



The Chilean Socialist Party and The Popular Front 1933-41

Author(s): David R. Corkill

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 11, No. 2/3, Special Issue: Conflict and Compromise: Socialists and Socialism in the Twentieth Century (Jul., 1976), pp. 261-273

Published by: [Sage Publications, Ltd.](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/260260>

Accessed: 11/02/2013 15:42

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Sage Publications, Ltd. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Contemporary History*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The Chilean Socialist Party and The Popular Front 1933-41

David R. Corkill

The Socialist Party (Partido Socialista de Chile—PS) has played a major role in Chilean politics since its foundation in 1933. Its participation, along with the communists, in the recent Unidad Popular government of Salvador Allende—himself a member of the PS since the 1930s and Presidential candidate in 1952, 1958, 1964 and 1970—was fundamental to the survival of the left-wing coalition that until recently ruled Chile. However, relations between the parties of the left have not always been amicable, as this study of the early history of the Socialist Party and its involvement in the Popular Front of 1936-41 will show.

The Extraordinary Congress of April 1933 that gave birth to the Chilean Socialist Party imposed a unified party structure on a bewildering kaleidoscope of microparties, factions and splinter groups. Yet in the short space of five years this unlikely amalgam of socialist oriented groups had become a major force in national politics as well as the majority party of the Chilean left, while the Communists remained, for the time being, a 'small and powerless sect'.¹ Yet, despite some startling electoral successes during the 1930s—made all the more impressive by the fact that the proportional representation system discriminated against new parties—the PS proved that it too was incapable of avoiding the factionalism, compromises and debilitating schisms that habitually plagued the 'traditional' parties.² Although a self-proclaimed doctrinary and revolutionary party favouring profound social and economic change, the PS in fact displayed a surprising willingness to become involved in the day-to-day politicking and scramble for office-holding characteristic of Chilean parties.

Socialist ideas have a long history in Chile but, in contrast to the

European experience, the PS emerged as a product of dissatisfaction with the Communists who had become affiliated to Moscow as early as 1922. The Partido Comunista de Chile (PCCh) had lost much of its influence on the left following the persecution and harassment meted out by the Ibanez dictatorship (1927-31) and through the 'bolshevization' of the party after 1926.³ The vacuum was filled by a plethora of Socialist micro-parties, the most prominent of which were the Nueva Acción Pública (New Public Action), Orden Socialista (Socialist Order) and the Partido Socialista Marxista (Marxist Socialist Party).

Impetus had been given to the unification process by the experience of the 12 day Socialist Republic (4-16 June 1932) when a small group of military and civilian conspirators engineered a coup d'état to overthrow the weak and ineffectual government of Juan Esteban Montero who had been elected in the aftermath of the depression and the collapse of the dictatorship. A governing junta, comprising Marmaduke Grove, an Air Commodore, Eugenio Matte and Raúl Puga, justified their takeover on the grounds that the country's 'total economic and moral bankruptcy' necessitated the overthrow of 'a government of oligarchic reaction which served only the interests of foreign capital'.⁴ Although a crash programme to 'feed, clothe and house the people' failed to get off the ground it showed just how far some thinkers had travelled from the neo-liberal individualism of the pre-depression era. The Socialist Republic may have failed to unite the working classes—it lacked Communist support—but it soon became part of the mythology of Chilean socialism.

The short-lived Socialist Republic may seem to be one of the many bizarre episodes during a period of chronic instability (although its hastily issued decree laws were dusted down and used by Allende to circumvent Congress after 1970) but its protagonists, following a brief sojourn in exile, were soon active again organizing the Socialist Party. The Presidential and Congressional elections of 1932 mark the beginning of an uninterrupted period of stable elected governments; they also gave the impetus to socialist unification. Backed by the Socialist splinter groups, Grove ran second to Arturo Alessandri for the Presidency.⁵ The lessons were obvious. By uniting behind a single banner the socialists had relegated the traditional parties to third and fourth places while it was evident from the elections to Congress that the various socialist factions were manifestly incapable of making an impact alone.

Once unity had been achieved the new party set about drawing up

both a declaration of principles and a basic programme. Acceptance of the class struggle led the Socialists to endorse the replacement of capitalism by 'a socialist economic system in which . . . private property would become collectivized'.⁶ This was to be achieved by setting up a dictatorship of the proletariat. The similarity of these aims to those of the communists was not without significance. Yet there was never any question of joint action. The communists might accuse the socialists of being 'social fascists' but were patently failing to make any headway among the working classes.

Although an avowedly working-class party, the leadership generally came from middle-class backgrounds. More importantly—and this explains the vagaries and inconsistencies of Chilean socialism in its early years—the *jefe* of the party, Marmaduke Grove, was a mercurial character with no clearly defined ideas of what he meant by Socialism. Affectionately known as 'don Marma', he became the *caudillo* of the workers. For thousands of Chileans, Socialism was crystallized in his personality and utterances. While Grove knew well the uses of nationalism he was, to say the least, no theorist—confessing that he had never read Marx—and, consequently, involved himself more with day-to-day problems than theoretical niceties. He preferred, it seems, to quote from H.G. Wells.⁷

Grove's social democracy and his concern for the welfare of the masses gave him great electoral pulling power. In April 1934 the Air Commodore had been returned to the Senate with the backing of socialists, democrats and left-wing radicals while still serving a prison sentence. Later in the year the party Congress ratified Grove's decision to join the Bloc de Izquierdas (Block of the Left) a parliamentary group comprising democrats, radical-socialists and the Trotskyist communists (Izquierda Comunista) in opposition to the government of the once reformist Arturo Alessandri. In defiance of Alessandri's call for a 'truly national government', Grove countered with the demand for an administration that would be 'truly Socialist'.

The Block could do little to undermine the Alessandri regime as a minority opposition so long as the Radical Party wavered in its attitude toward the President. The most that could be done was to criticize the government—in particular the policies of Alessandri's Finance Minister, Gustavo Ross Santa María—and hope that incessant propaganda against imperialism, the oligarchy and the President's inability or unwillingness to solve Chile's pressing social problems would pay dividends in the future. The most effective alternative, however, was to broaden the coalition opposing the government.

Hopeful signs soon began to appear. Early in 1934 the Radicals, dissatisfied at the policies being pursued, quit the cabinet. It was the signal for the younger left-wing elements in the party to assert themselves and set the Radicals on the road to outright opposition to Alessandri. The Democrats also used the cabinet crisis as an opportunity to withdraw, although the party split on the issue of whether to cooperate or not in the future.⁸ Then, late in 1935, the communists, responding to the directive emanating from the Comintern adopt a more open attitude to 'bourgeois' parties with the intention of forming a Popular Front, began approaches to both the radicals and the socialists. However, the latter emphatically rejected 'internationalism' and pointedly condemned the evils of excessive centralism and bureaucracy.

Events were soon to overtake the anti-Front factions within the PS. On 2 February 1936 a railway strike broke out in support of a wage demand. The repressive measures employed to break the strike—Congress had been dissolved, the opposition press gagged, left-wing political leaders arrested and the army called in—galvanized the opposition into action. The PS immediately called for the strengthening of the Block of the Left and within a fortnight, at a meeting of Santiago's Radical Assembly, a left-wing radical, Justiano Sotomayor, floated the idea of a Popular Front and received an enthusiastic endorsement. Finally, after some hesitation and much discussion, the Central Committee of the Radical Party formally called on the Block of the Left, the communists, labour unions, employees, farmworkers, artisans, students, professionals, intellectuals and independents to close ranks and support the Popular Front.

As was the case with the European Popular Fronts, many elements within the Chilean organization regarded it purely as an electoral alliance, a device for gaining power that prejudiced neither party doctrine nor independent action. There was a current of opinion within the socialist party that totally rejected any coalition with 'bourgeois' parties like the radicals who continued to act as if the Popular Front alliance implied no obligations on their part.⁹ Consequently when the PS Congress met in May 1937 a minority group led by Ricardo Latcham, who had dubbed the Front 'a mere short-term electoral combination', caused the first major schism in the party by refusing to accept the majority decision.¹⁰

Although the PS flatly rejected the tentative suggestions made by the communists as to the formation of a single revolutionary party—this despite the absorption of the Izquierda Comunista into the PS—

there had been few doubts that the leadership would opt to continue in the Popular Front. The 1937 Congressional elections, although moderately favourable to the Right, had highlighted, above all, the remarkable progress made by the socialists during the previous four years. 46,000 votes (11.2 per cent of the total) gave the party the fourth largest contingent in Congress with 19 deputies and four senators. This contrasted sharply with the poor performance of the communists who managed only six seats (4.2 per cent of the vote).

The build-up to the 1938 Presidential election proved tense and eventful. In Chile candidates are usually nominated well in advance of polling day, making the campaign lengthy, expensive and often agitated. The selection of the opposition candidate was not due to take place until April 1938 but in the months prior to the Covention a great deal of haggling took place within the parties. The Socialists, however, had little difficulty in choosing their pre-candidate, Grove's name being put forward a full 12 months before the Popular Front Convention. The PS also campaigned, in vain as it turned out, for a popular plebiscite to decide who would be an appropriate standard-bearer.

The Popular Front parties that assembled on 15 April 1938 faced a tricky problem. Agreement on a common programme had been a relatively simple task: essentially moderate in tone it hinged upon the maintenance of democratic and legal liberties, the planning of the economy and the amelioration of working-class living conditions. Noticeably absent were demands for nationalizations and a far-reaching agrarian reform. The chief aim seems to have been to appeal to as broad a cross-section of moderate and left-wing opinion as possible. But no such consensus existed over a suitable candidate for the forthcoming election. The successful nominee had to win two-thirds of the delegate votes that had been allotted as follows: radicals 400, socialists 300, communists 160, democrats 120 and the CUTCh (recently formed labour federation) 120. Grove could count on the socialist block vote and half of the trade union votes but no more.

After seven inconclusive ballots there was a real possibility of breakdown. Then the socialists, who had hurriedly convened an extraordinary party congress, announced the withdrawal of their candidate (the deadlock had been between Pedro Aguirre Cerda, a radical, and Grove). What had swayed the socialist leader in making his momentous decision to stand down? Earlier efforts had undoubtedly been made to persuade Grove to drop his candidacy, but to no avail. It seems that only under extreme pressure did he wilt;

finally convinced by the argument that being head of the Popular Front combination could be more prestigious and would carry more political weight than the Presidency itself.

The socialist decision, while far from unanimous, owed a great deal to the party's preoccupation with the threat of indigenous fascism. Possibly it was because the PS was a product of the 1930s, the decade that also saw the birth of the Chilean variant of fascism, *nacismo*,¹¹ that it reacted as vigorously as it did. The socialist militias had clashed frequently with the *nacista* combat squads throughout the decade and it was the PS that campaigned energetically but unsuccessfully against the incorporation of Carlos Ibáñez's pseudo-fascist Vanguardia Popular Socialista into the Popular Front following an abortive coup attempt by a group of Nacistas acting in his name on 5 September.¹²

The preoccupation with the increasingly bitter and violent election campaign did little to stifle the continuing debate within the socialist ranks. Critics of the Popular Front strategy pointed out the dangers of entering into a coalition that was dominated by the middle class radicals whose close links with the provincial upper class made them a rather unlikely revolutionary force. There was a growing feeling among the socialist rank and file that such compromises should be avoided even if it meant that the prospect of immediate political power would remain remote. Those who looked sceptically at the Popular Front could point to the continued growth of the party as an independent entity.¹³ Some idea of the expansion of the PS can be gleaned from the figures quoted at the Sixth General Congress. Between 1938 and 1940 the number of sections mushroomed from 200 to 341, in 150 different locations throughout the country. An indication of the social composition of the new intake is provided by the recruitment registers in the ten *comunas* of Santiago during the first five months of 1940. Out of 2246 new recruits, 87 were public employees, 360 were *profesionales*, small industrialists and tradesmen, 567 were domestics, 1161 were manual labourers and 69 were unclassified by profession.¹⁴ The figures corresponding to the city of Valdivia reflected the fruit of propaganda efforts in the countryside. Of the 318 newcomers to the party in the two-year period, 110 were *campesinos*. The growth of the youth movement paralleled that of the party as a whole—boasting a thousand members in November 1935, it counted nearly 9000 by 1938.¹⁵

Added weight had been given to the anti-Frentista forces within the PS when the first Aguirre Cerda cabinet was announced following his narrow victory over the government candidate, Gustavo Ross.¹⁶

The socialists had been awarded only three relatively minor posts—the Development, Lands and Colonization and Health portfolios—in an administration clearly dominated by the radical party. Dissatisfaction with the subordinate role accorded the party in the Popular Front administration found its expression in a group of dissidents led by César Godoy Urrutia. As early as 1936 Godoy, a *regidor* for Santiago, had opposed collaboration with the Radicals on the grounds that it involved a move to the Right. At the 1939 Congress his *Inconformistas* made a concerted attempt to reverse the policy of the Central Committee by forcing a vote. After a rowdy session lasting four hours the official party line survived the onslaught by 201 votes to 165. Nevertheless the voting had been so close that Godoy had made his point. Few, however, were yet prepared to go as far as the leader of the rebels and make a complete break with a party that he described as ‘a house of rats, moths and cobwebs’.¹⁷

The criticisms that the *Inconformistas* aired so vigorously were of particular significance because of their influence on the younger elements in the party who, on the whole, were less disposed to accept the decisions of the Central Committee. What then were the chief characteristics of *Inconformismo*? It was maintained that the victory of 1939 had been hollow because it brought in its wake collaboration with non-revolutionary groups and the subsequent betrayal of the tenets and principles of Socialism. Having failed to learn from the Spanish experience the leadership had become ‘lackeys and servants’ to the ‘reformist illusion’.¹⁸ Moreover, there had been an unseemly enthusiasm for ‘the ministerial corridors and the offices of the bureaucracy’.¹⁹ Herein lay the great dilemma for early Chilean socialism. Support for an openly reformist government soon tarnished the image of a ‘new style’ uncorrupted movement. Meanwhile the communists, by declining to sit in the cabinet, shared the accolades for any achievements but neatly avoided the opprobrium attached to any failures.

The older generation of socialist leaders, typified by Grove and Oscar Schnake,²⁰ were inextricably linked to the Popular Front. Its limitations and failures were theirs too. It is not surprising therefore that the socialist youth listened attentively to Godoy’s criticisms of the leadership and its policies. By 1940, with no progress toward agrarian reform and the absence of any measures to deal with foreign capital, socialism was in the throes of a crisis. The *Inconformistas* had a ready diagnosis: the exaggerated use of the person of the leader and the office-grabbing mentality of sections of the party membership. As a result the Central Committee had been obliged to issue a stream of

official declarations to rebuff these accusations that were being skilfully employed by the opposition to discredit the socialist party. Salvador Allende, taking on the role of defending counsel, insisted that such charges had little foundation in reality and that the percentage of socialists who had ensconced themselves in the bureaucracy was 'infinitesimal'.²¹ Whatever the truth of the matter, the enemies of the PS did manage to convince many people that the socialists and not the radicals were chiefly responsible for the ballooning of the state apparatus.

There can be little doubt that the socialists had a much broader concept than the Communists of the social forces destined to participate in the revolutionary process. An illustration of this point is trade union policy. When freedom of action was restored in 1932 the communists insisted in reviving the FOCh²² and took a narrow sectarian line on unions formed under the auspices of other groups. On the other hand the PS saw no danger in a broader-based workers' movement springing from the experience gained in defence of common interests. Until 1936 when the communist trade union federation was absorbed into the CUTCh, the communists kept a close link between their political and union activities; the socialists, in contrast, officially maintained that politics should be kept to a minimum during proselytization work.²³ In practice, however, it proved to be mere lip-service to an ideal that was unobtainable given the climate of socialist-communist relations and the constant rivalry for influence among the working population.

The struggle for supremacy in the union movement reached a climax in the CUTCh elections of July 1939, the first internal vote for three years and very much a test of strength among the workers. The headway made by the socialists received confirmation in the results: Bernardo Ibáñez collected 1682 votes, 471 more than the communist candidate, Salvador Ocampo. Yet already the communists were making significant inroads into the trade unions aided by the favourable conditions afforded by the Popular Front and the state of disarray in the socialist ranks. As for the peasantry, unionization had hardly begun to affect their working lives. Nevertheless a socialist deputy, Emilio Zapata Díaz, did organize the first ever National Congress of Peasants in April 1939; but hopes that the government might intervene to protect them against wrongful dismissal and other abuses were dashed when Aguirre Cerda succumbed to pressure from the landowning interests and imposed a moratorium on all unionization in the countryside.²⁴ Once again

the presence of socialist ministers in a government that could take such a step reflected badly on the party. Nor did the timid nature of Grove's Agrarian Reform Bill—which had no chance of passing through Congress anyway—do anything to appease the militants. The Bill aimed not at the destruction of the *terrateniente* class through the breakup of the large estates, but merely at better usage and the amelioration of the peasants' conditions.²⁵

Less than a year after its victory at the polls the credibility of the Popular Front government as an agent for change had run low—some of the euphoria and good will visible in the early months was still there but the impasse in Congress severely limited the President's room for manoeuvre. In consequence disillusion began to set in among the Front's most fervent adherents as they came to realize that even with the best intentions the President would be unable to accomplish anything fundamental before the March 1941 Congressional elections.

The Popular Front's first major cabinet crisis demonstrated the impatience in the socialist camp. In September 1939 the three socialist ministers had been instructed to resign. Behind the elevation of three new socialist ministers (Oscar Schnake, Rolando Merino and Salvador Allende) to the cabinet lay the desire to appease internal party critics and bolster what they regarded as the integrity of the Front. By placing three top-level and forceful politicians in the government the PS hoped to ensure that more of the promised benefits came the way of the working classes and that a start be made on the socialization of the economy. The nomination of Schnake (Secretary-General of the PS) underlined the socialist determination to defend and consolidate the inroads that had been made into the administrative machinery.²⁶

The PS not only made ministerial changes; a 'Plan for National Economic Action', which the new ministers were pledged to fight for, appeared. The Plan was a wide-ranging document calling for: the expropriation of uncultivated land and the subdivision of the large estates among the peasants under the slogan 'land for him who works it'; the organization of cooperatives and state farms in the countryside and the unionization of the peasantry; the revision of all contracts with imperialist enterprises and action to curb monopolies; the nationalization of credit and the creation of a State Bank; improvements in wages and salaries coupled with price controls on essential foodstuffs; the strengthening of social legislation; education reform; tax reform (more emphasis on direct taxation); the rooting out of corruption in Public Administration, and the introduction of

democratic reforms including equality of political rights for men and women.²⁷ In the prevailing political and socio-economic climate such radical demands were clearly impractical and excessive. The Popular Front government was experiencing great difficulties in carrying out its moderate reformism and could do nothing to act upon a programme that implied profound structural change.

Instead of moving to the left with the inclusion of three prominent socialists, the government lurched to the right. Under growing pressure from the opposition Aguirre Cerda appointed three right-wing members of his own radical party to what became known pejoratively as the 'millionaire's cabinet'.²⁸ Incensed by the new 'hard-line' policy, the left protested bitterly. The communists, increasingly uncooperative after the Russo-German Pact, joined with the socialists and left-wing radicals in censoring the new cabinet. By mid-July 1940 the government was having great difficulty in rebutting the attacks of its own supporters. Marmaduke Grove, President of the Popular Front organization, launched into a tirade against the Radicals, accusing them of making secret agreements with the right.²⁹

There was not as yet, however, any question of the socialists abandoning the Front. Although relations between themselves and the radicals were strained, the socialists still stood by the President. In Grove's opinion desertion would have been tantamount to committing treachery similar to that which spelled the end of the Socialist Republic.³⁰ Indeed the socialist leadership appeared to be less preoccupied about problems with the right-wing of the radical party than with the communists. The history of socialist-communist relations had always been one of strained comradeship barely disguising a fierce competitiveness that finally erupted into vitriolic exchanges during the twilight months of the Popular Front. In pre-Front days the communists had labelled Grove as 'a Chilean Kerensky' and it was only with the adoption of the anti-fascist strategy that relations began to improve and PCCh leader Carlos Contreras Labarca could refer to the socialists as a 'partido hermano' (brother party).

Now once again the latent hostility came to the surface. Having weathered a succession of storms over domestic issues it is perhaps surprising that the ostensible reasons for the collapse of the Front were international in origin. The socialists had been tireless propagators of the ideal of Hemispheric unity during the second world war. As the architect of this policy and the Chilean representative at the Havana Conference of July 1940, as well as loan negotiator with the US Import-Export Bank, Oscar Schnake became the target of

particularly vituperative criticism from the communists. He and other socialists had been particularly resentful of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, claiming that the Russians were aiding the Germanization of Europe.³¹

A counter-attack by Schnake on his return from the United States in December 1940 finally shattered Popular Front unity. Speaking in Santiago's Teatro Caupolican the Development Minister defended his position and called for the cooperation of all American nations against economic threats and the problems arising from the war.³² But his anti-communist invective went further than during any previous socialist-communist disagreements. Schnake derided what he termed 'the revolutionary gymnastics' of the PCCh, dictated, as he believed, by the Third International in Moscow.³³ In calling for a 'Popular Front without Communists' Schnake knew that he had the backing of Grove and the Central Committee. In a manifesto published shortly after Schnake's speech the party declared 'We are convinced that the Popular Front no longer interests the Communists; and since last year their policy has been directed towards the break-up of that political combination.'³⁴ On 6 January 1941 the PS sealed the fate of the Front by making a 'final and irrevocable' decision to withdraw, at the same time calling for a National Block of the Left that would exclude the communists.³⁵ The socialist action created acute strains within the trade union movement and a week later the CUTCh abandoned the Front. Despite last-ditch efforts at reconciliation by the radicals the first Chilean Popular Front had come to an inglorious end.

What had been the results of the socialist's involvement in the Popular Front experiment? Certainly the PS had been instrumental in fostering a mood within the country favouring change. So when little progress was evident the party lost face. It should be pointed out that the socialist position was perhaps the most difficult and tenuous of any in the coalition. They had come to power to transform Chile but met with frustration and failure all along the line. In the end the party seemed content to proclaim its revolutionism but do nothing about it. Inflation continued to eat away at the standard of living of the working classes and the government stubbornly refused to break with the Axis powers but still no new strategy emerged as an alternative to collaborationism. The leadership of the party clearly has much to answer for in this period. The electoral stagnation of the socialist party that lasted until the 1950s is, in large part, explained by the policies pursued during the Popular Front period.

NOTES

1. Federico Gil, *Political System of Chile* (Boston 1966) 124.
2. Traditional parties (also known as 'historic') were those formed in the nineteenth century i.e. the conservatives, liberals and radicals.
3. Stephen Clissold, ed., *Soviet Relations with Latin America 1918-1968* (London 1970), 16-17.
4. Jack Ray Thomas, 'The Socialist Republic of Chile', *Journal of Inter-American Studies* 3 (1964) 213.
5. The percentages were: Alessandri 54.6 per cent; Grove 17.7 per cent; Rodriguez 13.8 per cent; Zanartu 12.4 per cent and Lafertte 1.2 per cent.
6. Partido Socialista, *Estatutos y programa* (Santiago 1936).
7. Jack Ray Thomas, 'Evolution of a Chilean Socialist: Marmaduke Grove', *Hispanic American Historical Review* 47 (1967) 22-37.
8. The *Demócraticos* decided to join the opposition; the *Demócratas* opted to continue collaborating with the President.
9. The Radicals were represented in the Alessandri government as late as 1937.
10. Latcham formed a new personalist party, *Union Socialista*.
11. Movimiento Nacional Socialista de Chile (MNS); its members were known as *nacistas*.
12. The Chilean Popular Front, far from being anti-fascist, actually owed its electoral victory in 1938 to the votes of the indigenous fascist movement.
13. The party recruited under the slogan 'No queremos flojos, borrachos, ni ladrones' [We don't want idlers, drunkards or thieves].
14. Partido Socialista, *6 Congreso Ordinario* (Santiago 1940) 21.
15. Raul Ampuero Diaz, *Le Juventud en el Frente del Pueblo* (Santiago 1939) 26.
16. The figures were: Aguirre 222, 720; Ross 218, 609).
17. John R. Stevenson, *The Chilean Popular Front* (Connecticut 1942; reprinted 1970) 101. Godoy formed his own party—Partido Socialista de Trabajadores.
18. *Ercilla* 259 (17 April 1940).
19. Cesar Godoy, *Que es el Inconformismo?* (Santiago, 1940), 17.
20. Oscar Schnake Vergara, first General Secretary of the PS and former anarchist who became a very orthodox Minister of Development.
21. *Ercilla* 198 (17 February 1939).
22. Federacion Obrera de Chile, the old Communist trade union federation.
23. Partido Socialista, *Tesis Sindical* (Santiago 1939) 28.
24. Decision taken in April 1939 after strong protests from the *Sociedad Nacional de Agricultura* and other landowners' organizations.
25. Marmaduke Grove, *Reform Agraria. La tierra para el que la trabaja* (Santiago 1939). Presented to Congress but rejected by rightist majority.
26. Oscar Bermudez regards Schnake as the organizer of the PS. He

embarked on a policy of collaboration, opportunism and submission. His *Comer y callar* [eat and keep quiet] policy, officially described as 'realistic', in fact spelled the end of the PS as a revolutionary force. *El drama político de Chile* (Santiago, 1947).

27. Julio Cesar Jobet, 'El partido socialista y el Frente Popular en Chile', *Arauco* 85 (February 1967) 13-47.

28. Humberto Álvarez (Interior), Cristóbal Sáenz (Foreign Relations) and Victor Moller (Agriculture) were all landowners who favoured a clampdown on activities in the countryside.

29. *El Mercurio* (22 July 1940).

30. *La Hora* (22 July 1940).

31. Jobet, 'El partido Socialista' op. cit., 19.

32. *El Mercurio* (16 December 1940).

33. *Ibid.* (19 December 1940).

34. *Ibid.* (21 December 1940).

35. *La Hora* (7 January 1941).