida de un comunista*, 2d ed. (Santiago, 1971). Among the most interesting analyses based upon survey research are Patrick V. Peppe, "Working-Class Politics in Chile" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia Univ., 1971) and "The Aristocracy of Labor Thesis: Relative Deprivation and Working-Class Consciousness in Chile" (unpublished MS., 1973); Andrew Zimbalist and Juan Guillermo Espinosa, *Economic Democracy: Workers' Participation in Chilean Industry, 1970-1973* (New York, 1978); and Jacques Zylberberg and Christian Lalive d'Epinau, "Dimensiones ideológicas de la conciencia de clase" (*Cuadernos de Investigación*, No. 5, Univ. de Concepción, 1973) and "Dichotomie sociale et pluralisme culturel: La desparation politique de la classe ouvrière chilienne," Paper presented to the IXth World Political Science Congress, Montreal (Aug. 1975).
 6. William S. Allen, *The Nazi Seizure of Power: The Experience of a Single German Town* (Chicago, 1965).
 7. For a summary of other aspects of my research at the Yarur mill, see my "Workers into Managers: Worker Participation in the Chilean Textile Industry," in J. Nash, J. Dandler, and N. Hopkins, eds., *Popular Participation in Social Change* (The Hague, 1976), pp. 577-601, and "Loosing the Chains: Labor and the Chilean Revolutionary Process, 1970-1973," *Latin American Perspectives* 3, no. 1 (Winter 1976):70-84. For a fuller exploration of these themes, see my forthcoming book, *Yarur: The Chilean Revolution from Below*.
 8. For state-of-the-art reports on oral history in Latin America, see James W. Wilkie, "Postulates of the Oral History Center for Latin America," *The Journal of Library History* (Jan. 1967):45-55, and "Alternative Views in History: Historical Statistics and Oral History," in *Research in Mexican History*, Richard E. Greenleaf and Michael C. Meyer, eds. (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1973), pp. 52-62; Eugenia Meyer, "Oral History in Mexico and Latin America," *Oral History Review* (1976):56-61, and with Alicia Oliveta de Bonfil, "La historia oral: origen, metodología, desarrollo y perspectivas," *Historia mexicana* (Oct.-Dec. 1971):372-87; George P. Browne, "Oral History in Brazil Off to an Encouraging Start," *Oral History Review* (1976):53-55; Donald McCoy, "University of Kansas Oral History Project in Costa Rica," *LASA Newsletter* (March 1973):36-37; and Lyle Brown, "Methods and Approaches in Oral History: Interviewing Latin American Elites," *Oral History Review* (1973):77-86.
 9. Although an expensive reel-to-reel recorder will produce a superior recording, a good cassette machine with a built-in condenser microphone is generally adequate. With nonelite subjects, moreover, the presence of a large tape recorder and visible microphone may inhibit and distort the interview. A small cassette recorder with a built-in microphone is much easier for most subjects to ignore or forget.
 10. Theodore Rosengarten, *All God's Dangers: The Life of Nate Shaw* (New York, 1974).