

'A Small Revolution': Family, Sex, and the Communist Youth of Chile during the Allende Years (1970-1973)¹

Alfonso Salgado

This article discusses the way in which the Partido Comunista de Chile (Communist Party of Chile or PCCh) coped with sexual and family norms during the Popular Unity government. Between 4 November 1970 and 11 September 1973, communists and socialists united behind president Salvador Allende as he strove to lead Chile to socialism while respecting the country's democratic institutions. The article focuses specifically on the Juventudes Comunistas de Chile (Communist Youth of Chile or JJCC) and show that young communists attempted their own small revolution in sexual and family norms in the midst of Chile's socio-political revolution. Underscoring the tensions between the party and its youth wing, I argue that young communists approached the changing patterns in family life and sexuality in a much more flexible manner and challenged the conservative mores of the old guard.

Communist understandings of gender and family relations have usually been conceptualised as conservative. Historians have explored the paradoxes of a 'communist morality' that contained 'conservative elements of continuity and not rupture.'² Focusing on the 1960s and 1970s, the burgeoning Chilean scholarship in this field stresses the difficulties that communists had in coping with gender equality in both the private and public realms.³ American scholars have mounted an interesting critique of the Popular Unity along similar lines. Heidi Tinsman, in a detailed reconstruction of the Agrarian Reform during the Frei (1964-70) and Allende

(1970-73) administrations, shows that both the centre and left-wing governments promoted a model of the family centred on the male breadwinner.⁴ Examining the state's distribution of birth control methods, Jadwiga Pieper Mooney goes further and argues that the Christian Democrats were in fact more responsive to women's demands than the Popular Unity – an argument that parallels the findings of Margaret Power's study on women's political mobilisation.⁵ Other American scholars have also pointed out the shortcomings of the Popular Unity by studying political and social movements critical of the traditional left. Florencia Mallon focuses on the Revolutionary Left Movement's 'transgressive masculinity,' a representation that challenged the family ideals of the orthodox left by combining the heroic figure of the Cuban *barbudo* and the hippie rebel.⁶ Patrick Barr-Melej pays attention to youth esoteric movements to underscore the generational clash that emerged during the Allende years. The government, Barr-Melej argues, reacted negatively to attempts of 'sexual liberation' and 'total revolution' that were neither tied to the working class nor conventionally gendered.⁷

I draw on some of these insights, but argue that the emphasis on the limitations of the left in challenging patriarchal structures has blinded historians to the significant changes regarding family and sex that segments of the Chilean left experienced in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Generation is a variable that gender analyses have overlooked. Rather than assessing change in light of the transformations in the West or current notions of family and sexuality, yardsticks that are pervasive but rarely made explicit in the scholarship, the extent of the change should be appraised in relation to the history of Chilean society and Chilean communism in particular. A contextualised analysis demands the assessment of both continuities and ruptures by documenting the start points, end points, and rhythms of specific patterns.⁸ Consequently, I delve into a few particularly contentious issues in this localised setting – premarital sex, birth control, family arrangements, and marital breakups. In order to foreground the extent of change, I underline the tensions between older and younger generations of communist members.⁹

In the broader scholarly discussion, this generational emphasis intends to cast new light on the relationship between the sexual revolution and

the Latin American left during the 1960s and 1970s. Historians have emphasised the failure of the political left in addressing gender norms and sexual mores in a more innovative way. Allende's Chile and Castro's Cuba have become paradigmatic examples of how the left reinforced – rather than challenged – traditional family values.¹⁰ Those who have studied new left groups sometimes offer a more nuanced view, but most scholars have tended to underline the strict norms that revolutionary clandestine activism imposed upon members – that is, political militancy took precedence over private desires – and the difficulties that these groups had in grappling with women's liberation and homosexuality.¹¹ My contribution acknowledges the problematic articulation between the sexual and political revolutions, especially regarding gender equality and it provides ammunition for those scholars who emphasise overall change. More importantly, my piece calls attention to the shared cultural sensibilities of young left-wingers as a whole. Sexual revolution was not the exclusive province of the new left or the hippie movement, for the simple fact that the 1960s generation did not respect party boundaries. As Vania Markavian has recently argued, the labels 'orthodox left' and 'new left' are far from clear-cut categories by which to understand the cultural transformations of the Latin American left during these years.¹² To understand the relationship between the old left and the different social and political movements that emerged in these years, historians need to start paying more attention to the counter-culture trends that shaped this entire generation.¹³

Chilean communism is an illuminating case study to understand the cultural transformation of the old left in Latin America. The Chilean case is particularly interesting because the PCCh's electoral success and subservience towards the Soviet Union made it an example within the communist world movement – an example to be used against the more heterodox communist parties of the region.¹⁴ Yet, while the PCCh stood as one of the regional beacons of the orthodox left and upheld Stalinist notions of family and sexuality, the JJCC developed a rather tolerant attitude towards marital breakups, premarital sex, and birth control that rendered young communists more similar to their new left peers than to their old left parents. In the following pages, I bring this contradiction to the fore. The challenge is twofold: first, to delve into the conflicts

between older and younger generations of members hidden beneath the monolithic image of a communist party and second, to understand the diverse sources of change in a rigidly hierarchical political organisation that decreed change from above.

To uncover the young communists' attitude towards family and sexual conventions, this article focuses mostly on *Ramona*, a youth-oriented magazine under the control of the JJCC. Significantly, some historians critical of the gender politics of the left have mentioned this magazine in passing, sometimes acknowledging in footnotes the magazine's openness towards topics such as sex.¹⁵ The magazine, whose name pays tribute to one of the martyrs of the JJCC, appeared weekly between 29 October 1971 and 11 September 1973, publishing 98 issues of about 50 pages each. The magazine tried to break the boundaries that separated communist members from left-leaning people in order to reach a broader audience. The readership seems to have been relatively wide and socially diverse, although predominantly from urban areas. *Ramona* appealed to the youth by discussing popular culture (articles on music, television, and movies abound) and addressing controversial issues, such as sex and drugs. Politics also played an important role. *Ramona* supported several campaigns organised by the Popular Unity government, published a number of columns criticising the right and the ultra-left, and included interviews with communist candidates in periods of elections. The idea to publish this magazine came from the secretary general of the JJCC, Gladys Marín, and a generationally-defined, yet professionally-diverse, group of people willing to challenge the mores of the old guard and seduce its peers.¹⁶ The magazine was staffed by young journalists and students from Universidad de Chile's School of Journalism; some of them, such as Patricia Politzer, wrote the most controversial articles on sexuality discussed below. Particularly important for the purposes of this analysis are the 'letters to the editor' sections, 'Manuel's Answers' and especially 'Only Ask... that here we answer even that' – a not-so-subtle allusion to sex.¹⁷ Although at first the editor of 'Only Ask' discussed topics such as politics and sexuality in a somewhat theoretical register, the section soon became a public forum to share sentimental disappointments and request love advice.¹⁸

Young Rebels: Pornography, Premarital Sex, and Birth Control

Sex was a taboo subject in Chile until the mid-1960s, when mass media began to draw attention to contraception, female sexuality, and premarital sex.¹⁹ Magazines played a key role in stimulating public discussion. *Paula*, a magazine that targeted women launched its first issue in 1967 with a controversial article titled ‘Should I Take the Pill?’ The magazine, which grouped open-minded middle-class journalists without strong ties to the left, answered positively.²⁰ *Paula*’s provocative journalism prompted a more open discussion about female sexuality and forced Chile’s traditional women’s magazines, such as *Rosita* and *Eva*, to offer something more than the typical fashion, cooking, and parenting advice. Youth sexuality began to draw the attention of the public around the same time, although the discussion took a while to gain momentum. The most popular youth magazines of the 1960s, *Ritmo* and *Rincón Juvenil*, focused on popular music and fashion trends, only rarely addressing the issue of sexual relationships among young people. The appearance of new youth magazines in the early 1970s, such as *Ramona* and *Onda*, contributed to changing the landscape.²¹

Sex became an issue of public discussion in *Ramona*. An interview article called ‘Sex at Three Speeds’ reveals the generational dimensions involved, at least as imagined by young communists. The article delved into the changing female attitudes towards sex among three generations of women from the same family. The 83-year-old grandmother held the most conservative beliefs. However, she played a minor role in the interview as the conversation quickly turned into a debate between the 51-year-old mother and the 16-year-old daughter. The mother presented herself as an open-minded woman. She nevertheless believed that young people were not prepared to engage in sexual relationships. The daughter contradicted her mother. The interviewer played a mediating role, constantly pushing each participant’s argument towards its logical conclusion: when the mother stressed the risks of pregnancies at a young age, the interviewer mentioned birth control methods; when the daughter argued that young women were both psychologically and physically prepared to have sex, the interviewer asked her whether she was in favour of ‘free love’ altogether. The participants did not reach a

consensus. Although the overall article tended to side with the daughter, the conclusion ventured a compromise: 'Maybe they are all exaggerating a bit – the old people with their acid criticism and the young people in their exaggerated liberalism.'²²

Reluctant to look up to their parents, young Chileans turned instead to their European peers. The discussion on the trends of the 'sexual revolution' abroad figured prominently in *Ramona*.²³ Divided into a capitalist and a socialist camp, Germany attracted most attention. *Ramona* surely drew a line between menacing transformations in the West and positive improvements in the East. Nevertheless, the magazine's treatment of the sexual revolution abroad cannot be reduced to these Manichean terms. Under a Cold War rhetoric that denounced capitalism and praised socialism, young communists drew selective lessons from both camps. German psychologists and doctors from both sides were given the status of experts. One could even argue that, while rejecting many of the Western European sexual trends, the discursive explosion itself accentuated 'the incitement to talk about sex,' to paraphrase Foucault.²⁴ Indeed, communist graphic designers accompanied many of these articles with suggestive images.

Negotiating the boundaries of the permissible meant walking a fine line. This became particularly apparent in the controversies generated among communists of different generations by the publication of eroticised images of women. In its second issue, *Ramona* interviewed a showgirl and published a naked picture of her in the centrefold pages, which generated controversy in the PCCCh.²⁵ 'The party's political commission summoned us,' young communist cadre Ernesto Ottone remembers in his 2014 memoirs:

We went with Gladys [Marín] as our standard bearer; we knew things looked bad. They began by praising our creativity, and then immediately asked us to "end the pornography," [arguing] that ours was a serious [political] party.²⁶

Interestingly, *Ramona* came up in oral-history interviews I conducted between 2011 and 2014 precisely due to the internal strife between the young and old guard. Two of my interviewees recalled the same incident

narrated by Ottone – before he had published his memoirs – and used a strikingly similar language to speak about the controversy. Héctor, a young communist who had joined the JJCC in 1968, remembered that ‘one time, *Ramona* interviewed a showgirl... And, in the centrefold pages, the magazine published a nude picture of her.’ According to Héctor, ‘the old Party members (*los viejos del Partido*) made a scandal out of this publication, and that happened in 1971, [or] 1972.’ Héctor used this anecdote to illustrate the conservative stance (“*el pacatismo*”) of the old guard on these issues.²⁷ Boris, a young communist who came from a deeply committed communist family, spontaneously remembered the same incident when we were discussing the youth culture of the time: ‘There was even a conflict because a naked woman once appeared in *Ramona*. Thus, well, this created a scandal, even within the Party.’ I asked Boris whether the old communists were the ones scandalised by the picture and he concurred. According to him, older members ‘would have preferred a *Ramona* that was youthful but old,’ that is, young in its format and old in its content, with more of those boring interviews with political leaders. ‘There was a struggle there, sometimes, and you had to try and break the siege because we said: “we are young, *huevo*ón, let’s read something different.”’²⁸

Communists had always used the ambivalent concept of pornography to denounce the bourgeois eroticisation of women and at the same time delimit the boundaries of sexual exposure. The line that divided ‘sexual education’ from ‘pornography’ was a particularly thin one in communist subculture, and the young communists of the time often crossed it when trying to redraw the boundaries of permissible speech. A 1971 letter to the editor of *Mayoría*, ‘the magazine of the workers’ edited by the Popular Unity, reveals the obstacles that open-minded, left-wing journalists encountered among their own constituency. In her letter, the reader argued that it was not only the political right who were to blame when it came to mass media ‘exploiting sex and pornography.’ According to her, left-wing tabloids such as *Clarín* and *Puro Chile* were also responsible. The reader took particular issue with the left-wing magazine *Onda*, which, like *Ramona*, was printed by the government editorial and targeted teenagers. *Ramona*, which at the time the reader sent her letter had only published a couple of issues, would surely have fallen in her list

had it already enjoyed the broad circulation it later did. The complaining reader of *Mayoría* was most likely a middle-aged communist sympathiser, if not a member. She referred to the PCCCh as the most 'organised and mature' of the incumbent parties and hoped it could take control of these newspapers and magazines – paradoxically, the party indeed owned one of the papers she considered immoral. The editor of *Mayoría* explained to the reader that she was 'confusing two things. In our view, sexual education is very different from the pornographic utilisation of sex.'²⁹

A similar controversy sparked in *Ramona's* pages. In May 1972, a reader sent a letter complaining about the magazine's fixation with sex. He said he had noted an increasing tendency in *Ramona* and other magazines to address sexual topics, sometimes verging on pornography, and he argued against this trend: 'I believe that if our youth is to remain healthy, there should be no compromise on these topics. Nor should [the magazine] awaken the desire for obscenities and vulgarities under the pretext of "reporting."' In his response, the editor of the section 'Only Ask' admitted that sex had become a popular topic, discussed more and more often in *Ramona* and other magazines, but he did not consider this reprehensible. On the contrary, the editor believed that youth magazines had finally begun to address the concerns of young people, who wanted to break the taboos and know more about sex. 'In our view,' the editor explained, 'information about sex is not merely permissible. We feel that is our duty to talk about it, to promote culture and raise consciousness about [the significance of] sexuality, so young people can experience love and eroticism in a freer way than ever before.'

The editor's long answer quoted the famous German sex educator Oswalt Kolle to support his viewpoint. It also drew on, and recommended the reading of, a handbook of sexuality recently published by the government's printing house Quimantú. By referring to these authoritative sources, the editor clearly distinguished sex education from pornography. The magazine endorsed the former and claimed to have nothing to do with the latter: 'There is no intention to publish pornography neither in this problem page nor in any other section of *Ramona*.' The following paragraphs expand on *Ramona's* attempt to enlighten its readers about sex, stressing both its achievements and shortcomings.³⁰

Homosexuality began to be discussed by young communists, leaving

the realm of vices to enter the domain of medical science, but the tendency to link homosexuality with pornography and depravation was still strong. Take for example *Ramona's* article '48 Hours in Amsterdam.' A Chilean journalist visiting Amsterdam mentioned that sex shops abounded and he narrated his personal experience when entering one of them. It was full of pornographic books 'with the biggest depravations. Homosexuality and lesbianism in full-colour pictures.'³¹ Notwithstanding this and a few other examples, *Ramona* also contributed to the discussion of homosexuality in a different register. In October 1972, the magazine devoted three successive articles to homosexuality, motivated by the letter of a reader. The way this three-issue report addressed the topic contrasted with the language of the letter. The reader asked about homosexuality because he was negatively impressed 'by the amount of faggots [*maricas*] one can see in the streets, soda fountains, and cinemas.' *Ramona* gave the reader a well-documented response based on the scientific theories of American and German experts, using the opportunity to discuss the matter at length with its larger audience. The magazine began by acknowledging the difficulty of addressing homosexuality seriously due to the tendency to ridicule homosexuals or avoid the topic altogether. The first article explained that there existed three sexual tendencies: homosexuality, heterosexuality, and 'autosexuality.' The majority of men felt or practiced a combination of them. 'Homosexuality, therefore, is an issue of degree.' *Ramona* ventured an explanation of the 'problem' of homosexuality in the following two issues, relying on theories that underlined the lack of proper socialisation in a healthy family environment. These pseudo-scientific articles, written from a hetero-normative viewpoint, make the limits of the young communists' sexual revolution apparent.³²

Premarital sex, a common yet rarely acknowledged practice in twentieth-century Chile, was one of the most original themes discussed in *Ramona*. Communists had surely engaged in premarital sex even during the most virtuous periods of 'communist morality,' but the party had not publicly commented, much less defended, this libertine attitude before. Of special interest here is a 1969 interview that the PCCh's secretary general, Luis Corvalán, gave to the communist daily *El Siglo* in a special issue dedicated to the youth. His young interviewer posed the following

question: 'Do you agree with premarital relationships between young people?' A question to which Corvalán answered: 'Yes, on the understanding that these relationships take place within the framework of a healthy morality, based on love, and with the necessary precautions to avoid any complications.' Leaving aside the degree of conservatism one may read in Corvalán's words, this is a telling excerpt because it shows the interest of young communists in discussing the topic. Indeed, it was the JJCC interviewer who posed the question in the official party press and forced the secretary general of the PCCh to state his opinion on this rarely commented subject.³³

Depicting premarital sex as 'a pronounced youth tendency' in Chile as well as abroad, young communists began to address the issue openly and made it a topic of public discussion among communists of different generations.³⁴ To a certain extent, this emphasis responded to the demands of the audience. The loss of virginity was a topic that concerned, and sometimes tormented, young readers of the magazine. Two letters published in 'Only Ask' speak to the frustrations some of them had in satisfying their emotional needs and sexual desires. A 22-year-old communist had unsuccessfully tried to have sex with many women, 'decent ones and whores,' but he had been unable to perform the sexual act. An 18-year-old communist reader lamented his own problems in another letter. He had fallen in love many times, but he had never had a girlfriend or a sexual relationship, for he was too shy and had an inferiority complex. He concluded: 'I am very miserable, for I spend most of my time analysing and criticising myself, which has led me to think about killing myself and even imagining I am a homosexual.' The editor of *Ramona's* 'Only Ask' section gave these readers reassuring responses and a few tips to cope with their complexes.³⁵

Ramona promoted not only the discussion about, but also the practice of, premarital sex. It did so, nevertheless, indirectly and somewhat timidly. In an issue published in May 1972, the magazine transcribed a lively discussion on love and sex among high school students – all of whom seem to have been left-wingers. 'I agree with premarital sexual relationships among young people as long as they are psychologically prepared for them,' the first student said. The following students uttered similar statements, though gendered discrepancies factored in the discus-

sion – as a rule, the young women involved in this discussion tended to be more sceptic than their male peers about the benefits of premarital sex. In a July 1972 article devoted to parents facing their children's newly acquired sexual freedom, the magazine employed the expert voice of a psychologist from a West German university to advance its arguments. Rather than building obstacles to prevent premarital sex, parents had to acknowledge and allow 'what was already happening,' the German psychologist argued. The two journalistic pieces herein discussed approached premarital sex defensively and ended with conservative twists. Grappling with the contradictions between their physical needs and their status as dependent adolescents, the high school students ended their discussion praising the 'sublimation of sexual activity' for revolutionary ideals. The final words of the German psychologist encouraged parents to educate their children 'to reject sex without love, just like today they reject love without sex.'³⁶

The most audacious articles seem to have been written by journalists with less formal links to the party. Patricia Politzer, for example, discussed the problems many young couples experienced when trying to take their loving relationship to the next level. Drawing upon the opinion of sexologists, she explained that 'making out' was a pleasant yet only temporary phase and that it should not preclude couples from engaging in what they wanted and needed – sex.³⁷ Something closer to an editorial opinion on premarital sex can be found in the section 'Only Ask.' The following debate is illustrative. A mother asked the magazine for advice to help her develop a trusting relationship with her daughter, who was enjoying her youth by dating men and going out with friends. The key, the editor of this section explained, lay in understanding the time they lived in and respecting her daughter's privacy. The editor addressed the issue of premarital sex explicitly and even linked it to political awareness: 'the tendency among the most conscious youth is to experience love in all of its dimensions before getting married.' Parents should not create a scandal when they learn their daughters are having sex, nor condemn them for what is not condemnable. The editor's response elicited a reply from a self-declared left-wing educator. Paraphrasing Lenin, the educator accused the editor of implying 'that "even that" [i.e., sex] can be done with the same rashness with which

“one drinks a glass of water.” In his response, the editor clarified the magazine’s stance:

we favour a more open attitude towards sex. More information, less prejudices, and a freer and calmer attitude, which would provide sexual solutions for sexual problems. Honestly, we do not see in this position the slightest defence of licentiousness or sexual laxity. We are not promoting sexual terrorism. We just want to produce a small revolution.³⁸

Birth control played a significant role in the young communists’ self-styled revolution. Communists had traditionally had a difficult time endorsing birth control – Lenin’s famous critique of ‘Neo-Malthusianism’ set the line. The U.S. funding of family planning programs in the Third World made birth control an even more problematic issue during the 1960s. In Chile, birth control methods began to be widely distributed during the Frei administration (1964-1970), which carried out family planning programs thanks to the links it established with Chilean doctors and foreign foundations.³⁹ A public discussion on family planning and birth control began to take form. In the context of this broader national debate, communist doctors tried to persuade the PCCh to amend its negative stance on family planning and birth control. Doctor Tegualda Monreal repeated for the communist daily *El Siglo* the argument she had advanced in her influential academic pieces. She explained that birth control methods should be made easily available to the population in order to decrease the number of unsafe induced abortions and maternal mortality. She also participated in a 1967 forum organised by the Female National Commission of the PCCh, where she claimed that every woman had the right to decide the number of children she wanted to have – a statement that young communist leader Gladys Marín backed.⁴⁰ In *Principios*, the theoretical magazine published by the central committee of the PCCh, Doctor Hernán Sanhueza called to reopen the party debate on family planning, arguing that proletarian women demanded birth control methods.⁴¹ These doctors were moderately successful in reopening the debate in the late 1960s and there is evidence that some party leaders assumed a more flexible attitude in this

conjuncture.⁴² Unfortunately, the fact that the physician leading the family planning crusade, Doctor Benjamín Viel, publicly campaigned for the right-wing candidate Jorge Alessandri in the 1970 presidential election, proved critical to the Allende administration's decision not to prioritise family planning programs.

Without referring to the American-sponsored concept of 'family planning,' birth control resurfaced in the pages of *Ramona* during the Allende years. While older citizens were still discussing whether family planning was desirable among married couples, young communists succeeded in introducing the topic of birth control among its young readership when discussing premarital sex. One of the most significant contributions of this magazine to the young communists' sexual revolution was a five-issue report on birth control provocatively titled 'How to have a boyfriend without getting pregnant?' The report's purported mission was merely 'to inform the magazine's young readers of the birth control methods' at their disposal. The arguments the magazine employed to present this report to the broader Chilean community were very similar to those discussed above.

'Premarital relationships are no longer an exception,' said the lead of the first article in its defence. The article proceeded then to link unwanted pregnancies with risky clandestine abortions, therefore making birth control methods seem a lesser evil. The strongest – yet still mild – political intervention was reserved for the subhead of the last article. It explained that 'some people believe that a youth magazine like *Ramona* should not address these topics because it encourages young people to engage in premarital sexual relationships. We believe that this argument is wrong, and that the ones who employ it are very distant from young people. We did not tell young people to make love before getting married; they DO IT, and without even asking for our opinion. Consequently, and since *Ramona* is a magazine dedicated to young people, we have the obligation to inform them of birth control methods, which will prevent them from having to visit a midwife to solve the problem of an unwanted pregnancy.' As this statement makes clear, the magazine still addressed the topic defensively.⁴³

The most interesting tactical innovation in this revolutionary struggle for premarital sex and birth control lay not in the consciously political phrases sprinkled in the report, but in the eminently technical nature of the piece. The report can be considered 'technical' in the sense that it dealt mostly with medical issues and relied on the expertise of Doctor Lucía López, head of the maternity section of the Health National Service. Published throughout April 1973, each article of this five-issue report devoted between three and four pages to discussing different birth control methods, such as contraceptive pills (4 April), intrauterine devices (10 April), traditional methods (17 April), and male contraceptives (24 April). Most likely written by the aforementioned journalist Patricia Politzer, these medico-journalistic articles had women as their main target and were written in an overtly didactic format, following a simple, almost catechistical pattern of questions and answers. The questions ranged from 'what is a birth control pill?' and 'where can one get the pill?' to 'does the pill affect the sexual act?' and 'is it true that the pill makes one fat?' This five-issue report, a medical intervention in the Chilean body politic, reflected the confluence of young readers demanding information to practice safe sex and left-leaning professionals (journalists, doctors, and psychologists) promoting voluntary motherhood.

The discussion on abortion reveals some of the limits of the young communists' revolution. In Chile, the topic of abortion was brought to public discussion in 1969, when a congressman from a centrist party presented a bill to legalise abortion. The topic received some national attention in the early 1970s, before the bill was buried. The women's magazine *Paula* interviewed doctors, legislators, and even priests on the matter. In an interview in *Paula*, the communist doctor Tegualda Monreal supported the bill. This women's magazine also invited the general public to contribute by sending letters. The contributions of the readers reflected a diversity of views on the topic.⁴⁴

Whereas *Paula* seems to have been campaigning for abortion rights, *Ramona* treated legalisation with ambivalence. *Ramona* used the trope of risky abortions to advance the cause of birth control, but it only published a couple of articles on abortion itself. Published on 22 February 1972, the first of them included a section on the topic of legalisation. The journalist did not openly take sides but she commented

that several First World countries and ‘all the socialist countries’ had already legalised abortion. Furthermore, the journalist finished her article by quoting a doctor who was a staunch supporter of legalisation. This piece was followed by the publication of a reader’s letter on 4 April 1972. *Ramona* decided to publish this somewhat long letter in a special section of the magazine considering it a direct and harrowing testimony about the risks of abortion. The reader’s girlfriend had gotten pregnant with his baby. She tried to terminate the pregnancy and ended up tragically dead. The boyfriend advised other readers not to make the same mistake. *Ramona’s* subsequent silence on the issue of legalising abortion speaks for itself.⁴⁵

Communist Couples: Monogamy, Love, and Marital Breakups

The PCCh had traditionally supported family life, but it had a somewhat ambivalent attitude towards the institution of marriage.⁴⁶ Communists denounced the bourgeois family ideal because it subordinated women to men and allowed male extramarital relationships behind the moralistic façade of marriage. Yet far from debunking the monogamous ideal altogether, communists promoted its historical realisation. The party sanctioned loving and violence-free conjugal relationships among its members. A communist was not only supposed to be a revolutionary in the street, but also a good spouse and parent at home. Or, as the statutes put it, a communist had to ‘stick to the principles of communist morality in his or her public and private life, watch over the proper education of his or her children, [and] be an example at home and a good comrade with neighbours and co-workers.’⁴⁷ Communist understandings of family revealed its more conservative aspects when coping with gender and generational tensions. Family relationships were supposed to be harmonious and contribute to the socialist cause, for societies were divided along class lines, rather than age or gender ones. The party tried to promote a greater degree of gender equality through the integration of women into the labour force but it paid little attention to gender equality at home. Alongside the well-studied representations of women as workers and activists, the communist press was plagued with articles that addressed women as housewives.

Relationships among older communist couples remained within a patriarchal framework. This can be glimpsed in the 1969 interview that secretary general Luis Corvalán gave to the communist daily *El Siglo*. In a section headed 'Father, Husband, and "Uncle,"' the journalist described Corvalán as a caring father and loving husband. Interviewed at home, Corvalán sometimes let his wife speak for him about these matters. When the journalist asked him whether he considered himself a good husband, Corvalán redirected the question to his wife, who answered: 'We have been married for twenty-two years. And, I would marry Lucho [Corvalán] again.' Yet, an interesting section headed 'Is there collective leadership in the PC[Ch]? And at home?' suggests that party leaders had problems addressing the negotiation of gender roles. After discussing the obscure decision-making process of the party, the young journalist asked Corvalán who was in charge at home: 'you or your *compañera*?' Corvalán said that it depended on the matter and explained that even their seven-year-old daughter made some family decisions. At this moment, Corvalán's wife interrupted him and jokingly complained that everyone knew that Corvalán was the head of the house, his small size notwithstanding. It seems that the Leninist principle of 'collective leadership,' to use the words of the journalist, eluded communists in both the party and the home.⁴⁸

During these years, family became a particularly sensitive matter because it was believed that worldwide trends were challenging its primacy. The letters to the section 'Only Ask' lay bare the anxieties these issues awakened among young readers. They also render evident the young communists' defence of the family ideal vis-à-vis individualistic and communitarian alternatives. Alicia Gómez noticed in her 1972 letter that people in developed countries were seeking new living arrangements. Some lived in hippie communes sharing sexual partners and children, others preferred to remain single. She declared herself troubled by these social developments and asked: 'Do you think that the family, the couple, will disappear?' In his answer, the editor of the section 'Only Ask' pointed out that some Chileans were already dreaming of having their own harem or going from one bed to the other. In capitalist societies, the editor explained, some had tried experiments like those mentioned in the letter. According to him, this was merely 'escapism.' In

contrast, the socialist countries were setting a positive model. Family had not disappeared in the Soviet Union. It was becoming a more equalitarian and liberating institution. 'Under the current conditions,' the editor concluded, 'it seems that there is no better life system than a man and a woman living together, having kids, being friends, and trying to make their relationship as lively as they both are individually.' The editor acknowledged that many couples failed, but he added: 'there are also ones that do function. And, this makes the effort worthy.'⁴⁹

Other answers by the editor of *Ramona's* 'Only Ask' reveal the nuances of the young communists' understanding of monogamy and love. In a letter published in June 1973, a young left-leaning woman asked for advice. She had been in a relationship with a left-leaning man from another city for almost a year and a half. Her boyfriend was nice and considerate, but she was not sure whether she really loved him. She had recently met another man and started a secret, simultaneous relationship. The second boyfriend was feeling ready for something more serious, but she was uncertain whether she wanted to commit further. In his response, the editor of the section 'Only Ask' pointed out that she seemed to love both men, but neither of them enough to have 'a special, exclusive, rich, and profound relationship to not need any other affairs.' The editor gave her a piece of advice that, he said, 'could sound a little weird: do not decide yet. Give yourself some time and get the urgency to define your sentimental issues off your mind.' He was not encouraging parallel relationships. The girl already had them. She now had to proceed slowly, 'letting the events take place by themselves. And, when you find yourself connected to one of the two young men, when you have the sensation that that person is all you need, only then should you make a formal decision.' The editor was not giving up on the communist ideal of monogamous love: 'the time for exclusive love will come to you,' he finished by saying.⁵⁰

The attitude of younger communists towards the institution of marriage remained fraught with ambivalence. *Ramona* tried to adapt the institution of marriage to the new, more equalitarian times. Published on 16 January 1973, 'Is It Worth Getting Married?' began by acknowledging the paradox: infidelities and breakups showed that the institution of marriage had not been successful, but people continued to get married. In a section called 'Shattered Homes,' the article included 'three

dramatic testimonies on marital failures. It is the word of young people who have suffered in their own flesh the impact of this problem.' The solution lay not in rejecting marriage but in developing a different approach which, following contemporary psychologists and sociologists, the journalist termed 'open contract.' This notion did not weaken rights or responsibilities. It departed from traditional marriage in demanding a greater degree of communication between the couple, more space for each to have an independent life, and a flexible understanding of their roles. As this and other articles suggest, the youth wing of the party defended the family while attempting to redefine its most traditional elements.⁵¹

In Chile's somewhat conservative context, marital failures were one of the most problematic issues. In contrast to other Latin American countries, Chile did not even have a proper divorce law, relying instead on marriage annulment as the sole legal solution. Marital breakups were a sensitive matter for Chilean communists, too. Although the PCCh could embrace the idea of legislating on divorce in theory, in practice the party tried to prevent marital breakups among its members at all costs. The endurance of some conservative beliefs among old communists is particularly apparent in the aforementioned 1969 interview that Corvalán gave to the communist daily *El Siglo*. His young interviewer brought up the topic of 'morality,' and asked: 'Don't you think that in this matter the communists are, or may appear, a little conservative [*pacatos*]?' Corvalán explained, first, that the party had no intention of making angels out of militants. He added 'that without falling into Puritanisms [sic], the Party takes great care in avoiding, to the extent possible, the breakup of marriages... Perhaps this is why we may seem, to some people, a little conservative.' Revealingly enough, it was Corvalán who chose to illustrate the PCCh's moral stance by discussing the way in which the party dealt with the problem of marital breakdown. Corvalán took pride in the party's attempt to prevent breakups and stressed this idea in a special issue dedicated to the youth.⁵²

The letters sent to 'Only Ask' reveal the anxieties marital failure awakened among young readers and the editor's responses allow us to examine the nuances of the JJCC's stance. A letter published in June 1973 is illustrative. The author of the letter, a 21-year-old communist man who held

a middle level position in one of the local branches of the JJCC, told the magazine about his wife's increasing indifference towards him, which had only grown after the birth of their first child. They had married a year and a half ago, partly motivated by the woman's pregnancy. The letter writer argued that he had done everything he could possibly do to solve their marital troubles. He had even abandoned his political activism for a while to devote more time to his wife, who blamed his activism for their problems. However, his wife had not made any efforts to save their marriage. They had recently discussed ending the relationship. Only his concerns with the social sanctions of his family and the community had prevented him from taking the definitive step. The editor's response was straightforward: 'If your wife's attitude does not change, you have no other solution but to abandon the [sinking] ship.' The editor told him that he should not fear the social sanction. That was an old-fashioned concern. Indeed, the worst thing he could do was to raise his daughter in a 'shattered home,' although he should be aware that being a father carried responsibilities that went beyond marriage. In inspired prose, the editor ended: 'Gather strength, take a deep breath, and make a decision.'⁵³

The way the editor of *Ramona's* 'Only Ask' treated the complex issue of marital breakups was rather consistent, disregarding the political affiliation and even the gender of the spouses. The editor's answers to two letters sent in mid-1972 prove the point. In a letter published in June, a 23-year-old man recounted his marital troubles. About a year ago, he had married a single mother who soon began an extramarital affair. He had recently left the house of his parents-in-law, where he used to live with his wife, but he could still not digest the idea of a definitive separation. In a letter published in September, a 27-year-old left-wing woman told a similar, yet somewhat more complicated, story. Her husband had had love affairs in the past. She had replied in kind. Now, her husband showed no romantic interest in her, even though she was pregnant with his first child. The editor gave similar answers to both readers. He told the first one that the best solution was to end his relationship once and for all. 'You will always be dissatisfied with her. To wait for an improvement is to lie to yourself.' There were many fish in the sea and he was still young. 'At 23, one should not fall into despair. You have your whole life ahead of you.' Similarly, the editor explained to the second reader that

there were no signs that her partner would suddenly become the 'loving husband, caring mate, and responsible parent she had searched for.' The editor recommended this female reader to give her husband a deadline; for example, six months after the baby was born. If, by then, the relationship had not improved, she should say 'goodbye' to her husband and find a more suitable man. 'Search calmly... At 27, you still have much life ahead of you.' Although one can find different emphases in the editor's answers, that which is surprising is the overall consistency of the advice irrespective of the gender of the letter writer. As these examples reveal, *Ramona* developed a tolerant attitude toward marital breakups – love being the touchstone – and did not hold back from advising its readers to end unfulfilling relationships.⁵⁴

Conclusion

Recent literature tends to dwell on the enduring sexism of the Latin American left, underestimating the significance of generational cleavages and the degree of cultural change. Although younger generations of communists upheld some of the conservative beliefs of the old communist subculture, they approached the changing patterns in family and sexuality more flexibly. True, young communists continued to defend the family ideal, stressing the importance of love and monogamy. And true, they fell short of supporting homosexuality or abortion. But the significance of change should not be underestimated. *Ramona's* discussion of marital breakups, premarital sex, and birth control underscores the extent of this change. The young communists who published this magazine advised their readers to engage in sexual relationships even if they were not conducive to marriage, recommended them different birth control mechanisms to practice safe sex, and did not hold back from suggesting judicial separation to those whose marriage had failed.

The root of the cultural changes discussed in this piece came from both 'above' and 'below.' On the one hand, the young communist leaders of the 1960s and 1970s were more educated and open to the outside world than the leaders of the PCCH. The importance of this vanguard of open-minded and worldly individuals in promoting change is particularly apparent in the case of *Ramona*. On the other hand, the recruitment

of thousands of new rank and file members propelled change. In the context of massive youth mobilisation and increasing competition with leftist political groups and esoteric social movements, the JJCC decided to open its gates to inexperienced individuals from different backgrounds. Leaders were confident they could indoctrinate these uninitiated men and women within the prevalent party structures, but in the process they had to engage with, and respond to, the specific concerns of this new generation of members. These young members demanded more information about sex and expected fewer obstacles to develop their own selves. They pushed to create a world after their own image and, in the end, reshaped the contours of the Chilean communist subculture in significant ways.

Note

1. I wish to thank Nara Milanich, Vania Markarian, Barbara Weinstein, Matthew Connelly, and the anonymous reviewers for their feedback on various versions of this article.
2. Rojas, Jorge, "Historia, Historiadores y Comunistas Chilenos," in Manuel Loyola and Jorge Rojas, eds., *Por un Rojo Amanecer. Hacia una Historia de los Comunistas Chilenos*, Santiago, Chile: Impresora Vals, 2000, pp49-53. See also Roseblatt, Karin Alejandra, *Gendered Compromises: Political Cultures and the State in Chile, 1920-1950*, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000, pp185-229. Although Rojas and Roseblatt stress the role of local factors when explaining this paradox, the pro-family discourse of the PCCh paralleled transformations in the Soviet Union and the international communist movement. See Goldman, Wendy Z., *Women, the State, and Revolution: Soviet Family Policy and Social Life, 1917-1936*, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1993; Evans, Janet, "The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Women's Question: The Case of the 1936 Decree 'In Defence of Mother and Child,'" *Journal of Contemporary History* 16 (4), 1981, 757-75; Gosse, Van, "'To Organize in Every Neighborhood, in Every Home': The Gender Politics of American Communists between the Wars," *Radical History Review* 50, 1991; Casalini, Maria, *Famiglie Comuniste. Ideologie e Vita Quotidiana nell'I-*

- talia degli Anni Cinquanta*, Bologna, Italy: Il Mulino, 2010; Bellassai, Sandro, *Morale Comunista. Pubblico e Privato nella Rappresentazione del PCI: 1947-1956*, Roma, Italy: Carocci, 2000. For a somewhat different interpretation of the transformations in the Soviet Union, see Hoffmann, David, *Stalinist Values. The Cultural Norms of Soviet Modernity, 1917-1941*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003.
3. Fernández-Niño, Carolina, “‘Y Tú, Mujer, Junto al Trabajador.’ La Militancia Femenina en el Partido Comunista de Chile,” *Revista Izquierdas* 3, Año 2, 2009; Reyes, Jocelyn, *Luchamos por la Transformación Revolucionaria de la Sociedad y Debemos Actuar con una Ética También Revolucionaria en la Vida Privada: Discursos Políticos Enunciados por el Partido Comunista Hacia las Mujeres y sus Roles de Género (1969-1973)*, B.A. thesis, Universidad Academia de Humanismo Cristiano, 2011; Lecourt, Yazmín, *Relaciones de Género y Liderazgo de Mujeres dentro del Partido Comunista de Chile*, M.A. thesis, Universidad de Chile, 2005.
 4. Tinsman, Heidi, *Partners in Conflict: The Politics of Gender, Sexuality and Labor in the Chilean Agrarian Reform, 1950-1973*, Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.
 5. Pieper Mooney, Jadwiga, *The Politics of Motherhood: Maternity and Women's Rights in Twentieth-Century Chile*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009, pp102-33; Power, Margaret, *Right-Wing Women in Chile. Feminine Power and the Struggle against Allende, 1964-1973*, University Park, Penn: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.
 6. Mallon, Florencia, “*Barbudos*, Warriors, and Rotos: The MIR, Masculinity, and Power in the Chilean Agrarian Reform, 1965-1974,” in Matthew C. Gutmann, editor, *Changing Men and Masculinities in Latin America*, Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.
 7. Barr-Melej, Patrick, “Siloísmo and the Self in Allende’s Chile: Youth, ‘Total Revolution,’ and the Roots of the Humanist Movement,” *Hispanic American Historical Review* 86 (4), November 2006.
 8. This methodological strategy draws upon Cosse, Isabella, “Familia, Sexualidad y Género en los Años 60. Pensar los Cambios desde la Argentina: Desafíos y Problemas de Investigación,” *Temas y Debates* 16, Diciembre 2008.
 9. This approach is partly inspired by recent literature on youth and generation within the communist world movement. See the articles in

- Twentieth-Century Communism: A Journal of International History* 4, May 2012.
10. McGee Deutsch, Sandra, "Gender and Sociopolitical Change in Twentieth-Century Latin America," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 71, 2, May 1991; Lillian Guerra, "Gender Policing, Homosexuality, and the new Patriarchy of the Cuban Revolution, 1965-70," *Social History* 35, 3, July 2010.
 11. Cosse, Isabella, *Pareja, Sexualidad y Familia en los Años Sesenta. Una Revolución Discreta en Buenos Aires*, Buenos Aires, Argentina: Siglo Veintiuno Editores, 2010, pp142-6; Green, James, "'Who Is the Macho Who Wants to Kill Me?' Male Homosexuality, Revolutionary Masculinity, and the Brazilian Armed Struggle of the 1960s and 1970s," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 92, 3, 2012; Langland, Victoria, "Birth Control Pills and Molotov Cocktails. Reading Sex and Revolution in 1968 Brazil," in Gilbert Joseph, and Daniela Spenser, eds., *In from the Cold: Latin America's New Encounter with the Cold War*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008.
 12. Markarian, Vania, "Sobre Viejas y Nuevas Izquierdas. Los Jóvenes Comunistas Uruguayos y el Movimiento Estudiantil de 1968," *Secuencia* 81, 2011.
 13. Zolov, Eric, "Expanding Our Conceptual Horizons: The Shift from an Old to a New Left in Latin America," *A Contracorriente* 5, 2, Winter 2008. For the Chilean case, see González, Yanko, "'Sumar y no ser sumados': Culturas juveniles revolucionarias. Mayo de 1968 y diversificación identitaria en Chile," *Alpha* 30, 2010.
 14. Communist leaders elsewhere sided with their Chilean peers to halt the Cuban attempt to export the revolution, especially after the failure of guerrilla wars in Bolivia and Venezuela. Ballots, not bullets, were the weapons by which to achieve power. The PCCh's growing international significance became apparent in 1969, when the party celebrated its 12th National Congress. This congress was the first occasion in which representatives of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the French Communist Party, and the Italian Communist Party met together in Latin America. Santoni, Alessandro, *El Comunismo Italiano y la Via Chilena. El Origen de un Mito*, Santiago, Chile: Ril editores, 2011, p54.

15. Power, *Right-Wing Women in Chile*, p8; Barr-Melej, "Siloiismo and the Self," p769; cf. Tinsman, *Partners in Conflict*, p235.
16. Carlos Berger, the son of middle-class, left-leaning Jewish immigrants and a lawyer by training, was the magazine's first editor; most of the subsequent issues were published under the direction of the university-trained, communist journalists Marcel Garcés and Sergio Muñoz Riveros – all of them were open-minded, middle-class young men. Carlos Berger's open attitude toward relationships and sexuality comes through in his private letters. See Berger, Eduardo, *Desde Rusia con Amor. Cartas de Carlos Berger a su familia*, Santiago, Chile: Pehuén Editores, 2007. Sergio Muñoz's memoirs, written in the 1990s, are very critical of the PCCh's dogmatism. See Muñoz, Sergio, *Ardua Libertad*, Temuco, Chile: Ediciones Universidad de la Frontera, 1995. The editors of *Ramona* also asked advice to the editors of the polemic left-wing tabloid *Puro Chile*.
17. Sociologist Manuel Fernando Contreras seems to have been in charge of the former and visual artist and philosophy student Juan Guillermo Tejada of the latter. While Contreras was a member of the JJCC, Tejada was a sympathiser. In an interview conducted in the mid-1990s, Tejada describes himself as being in-between the hippies and the communists during the Allende years. See Verdugo, Patricia, ed., *Así lo viví yo... Chile 1973*, Santiago, Chile: Universidad Nacional Andrés Bello, 1994, pp127-32.
18. Most of the factual information of this paragraph is based on Suazo, Francisco, *La Prensa de Izquierda en el Gobierno de la Unidad Popular: La Revista Ramona y el Proyecto de Transformaciones Sociales del Gobierno de Salvador Allende. Octubre 1971-Octubre 1972*, B.A. thesis, Universidad de Santiago de Chile, 2003, pp46-51.
19. Pieper Mooney, *The Politics of Motherhood*, p51.
20. *Paula* 1, July 1967, "¿Debo tomar la píldora?"
21. Suazo, *La Prensa de Izquierda en el Gobierno de la Unidad Popular*, pp73-79.
22. *Ramona* 69, 20 February 1973, "El sexo a tres velocidades."
23. See *Ramona* 3, 12 November 1971, "Jóvenes Europa 1971. ¿Se muere el amor?"; *Ramona* 23, 4 April 1972, "Las checas y la píldora"; *Ramona* 46, 12 September 1972, "48 horas en Amsterdam; Tulipanes, hippies, bicicletas, holandeses y pornografía"; *Ramona* 47, 20 September 1972, "La

- 'Olimpiada' de Leipzig: una feria con medallas de oro"; *Ramona* 49, 3 October 1972, "Los lolos de la RDA son como tú"; *Ramona* 52, 24 October 1972, "Checoslovaquia. El consumo y el socialismo"; *Ramona* 60, 19 December 1972, "La vida moderna en Francia: Padres abandonados se sindicalizan"; *Ramona* 70, 27 February 1973, "Sexo es estar nervioso."
24. Foucault, Michel, *The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: The Will to Knowledge*, London, England: Penguin, 1998.
 25. *Ramona* 2, 5 November 1971, "La porno llegó a Santiago."
 26. Ottone, Ernesto, *El viaje rojo: un ejercicio de memoria*, Santiago, Chile: Debate, 2014, p56.
 27. Interview with Héctor in Santiago, Chile, 22 August 2012.
 28. Interview with Boris in Santiago, Chile, 13 January 2014.
 29. *Mayoría* 5, 17 November 1971, "...Y dale con el sexo."
 30. *Ramona* 29, 16 May 1972, "Ciertos temas muy privados."
 31. *Ramona* 46, 12 September 1972, "48 horas en Amsterdam"
 32. *Ramona* 50, 10 October 1972, "La homosexualidad es así"; *Ramona* 51, 17 October 1972, "La homosexualidad es así"; *Ramona* 52, 24 October 1972, "Y existen, además, las 'homosexuales.'" To a certain extent, discourses such as the one discussed above did play a positive role in expanding the realm of the possible. The very few public discourses available in Chilean society were all blatantly negative. In the press, homosexuals enjoyed publicity only in the crime reports. To make matters worse, the gay movement developed rather late in Chile. See Robles, Victor Hugo, *Bandera Hueca. Historia del Movimiento Homosexual en Chile*, Santiago, Chile: Editorial Arcis and Cuarto Propio, 2008.
 33. *El Siglo*, 8 June 1969, "Corvalán habla de lo humano y lo divino." Chilean historian Rolando Álvarez has interpreted these words as another proof of the moral conservatism of communism. Álvarez, Rolando, *Arriba los Pobres del Mundo: Cultura e Identidad Política del Partido Comunista de Chile entre Democracia y Dictadura, 1965-1990*, Santiago, Chile: Lom ediciones, 2011, p55. I believe Corvalán's words to be more ambivalent. True, Corvalán does qualify his endorsement of premarital sex. But he does so by stressing the importance of love and, more importantly, birth control, rather than the conduciveness of these sexual relations to marriage.
 34. *Ramona* 70, 27 February 1973, "Sexo es estar nervioso."

35. *Ramona* 71, 6 March 1973, "Insatisfecho"; *Ramona* 79, 1 May 1973, "Moreno, virgen, autocrítico y suicida."
36. *Ramona* 36, 4 July 1972, "El ángulo de los padres: ¿Qué hacer ante la libertad sexual de nuestros hijos?"; *Ramona* 31, 30 May 1972, "El adolescente chileno 1972 se desnuda ante el amor."
37. *Ramona* 66, 30 January 1973, "Muchas ganas; pero mucho miedo."
38. *Ramona* 42, 15 August 1972, "Lolitas encabritadas y madres desorientadas"; *Ramona* 47, 20 September 1972, "A propósito de 'Lolitas encabritadas y madres desorientadas.'"
39. Pieper Mooney, *The Politics of Motherhood*, pp71-101.
40. Molina, Carlos, and Michael Reynolds, *Historia de Vida: Tegualda Monreal. Un Acervo Multimedia de Testimonios Orales*, Santiago, Chile: Ministerio de Salud, 2009, pp167-8, 241-2; *Principios* 121, October 1967, "Hacia nuevos métodos en el trabajo femenino."
41. Hernán Sanhueza, "La planificación de la familia y el subdesarrollo," *Principios* 119, May 1967.
42. Communist senator Volodia Teitelboim partially welcomed the conference of the IPPF and secretary general Corvalán alluded to birth controls when discussing premarital sex in the interview mentioned above. Senado, *Diario de Sesiones del Senado*, Sesión 6ª, 11 April 1967, pp181-5; *El Siglo*, 8 June 1969, "Corvalán habla de lo humano y lo divino."
43. *Ramona* 75, 3 April 1973, "Hoy día le toca a la píldora"; *Ramona* 76, 10 April 1973, "Hoy le toca a los DIU"; *Ramona* 77, 17 April 1973, "Hoy día le toca a los métodos tradicionales"; *Ramona* 78, 24 April 1973, "Hoy les toca a los métodos para hombres"; *Ramona* 79, 1 May 1973, "Hoy día le toca a: Lo bueno y lo malo de los diferentes métodos anticonceptivos." All the quotes of this and the next paragraph refer to these articles.
44. Pieper Mooney, *The Politics of Motherhood*, p122. For the interview to Tegualda Monreal, see *Paula* 54, January 1970, "¿Aborto legal o control intensivo de la natalidad?" For a communist journalist's call to legalise abortion, see *El Siglo*, 7 November 1969, "¿Es culpable la abortera?"
45. *Ramona* 17, 22 February 1972, "El aborto, ¿un castigo para chilenos de segunda clase?"; *Ramona* 23, 4 April 1972, "Testimonio sobre el aborto."
46. Although the PCCh's line on marriage and marital breakups dated from the late 1930s, interesting examples of its endurance can be found in Carlos Robles, "Nuestro concepto del matrimonio," *Principios* 63,

- November 1959; José Pino, “Algunos problemas de la moral comunista,” *Principios* 125, June 1968.
47. Partido Comunista de Chile, “Estatutos,” Santiago, Chile: n.p., 1962, p11. This article of the statutes was first added in 1962 and subsequently ratified in 1965 and 1969.
48. *El Siglo*, 8 June 1969, “Corvalán habla de lo humano y lo divino.” These excerpts are not a transparent expression of power relations. Yet, the dynamics of the interview, conducted by a young communist who knew Corvalán and interviewed him at home, are nevertheless revealing. And, so is the young interviewer’s decision to mix questions about gender and political power, publishing the answers under catchy headings.
49. *Ramona* 41, 8 August 1972, “La familia y los hippies.”
50. *Ramona* 86, 19 June 1973, “Dos pololos que no son lolos y una lola que está muy sola.”
51. *Ramona* 64, 16 January 1973, “¿Vale la pena casarse?”
52. *El Siglo*, 8 June 1969, “Corvalán habla de lo humano y lo divino.”
53. *Ramona* 87, 26 June 1973, “Indiferencia con matrimonio, guagua y política.”
54. *Ramona* 35, 27 June 1972, “Casado, separado y desesperado”; *Ramona* 48, 26 September 1972, “Esposa que sufre y marido que no comparte.”