REPLY

Eugene F. Sofer

I would like to thank the Editors of LARR for the opportunity to respond to Spalding, Erickson, and Peppe. While I disagree with them about the accuracy and fairness of my critique, I am pleased that they accept the major points of my essay. We have achieved a consensus that the historiography of the Latin American working class would be significantly strengthened through the incorporation of the concepts and techniques I cited into their more traditional approaches. I am pleased that my critics also recognize the need to be more sensitive to local distinctions that arise from different productive functions and from the internal dynamics of Latin American societies. Their support for local level "microstudies" that examine the daily lives of workers and how those experiences relate to collective political activity, broadly conceived, is also welcome. Equally important, my critics recognize the need to treat the working class as an active force in the making of history.

Their response captures the differences in our approaches to this topic. Hopefully, the results of such debates as these will be to stimulate still more students of Latin America to explore the complexities of the working class in all its forms.